



Update on the Pretrial Systems Report - Feb. 2019
Criminal Justice Interest Group
League of Women Voters of Cook County

It has been 3 years since we issued our original Pretrial Systems Report. In that report we made 11 recommendations to help ensure that pretrial operations are fairly and equitably administered within the criminal justice system of Cook County. These recommendations were put forth in order to ensure that pretrial systems efficiently and effectively serve the accused and the citizenry of Cook County. The purpose of this updated report is to summarize the progress made on each of these recommendations and to assess what further steps our criminal justice interest group needs to take in order to further each goal.

Since the publication of our report in 2015 our group has interviewed 15 public officials and active employees in the criminal justice system. We have made 13 visits to bond courts throughout Cook County including Central Bond Court and all 5 of the suburban branches. We visited Mental Health Court twice, Drug Court 3 times, Problem Solving Court twice, and Restorative Justice Court once. We made one visit to Winnebago County in order to compare their problem solving court to that of Cook County. We toured the Roseland Community Triage Center and the Pretrial Services Department (in both the Courthouse at 26th and California and the Jail). We attended the Cook County Board of Commissioners' Hearing on bail where our Co-Chair gave testimony in favor of eliminating monetary bail. We participated in the monthly meetings of the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee organized by the Appleseed lawyers of the Chicago Council of Lawyers. Our Co-Chair also met with the Chicago Civic Federation to discuss the problems of data collection. These activities shaped this update of our 11 original recommendations:

1. Discontinue the Use of Cash Bail.

Developments. There has been great progress on this recommendation. In September of 2017 Chief Judge Evans issued his order to ensure that no defendant was held in jail pretrial solely because of his inability to afford bail. The order required that defendants must be questioned about this ability in bond court. A report issued in Feb. of 2018 by the Coalition to End Money Bail studied central bond court practices approximately 6 weeks before and 6 weeks after this order. They found that 80% were asked about their ability to pay versus 7% before the order. In addition, State's Attorney Kim Foxx issued a directive to her prosecutors not to ask for monetary bail if the

defendant had no prior convictions and was charged with a low level offense. Cook County Public Defender Amy Campanelli has directed her attorneys go into jail to do a review of detainees who may still be held after 7 days due solely to their inability to pay.

Numbers tell part of the story. The population of Cook County Jail has declined at least 25% since our criminal justice interest group was established (from 10,000 to 6,000 detainees) . It is not easy to determine how many are there solely due to inability to pay. The Coalition to End Money Bond's report puts the number at little over 3,000 only 2 months after the Judge's order was issued. ("Monitoring Cook County's Central Bond Court" report by the Coalition to End Money Bond Feb. 2018. p. 29). Others (such as those who attend the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee meetings) put the number closer to 2,500. Cara Smith, Policy Director for the Jail, said such numbers are difficult to count because so many factors go into a bond court decision. FOIA requests are required in order to receive this data.

Next Steps. The difficulty in obtaining reliable data has been a huge obstacle in assessing the use of cash bail. This concern is shared by the Chicago Civic Federation in a parallel report. We will be working with other groups to obtain this data.

2. Make Thoughtful Use of Personal Recognizance I- Bonds and Electronic Monitoring.

Developments. There are far more detainees receiving I-Bonds and Electronic Monitoring than before the Judge's order. According to Brad Curry of the Sheriff's office there are about 2600 detainees on EM. The Coalition's report stated that the number receiving I-Bonds had doubled.

There continue to be some troubling aspects to the EM program. Most of the detainees are under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Dept. (about 2000) and the rest are under the Chief Judge's office. The former often has more restrictive conditions, such as curfews for both 24/7 and 7PM to 7AM. The latter program has detainees on GPS monitoring. The bond court judge sets the type of EM and under whose jurisdiction the detainee will remain. The specific conditions are also set by the judge, according to Bond Court Judge David Navarro.

We are concerned about the lack of consistency concerning the conditions of EM. Mr. Curry stated that he was aware of this issue and that he and the Sheriff were working on it. Amy Campanelli, the Cook County Public Defender, stated that these inconsistencies and inequities would be lessened if all of the EM detainees were placed under the Judge's jurisdiction.

Next steps. We did not foresee these problems when we advocated for more Electronic Monitoring in our original report. We are pleased that there are fewer defendants in jail. However, we will continue to advocate for the elimination of inequities in all EM programs.

3. Improve Collaborations Among the Stakeholders to Expand the Availability of Alternatives to Jail.

Developments. According to the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC) the stakeholders meet regularly to discuss reforms in the criminal justice system. Either the

elected officials or their top staff are present at each meeting. Bond court judges are all aware of the various diversion programs and specialty courts because they are made aware by the State's Attorney's Office. Detainees who enter these programs are usually recommended by a prosecutor from this office.

In our original report we advocated Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training. It has been proven effective in de-escalating situations for police officers who have the full 40 hour training. The collaboration of the stakeholders did not originally include police officers at their meetings. However after meeting with Lt. Antoinette Ursitti, the Chicago Police Department's then head of CIT training, she assured us that she met regularly with court officials and many outside agencies that deal with mental illness. She also assured us that 20% of CPD's officers have had this training, and at least one trained officer is available for every shift at every precinct. The new Consent Decree for the CPD has CIT training as a requirement (details of this decree are still being worked out).

Officers who have had this training are concerned that there are too few places to take detainees once a situation is de-escalated. We visited the Roseland Center Triage for this purpose and were surprised to see that it was not very well utilized (it had just opened). Our follow up one year later revealed no increased usage there. We have also visited mental health courts around the county. These seem to be helping those defendants who were sent there, but each time we saw only a dozen or so people.

Next steps. We will continue to monitor stakeholder collaboration. Police officers must be involved in this process. The Cook County Criminal Justice system has a variety of specialized courts which offer alternatives to jail. Better coordination within the system could bring equal justice and less recidivism.

4. Improve Communication Among Bond Court Judges.

Developments. In September 2017, Chief Judge Evans replaced all of the original bond court judges at Central Bond Court with 6 new judges. The new ones had been serving in other courtrooms. The new judges meet regularly, have bias training and are well versed in using the Public Safety Assessment Tool (see number 7). According to observations from the Coalition to End Money Bail and the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, 2 of the 6 new judges regularly set higher amounts of cash bail than the other 4. State statute requires bond court judges to consider 36 factors when deciding what type of bail to set. Like most judges, all 6 do not have the same interpretation of the law and have differing opinions in evaluating flight risk and reoffending risk.

Next steps. We will continue to communicate with Judge Evans' staff in order to monitor this collaboration.

5. Complete the Integrated Information System.

Developments. This relatively new technology system (BUS) seeks to automate the exchange of data between key criminal justice agencies (Clerk of the Circuit Court, the Chief Judge, Sheriff's Office, Police Departments, State's Attorney, Illinois Department of Corrections). All of these agencies are using the BUS technology to some extent. (Some information needs to stay within a single department due to security reasons.)

To do this quickly and effectively, four phases of this technology are being implemented with the completion date set for August of 2019. According to the 2018 Quarter 2 report, the following are completed: Automated Court Reminders for all defendants via phone messages and text, Electronic Mittimus between the Sheriff and the Clerk of the Court in order to minimize unlawful or delayed releases from Cook County Jail and to report timely releases, eDefender case management system (KRIMS for felony and misdemeanor criminal cases and TRIMS for traffic cases). With a completion goal of March 2019, the processing of new inmates between the Sheriff's Office and the Illinois Department of Corrections should prove safer and more accurate. The Bond Court exchanges will modernize the document sharing process by doing away with carbon and paper documents. This part should be completed by Aug. 2019.

Better use of technology should lead to better case management and a more efficient court process from arrest to disposition of the case. Every part of each case from subpoenas to the use of expert witnesses should be electronically available to all participants.

Next steps. We will be following up with the Technology Committee of the Cook County Board of Commissioners as these dates get closer.

6. Evaluate the Results of Diversion Programs.

Developments. We define these programs as those offered to defendants while they are still in the pretrial stage. There are special programs for defendants after they have been sentenced, but we focused on pretrial. The goal is to divert the defendant from trial and/or incarceration. These programs can be called successful if the defendant completes all of the requirements of the program (graduates) and stays out of the criminal justice system for the next 3 years.

TASC (Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities) is a prominent organization in Illinois that works with the State's Attorney's office to divert defendants during pretrial and post-trial. Their own data cited over 3000 detainees who were diverted in 2017 from traditional prosecution in Cook County. These are people who completed programs mainly for substance abuse. They also cite a reduction in those who were arrested for future drug offenses for those who graduated from these programs compared to those who never attended, after a 2 year post incarceration period. That figure is for all of Illinois, not just in Cook County.

The State's Attorney's Office has had a deferred prosecution program for many years. A study ("Evaluation of the Cook County State's Attorney's Office's Deferred Prosecution Program" pp.6-8) completed in 2015 by the ICJIA (Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority) cited 35 people per month diverted to this program. 69% graduated and the recidivism rate for those graduates was 31% after 18 months. Unfortunately the control group's recidivism rate was statistically similar (34%). The State's Attorney's current website does not include data on this program, only on arrests, prosecutions, and disposition of cases in the traditional sense.

The JAC (Justice Advisory Council) under President Preckwinkle's office is another group that advocates diversion programs. After meeting with the JAC's Delrice Adams and Rebecca Janowitz we learned a lot about the grant process and the various

programs that exist for addiction problems, but we did not receive much data related to completion and recidivism. Interestingly this council advocated CIT training as one of the best ways to divert people from the criminal justice system. (see number 3).

These diversion programs help too few defendants. The data from such a small sample is limited.

Next Steps.The Chicago Civic Federation is focused on getting data from Cook County's criminal justice system. We will continue to work with them and with our connections at TASC and the State's Attorney's office to request better data collection and analysis. The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative is also working on ways to collect the data dealing with the effectiveness of some of these programs. They will be working with the staff from the Justice Advisory Council to identify which of these programs should continue to receive funding. We will be reviewing better data collection and analysis.

7. Confirm the Validity of the Pre-trial Public Safety Assessment.

Developments.The Public Safety Assessment (PSA) is an integral part of the new bond court process. This particular tool has been an objective way for judges to determine the flight risk and reoffending probability for each defendant. The judge receives a numerical score for predicting each of these 2 factors along with a report written by the pretrial officer.

Members of our group were given a first hand look at this process both at the jail and in the court in April of 2017. We were granted access by Juan Hinojosa of the Pretrial Services Dept. and Chris Carroll of the Chief Judge's Office. Our tour was arranged by the Chief Judge. We witnessed a new defendant being interviewed by a pretrial services officer in the jail. Then the information was checked thoroughly for accuracy by PSA workers in the court. This sometimes took all day if the defendant had an arrest record out of state. Also different states label crimes differently, so that the PSA evaluator had to figure out how the out of state charges compared with similar crimes in Illinois. We were impressed with the amount of time taken to achieve accurate PSA scores and an accurate accompanying report.

However, the PSA and the report are merely tools that go into the judge's decision on bond. He has 36 factors to consider according to state statute and he is still free to "judge" the situation as he sees fit. The Civic Federation's report "The Impact of Cook County Bond Court on the Jail Population: a Call for Increased Public Data and Analysis" (Nov. 2017) stated "it is unclear to what extent bond court judges have used risk assessment tools or what effect the new formula has had on bail decisions." p. 47

Next steps.We understand that a bond court decision is based on many factors, But the objective use of the PSA has been an improvement over the subjective guesswork of the past. Bond Court hearings are longer for each defendant, they begin at 1:30 PM in order to get all of these reports in order. Pretrial services workers are working diligently to get the proper and accurate information to each judge, and decisions seem more objective than in the recent past. We are satisfied that things are improving. We will continue to monitor the use of the PSA and other bond court procedures.

8. Improve the System of Drug Testing to Reduce Unnecessary Incarceration.

Developments. In 2015 suspicious substances seized by police were sent to the Illinois Crime lab for testing. This resulted in unnecessary delays and jail time. A pilot program was started soon afterward in several Chicago police precincts to test these substances right there. This has cut down on the delays.

Next steps. According to the Appleseed lawyers who evaluated the pilot program, the need for field testing is somewhat moot. The CPD is making far fewer drug arrests than in the past. Bail reform has enabled people caught for possession of suspicious substances to bond out without cause, for the most part. This recommendation has become unnecessary. No follow up is needed.

9. Create More Locations for Bond Court.

Developments. When we first visited bond court around the county we were appalled at the difference in the length of time given to a defendant between suburban and central bond court hearings. At 26th and California the average time per defendant was about 90 seconds. In the suburbs it averaged 5-10 minutes. We now see longer hearings and more thoughtful deliberations at central bond court. More attention is now given to reports, the PSA, ability to pay and the overall background of each defendant.

Next steps. The 6 new central bond court judges share the main courtroom (room 100). Using other locations is probably not necessary at this point.

10. Evaluate the Value of Specialty Courts.

Developments. We visited many specialty courts including drug courts, mental health courts, veterans courts, problem solving courts, and the Restorative Justice Court. All of the detainees at these courts were assigned through the State's Attorney's Office. The Restorative Justice Court is located in North Lawndale and is new to the Cook County Court System. If this court works well, it will be replicated in other locations. The other courts are located at 26th and California (at Central Bond Court) and all suburban locations. The suburbs with the most cases are Skokie and Maywood. In all of these courts, the judges take a great deal of time with each case. Many have taken social work classes and all have special training. These courts usually meet once a week. All of the programs at these courts have special requirements for participants such as weekly drug testing. All have completions or graduations.

Recidivism rates vary. The courts with the best rates are those that work with community groups. We saw the presence of workers from TASC (Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities) at many of these locations. Drug court at 26th and California has a wholistic program with a very low recidivism rate (less than 20% after 3 years according to TASC statistics). This program (Alternative Drug Program) works. It offers job training, housing, counseling and a support group. It is rare to have this wholistic approach. We noted that too few defendants are offered access to these specialty courts. Each visit showed us a small group of those defendants, perhaps 15 at a time. With 30,000 felony cases per year, this is not enough.

The Restorative Justice Court in North Lawndale is too new to offer recidivism rates. It meets every Thursday and involves community organization. Present at this court were

4 attorneys (2 from each side) a police officer, the victims of the crime, and 4-5 people from social service organizations or community restorative justice groups. The judge handled defendants from various stages in the process. She patiently explained that this process could be used instead of going to jail. She explained how each defendant must take responsibility for his actions and must pledge to follow the steps outlined in his action plan called a “repair of harm” agreement.

Next steps. These programs show promise for the future, but it is too soon to see if they can succeed and be replicated elsewhere. They require a commitment of staff and resources, but the investment in reducing recidivism will result in reduced expenditures in the criminal justice system. We will be monitoring these programs and this type of court in the future.

11. Continue to Mandate Stakeholder Collaboration.

We are pleased that the various stakeholders within the criminal justice system continue to meet regularly. They are mandated to do so by the Illinois Supreme Court and are monitored by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC).

AOIC will be releasing another pretrial report in 2019 with updates on all of the changes that have been taking place. The Civic Federation will be pursuing its task of finding data that is easily available to the public at all stages of the criminal justice system. The League of Women Voters of Cook County’s Criminal Justice Interest Group will continue to advocate for these recommendations and report on their progress.

Members of the LWVCC CJIG:

Jan Goldberg and Karin Hribar, Co- Chairs,
Carole Cotter, Laura Davis, Diane Edmundson, Sonia Evenstad, Beverly Graham, Barbara Koger Hayes, Elizabeth Hayford, Janet Kittlaus, Mary Rose Lambke, Amy Little, Glenda Townsend, Sharon Welch

Interviews and Communications with Public Officials

1. Delrice Adams, Executive Director, and Rebecca Janowitz, Special Assistant for Legal Affairs, for the JAC, Justice Advisory Council (June 2018)
2. Justice Anne Burke, Illinois Supreme Court Justice. (June 2017)
3. Amy Campanelli, the Cook County Public Defender (Aug. 2018)
4. Chris Carroll CEO of the Community Counseling Center of Chicago (Oct. 2017)
5. Thomas Dart, Sheriff of Cook County, Dr. Jones-Tapia, former Executive Director of the Jail. Cara Smith, current Executive Director of the Jail, and Brad Curry, Chief Operating Officer for the Sheriff (Sept. 2016, Sept. 2017, and Oct. 2018)
6. Chief Judge Tim Evans, Michael Carroll of the Chief Judge’s office, Pat Milhizer, Director of Communications for the Judge (Nov. 2016, April, 2017, and Oct. 2018)
7. Sharlyn Grace, attorney for the Chicago Bond Fund, previously for Appleseed.
8. Katie Hill, Director of Policy for the State’s Attorney’s Office (July, 2017)

9. Juan Hinojosa, Asst. Chief Probation Officer for Pretrial Services (April, 2017)
10. Lilian Jimenez, Director of Policy for Cook County Commissioner Garcia's office. (throughout 2016 and 2017)
11. Marcia Meis, Director of the AOIC (Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts) Tanya Anderson, Pretrial Services Coordinator, and Rich Anderson, Asst. Director of Probation Services (Dec. 2017)
12. Judge David Navarro, Central Bond Court Judge and 26th and California (Oct. 2018)
13. Pam Rodriguez, President of TASC (Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities)
14. Lt. Antoinette Ursitti, the head of CIT (Crisis Intervention Team) training for the Chicago Police Dept. (Nov. 2017)
15. Illinois State Rep. Mike Zalewski, 23rd District (Oct. 2018)

Special Tours:

1. Cook County Pretrial Services tour, Apr. 2017
2. Roseland Community Triage Center tour, Jan. 2017
3. Winnebago Specialty Courts Tour, Mar. 2016

Reports:

1. The Civic Federation's "The Impact of Cook County Bond Court on the Jail Population: A Call for Increased Public Data and Analysis" Nov. 2015
2. The Coalition to End Money Bond's "Monitoring Cook County's Central Bond Court" Feb. 2018
3. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority's "Evaluation of Cook County State's Attorney's Office's Deferred Prosecution Program" June 2015
4. TASC Newsletter, Spring 2018. (Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities)

Meetings:

1. Monthly meetings with the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee made up of Appleseed Lawyers, various public interest lawyers, law professors, and private attorneys.
2. The Civic Federation of Chicago in early 2018.
3. The Cook County Board of Commissioner's Criminal Justice Committee in Nov. 2017.

**PRE-TRIAL SYSTEMS: REPORT OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTEREST
GROUP
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COOK COUNTY
DECEMBER 4, 2015**

Between May 2014 and October 2015, the Criminal Justice Interest Group of the League of Women Voters of Cook County undertook a study to evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of the pre-trial operations of the County's criminal justice system.

The Interest Group proceeded under the following mission statement:

"The purpose of the LWVCC Criminal Justice Interest Group is to evaluate the Cook County pre-trial operations of the Criminal Justice System to ensure that they are fairly and equitably administered. We also want to ensure that the system both efficiently and effectively serves the accused and the wider citizenry of Cook County."

The Interest Group's study coincided with nationwide public pressure to reduce the number of individuals in jail and in prison and to investigate alternatives to incarceration. Locally, the treatment of pre-trial detainees (who make up more than 90% of those in the Cook County Jail) became a matter of particular public concern once the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) issued its March 2014 "Pretrial Operational Review" of the Circuit Court of Cook County. The AOIC report included 40 recommendations for improvement of the Cook County pre-trial system, whose implementation became the focus of the Interest Group's study. A summary of the current system can be found in the AOIC report, www.illinoiscourts.gov/supremecourt/reports/pretrial/pretrial_operational_review_report.pdf, at pages 15-19 and 22-26.

Members of the Interest Group are listed on Exhibit A. One or more group members participated in 20 interviews of public officials, lawyers, and professors of law and criminal justice, or visited and observed procedures in the Cook County Jail, Central Bond Court, and four suburban bond courts. Those interviewed are listed on Exhibit B.

The Criminal Justice Interest Group and its interviewees are all interested in ways to reduce the jail population without diminishing public safety. A number of specific recommendations were made repeatedly in the interviews and several significant modifications in procedure have been adopted during the 18-month period of the study.

FINDINGS

The interviews revealed consensus on a wide range of issues affecting the operation of the Cook County Circuit Court's pre-trial system. Areas of agreement are highlighted below, broken out by stages of the process.

Bond Court:

1. Bond hearings for defendants are 90-120 seconds in the city as opposed to 10-15 minutes in the suburbs. This disparity is unfair to the arrestees at Central Bond Court.
2. To ensure defendants' appearance at trial and minimize the likelihood of their re-offending during the pre-trial period, Cook County Bond Court judges frequently impose cash bail. This produces unequal treatment of rich and poor defendants. The AOIC recommended increased use of alternatives to cash bail, and other jurisdictions, including Washington, D.C., have eliminated it without significant problems.
3. The courts are currently using a grant to staff more assessment personnel. If this level of assessment staffing is to be maintained, new money will need to be found and allocated.
4. In early 2015, Chief Judge Evans changed the traditional morning bond court hearings to the afternoon to allow additional time for pre-trial managers to evaluate the defendant's risk. This change is favored by the judges and pretrial managers. Public Defender Amy Campanelli also

supports the change and suggested possibly staggering the times (1:30 and 3:00) to allow time for both the pretrial managers and the public defenders to assess clients fully.

5. To ensure consistency across the Circuit Court of Cook County, judges would benefit from a “bench book” enumerating all possible alternatives to incarcerating low risk pre-trial detainees. Per Judge Evans there is a reference resource available for those who go through the pretrial assessment tool training, but judges are not required to attend the training.

Pre-Trial Assessment Tool:

1. The Circuit Court of Cook County is engaging in a pilot project testing the pre-trial Public Safety Assessment, developed under a grant from the Arnold Foundation. The model provides a numerical score reflecting flight and safety risk as well as the risk of re-offending. The Cook County experience will be used to further validate the model.

2. Prior to its full implementation, some judges, the Public Defender and the Sheriff expressed skepticism about the value of this or any assessment tool to determine risk of re-offending. There was, however, strong consensus that a personal interview by a trained pretrial manager would greatly increase trust in the pretrial tool. In addition, there was a strong recommendation that the Public Defender interview the client before the pretrial assessment to be alerted to mental health issues and possible diversion programs.

Diversion Programs (typically for mental health and/or addiction issues):

1. Judges need to know what diversion programs exist, who runs them, and how well they operate. This points to the need for regular collaboration among the Bond Court judges and for coordinated and on-going information sharing among the judges, public defenders, assistant state’s attorneys, and the diversion program providers.

2. More data (and more independent data) is needed to determine which programs actually work to lower recidivism. Treatment Alternatives for Safer Communities (TASC), the organization designated by state statute to assess program results, claims 84% of the graduates of the State’s Attorney’s Drug Abuse Programs had no drug-related arrests after 3years, but that is just one of many diversion programs available.

3. The State’s Attorney’s Office also has a Deferred Prosecution program. Detainees who complete diversion programs before they are sent to trial can have their felony charges dropped. The detainees must be charged with non-violent offenses to participate.

4. Detainees are entitled on request to an evaluation by a group such as TASC to see if they are suited to a community-based program. Relatively few detainees know about this option, nor is it necessarily in their best interests to participate. Some Public Defenders object to having detainees assigned to rehabilitative programs when they haven’t been convicted of anything.

Mental Illness:

1. The Sheriff reports that he runs the “largest state mental health facility in the nation,” estimating that between one-fourth and one-third of the detainees suffer from mental illness. It is universally recognized that jails have too often replaced the now defunct public mental

health facilities since these individuals often have no place to turn for free or affordable services and medication.

2. The new Executive Director of the jail most recently served as its main staff psychologist. This appears to reflect the Sheriff's emphasis on the importance of providing appropriate mental health services to detainees.

3. The Cook County jail now offers a Mental Health Transition Program, a new approach involving a three-step process to change thinking, solve problems, and learn social skills.

4. The Affordable Care Act will pay for mental health treatment, and those brought to the Cook County Jail are immediately signed up for health insurance coverage which carries over once the detainee leaves the jail system. However, detainees often need a case manager or other follow-up measures to ensure that they stay on their medication.

5. University of Chicago Professor Mark Heyrman said that the biggest problem in dealing with the mentally ill who end up in the criminal justice system is insufficient training of police, judges, and pre-trial managers. Until recently, the County had a training grant available for Chicago police personnel.

6. Two specialized Mental Health Courts bring together police, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and treatment experts from TASC to adjudicate cases. TASC is a strong advocate for signing up detainees for both in-patient and out-patient treatment services through organizations such as Gateway, Pillars and Thresholds.

Collaborations Among the Stakeholders:

1. Two Supreme Court-appointed retired judges hold regular meetings among Chief Judge Evans, President Preckwinkle, Sheriff Dart, State's Attorney Alvarez, Public Defender Campanelli, and Michael Tardy, Director of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC). The stakeholders attend themselves; they are not permitted to send surrogates.

2. Between scheduled stakeholder meetings, the Chief Judge meets with AOIC Director Tardy to discuss the court's progress on the 40 recommendations contained in the AOIC report. The Chief Judge reported in September 2015 that he had acted on 33 of them.

3. Other counties in Illinois use more extensive collaboration. In Aurora, for example, the Assistant State's Attorneys and Public Defenders meet every morning to discuss the disposition of cases on the docket for that day.

4. Better information-sharing is essential. The court is working on creating a technology "bus" through which stakeholders could share information, but the process is slowed by the parties' concerns about confidentiality and other boundary issues.

5. Virtually all of the interviewed stakeholders and experts agreed that better collaboration is essential to reducing the jail population. Not only is there an economic but also a societal incentive. Too many detainees lose their jobs and have their family lives seriously disrupted only to have their case dismissed at trial. Further, there is growing evidence that even two days in jail can set the stage for a future of crime and recidivism for those most vulnerable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite encouraging progress, substantial changes remain to be made to ensure that the pre-trial system in Cook County incarcerates as few people as possible for as short a time as possible while ensuring that those released will appear for their trials and pose no threat to the community. To promote these outcomes, the League of Women Voters of Cook County recommends:

1. DISCONTINUE THE USE OF CASH BAIL

Requiring defendants to put up cash to avoid jail while awaiting trial punishes the poor more than others. If defendants are adjudged not a threat to any person or the community and are found likely to return to court, they should be released on their own recognizance (I-Bond) or on appropriately restrictive electronic monitoring. Additional conditions of release may accompany either of these options. If defendants are a risk to the community or a flight risk, they should be kept in jail. Cook County judges are already using I-Bonds and electronic monitoring in approximately half the cases and should be encouraged to expand this practice. Other jurisdictions including Washington, D.C., have eliminated money bail entirely without significant increases in defendants' absconding or committing additional crimes during the pre-trial period. While actual abolition of money bail would require a state statutory change, even the current statute says that bail should be a last resort, and Bond Court judges should take this into account when exercising their discretion.

2. MAKE THOUGHTFUL USE OF PERSONAL RECOGNIZANCE I-BONDS AND ELECTRONIC MONITORING

Electronic monitoring may be more appropriate than I-Bonds for higher-risk defendants. The courts should track and report on the effectiveness of electronic monitoring vs. I-Bonds in assuring good behavior and timely return for trial. The goal of either form of release is to enable the accused to work and care for his/her family while awaiting trial.

As recommended by the AOIC, institute a system of court-date reminder calls for defendants. This has been used effectively in Washington, D.C., and other states and counties.

3. IMPROVE COLLABORATION AMONG STAKEHOLDERS TO EXPAND THE AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVES TO JAIL

Each office appears to have its own program designed to reduce the jail population or improve outcomes for pre-trial detainees: the Sheriff, the State's Attorney, the Chief Judge. Doubtless some of these programs overlap. The Sheriff, the State's Attorney, the Chief Judge, and perhaps a representative from the Judicial Advisory Council need to assign experienced personnel to a joint Task Force to identify best practices and services currently available, and develop recommendations for joint implementation and support.

Police should be integrated into this collaboration with the goal that some prosecutions be stopped before they begin. Specifically, funding should be restored for the Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) program for police officers. CIT has a proven track record in enabling officers to de-escalate situations, particularly those involving persons with mental illness. Police trained in crisis intervention may be able to take a mentally ill person for respite or treatment to a triage center or other location instead of a police station. Several stakeholders and experts strongly

support increasing the number of triage centers. Finding grants or adding money to budgets is the largest impediment.

In any case, judges must be made more aware of the range of available alternatives so they can use them when appropriate. This will enable more people accused of crime to remain in their communities, working and supporting their families, while they receive help for their problems.

4. IMPROVE COMMUNICATION AMONG BOND COURT JUDGES

Judges have broad discretion in setting bonds and conditions of release. However, this discretion does not override the imperative that justice be equitably administered. Thus, we recommend that Bond Court judges meet regularly to compare notes and strive for a more uniform application of decision-making across the county, possibly leading to the development of a "bench book" of guidance for Bond Court judges. The expanded use of the Public Safety Assessment tool should make this easier to accomplish.

5. COMPLETE THE INTEGRATED INFORMATION SYSTEM

This will minimize the flow of paperwork and assure that all participants in the process have all the necessary background on the accused. While certain aspects of a defendant's record must be kept confidential, many others can be shared. All parties should come to the table now, explain frankly what they will and won't share, and empower their information technology subordinates to incorporate the shareable items into a system usable by all. The more information shared, the easier it will be for stakeholders to trust each other and the less resistance there will be to additional sharing or to reaching agreement on what must remain confidential.

6. EVALUATE THE RESULTS OF ALL DIVERSION PROGRAMS

To determine which interventions and programs actually work, and for which types of defendants, these evaluations should be conducted by neutral and expert monitors and not rely exclusively on self-reporting. Guidelines and measures for programs and accurate statistical data should be used.

7. CONFIRM THE VALIDITY OF THE PRE-TRIAL PUBLIC SAFETY ASSESSMENT

Verify the information arrestees provide at intake. Monitor outcomes (non-appearance for trial or re-arrest while awaiting trial) to ascertain the predictive value of the pre-trial Public Safety Assessment. The more reliable the assessment is shown to be, the more Bond Court judges will be willing to use it in determining release or detention.

8. IMPROVE THE SYSTEM OF DRUG TESTING TO REDUCE UNNECESSARY INCARCERATION

Currently the practice is to detain drug arrestees while their suspicious substances are sent to the state crime lab, which takes three weeks to process them. If the drugs prove to be below criminal potency, the charges are dropped but the arrestee has already served three weeks in jail, which is correlated with recidivism. The routine for drug arrests should be designed to keep people out of jail: either release them pending test results or institute field testing of drugs.

9. CREATE MORE LOCATIONS FOR BOND COURT

The five courtrooms attached to police districts in Chicago should be used for suburban Bond Court at night and on weekends, when the suburban courts are closed. In addition, more associate judges should be assigned to Central Bond Court, reducing the current disparity

between the amount of time spent on defendants in the city and the amount of time suburban defendants receive.

10. EVALUATE THE VALUE OF SPECIALTY COURTS

It should be determined if specialty courts such as Veterans Court, Drug Court or the Alternatives for Community Treatment Court are the best use of judicial resources. If they produce more positive outcomes for the target populations than broad-spectrum courts at similar cost, they should be expanded.

11. CONTINUE TO MANDATE STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION

Several interviewees were skeptical that continued collaborative progress would occur without external

support. This is not a reflection on the stakeholders, but rather a recognition of the difficulty and energy it takes to move an entrenched system to a new and better place, or even to agree that it is a new and better place. Therefore, the League of Women Voters of Cook County recommends that the Illinois Supreme Court through its appointed judicial liaisons and the AOIC continue to schedule collaborative meetings, urge the establishment of achievable goals, and provide reports to the public.

Exhibit A: Members of the Criminal Justice Interest Group, League of Women Voters of Cook County

Jan Goldberg and Karin Hribar, co-chairs

Jill Althage, Kathy Balk, Carol Clancey, Jaclin Davis, Laura Davis, Diane Edmundson, Sonia Evenstad, Beverly Graham, Betty Hayford, Karen Hunt,

Janet Kittlaus Kelly Kleiman Amy Little

Cynthia Schilsky, Lali Watt

Exhibit B: Interviewees

1. Ali Abid and Elizabeth Monkus, lawyer-investigators, Chicago Appleseed Fund, research arm of the Chicago Council of Lawyers

2. Anne Burke, Justice, Illinois Supreme Court; chair, Cook County Justice Advisory Council Board of Directors (2 meetings)

3. Amy Campanelli, Public Defender, Cook County

4. Tom Dart, Sheriff, Cook County

5. Timothy G. Evans, Chief Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County (2 meetings)

6. John Fritchey, Commissioner, Cook County; chair, Technology Committee, Cook County Board of Commissioners

7. Mark Heyrman, professor, University of Chicago Law School; mental health expert

8. Daniel Kirk, Philip Roy, and Joe Magats, Assistant State's Attorneys, Cook County

9. David Olson, professor, Loyola University Department of Criminal Justice; crime statistics expert

10. Patrick Reardon, First Assistant Public Defender (retired)

11. Pam Rodriguez, Executive Director, Treatment Alternatives for Safer Communities (TASC)

12. Julianna Stratton, Executive Director, Justice Advisory Council (retired)

13. Larry Suffredin, Commissioner, Cook County; Michelle Jordan, counsel
14. Michael Tardy, Director, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) (2 meetings)
15. Lanetta Haynes Turner, Executive Director, Justice Advisory Council
16. Amy Watson, professor, Jane Addams School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Chicago; mental health expert
17. Mike Zalewski, Representative, Illinois General Assembly; chair, General Assembly's Joint Commission on Criminal Justice

LWV LaGrange Area | PO Box 542, LaGrange, IL 60525

[Unsubscribe rblackwell@punshui.com](mailto:rblackwell@punshui.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [About our service provider](#)

Sent by league@lagrangearealwv.org in collaboration with



Try it free today