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Appellate Court Offices
First Appellate District
160 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Second Appellate District
55 Symphony Way
Elgin, Illinois 60120

Third Appellate District
1004 Columbus Street
Ottawa, Illinois 61350

Fourth Appellate District
201 West Monroe Street
Springfield, Illinois 62794

Fifth Appellate District
14th & Main Streets
Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62864
January 14, 2020

Adelfia LLC
Certified Public Accountants
400 East Randolph Street
Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are responsible for the identification of, and compliance with, all aspects of laws, regulations, contracts, or grant agreements that could have a material effect on the operations of the State of Illinois, Supreme Court (Court). We are responsible for and we have established and maintained an effective system of internal controls over compliance requirements. We have performed an evaluation of the Court’s compliance with the following specified requirements during the two-year period ended June 30, 2019. Based on this evaluation, we assert that during the years ended June 30, 2018, and June 30, 2019, the Court has materially complied with the specified requirements listed below.

A. The Court has obligated, expended, received, and used public funds of the State in accordance with the purpose for which such funds have been appropriated or otherwise authorized by law.

B. The Court has obligated, expended, received, and used public funds of the State in accordance with any limitations, restrictions, conditions, or mandatory directions imposed by law upon such obligation, expenditure, receipt, or use.

C. The Court has complied, in all material respects, with applicable laws and regulations, including the State uniform accounting system, in its financial and fiscal operations.

D. State revenues and receipts collected by the Court are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and the accounting and recordkeeping of such revenues and receipts is fair, accurate, and in accordance with law.
E. Money or negotiable securities or similar assets handled by the Court on behalf of the State or held in trust by the Court have been properly and legally administered, and the accounting and recordkeeping relating thereto is proper, accurate, and in accordance with law.

Yours truly,
Supreme Court of Illinois

Signed original on file
Marcia M. Meis
Director, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

Signed original on file
Kara McCaffrey
Assistant Director, Administrative Services Division, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

Signed original on file
Janeve Zekich
Deputy Director / Chief Legal Counsel, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
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COMPLIANCE REPORT

SUMMARY

The compliance testing performed during this examination was conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and the Illinois State Auditing Act.

ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT

The Independent Accountant’s Report on State Compliance, on Internal Control Over Compliance, and on Supplementary Information for State Compliance Purposes does not contain scope limitations, disclaimers, or other significant non-standard language.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Findings</th>
<th>Current Report</th>
<th>Prior Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated findings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior recommendations implemented or not repeated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Last Reported</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Finding Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Lack of adequate controls over the review of internal control over service providers</td>
<td>Significant Deficiency and Noncompliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXIT CONFERENCE

The finding and recommendation appearing in this report was discussed with Illinois Supreme Court personnel at an exit conference on December 18, 2019.
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Attending were:

Illinois Supreme Court
Marcia M. Meis, Director, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC)
Janeve Zekich, Deputy Director, AOIC
Kara McCaffrey, Assistant Director, Administrative Services Division, AOIC
Skip Robertson, Assistant Director, Judicial Management Information Services Division, AOIC
John Bracco, Chief Internal Auditor

Office of the Auditor General
Lisa Warden, Senior Audit Manager

Adelfia LLC
Stella Marie Santos, Managing Partner
Jennifer Roan, Partner
Annabelle Abueg, Principal

The response to the recommendation was provided by John Bracco, Chief Internal Auditor, in a correspondence dated December 24, 2019.
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT
ON STATE COMPLIANCE, ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE, AND ON SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR STATE COMPLIANCE PURPOSES

Honorable Frank J. Mautino
Auditor General
State of Illinois

Compliance

As Special Assistant Auditors for the Auditor General, we have examined compliance by the State of Illinois, Supreme Court (Court) with the specified requirements listed below, as more fully described in the Audit Guide for Financial Audits and Compliance Attestation Engagements of Illinois State Agencies (Audit Guide) as adopted by the Auditor General, during the two years ended June 30, 2019. Management of the Court is responsible for compliance with the specified requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Court’s compliance with the specified requirements based on our examination.

The specified requirements are:

A. The Court has obligated, expended, received, and used public funds of the State in accordance with the purpose for which such funds have been appropriated or otherwise authorized by law.

B. The Court has obligated, expended, received, and used public funds of the State in accordance with any limitations, restrictions, conditions, or mandatory directions imposed by law upon such obligation, expenditure, receipt, or use.

C. The Court has complied, in all material respects, with applicable laws and regulations, including the State uniform accounting system, in its financial and fiscal operations.

D. State revenues and receipts collected by the Court are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and the accounting and recordkeeping of such revenues and receipts is fair, accurate, and in accordance with law.

E. Money or negotiable securities or similar assets handled by the Court on behalf of the State or held in trust by the Court have been properly and legally administered and the accounting and recordkeeping relating thereto is proper, accurate, and in accordance with law.
Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Illinois State Auditing Act (Act), and the *Audit Guide*. Those standards, the Act, and the *Audit Guide* require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Court complied with the specified requirements in all material respects. An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about whether the Court complied with the specified requirements. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgement, including an assessment of the risks of material noncompliance with the specified requirements, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the Court’s compliance with the specified requirements.

In our opinion, the Court complied with the specified requirements during the two years ended June 30, 2019, in all material respects. However, the results of our procedures disclosed an instance of noncompliance with the specified requirements, which is required to be reported in accordance with criteria established by the *Audit Guide* and is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings as item 2019-001.

The Court’s response to the compliance finding identified in our examination is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings. The Court’s response was not subjected to the procedures applied in the examination and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing and the results of that testing in accordance with the requirements of the *Audit Guide*. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

**Internal Control Over Compliance**

Management of the Court is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the specified requirements (internal control).

In planning and performing our examination, we considered the Court’s internal control to determine the examination procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the Court’s compliance with the specified requirements and to test and report on the Court’s internal control in accordance with the *Audit Guide*, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Court’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Court’s internal control.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with the specified requirements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with the specified requirements will not be
prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that have not been identified. Given these limitations, during our examination, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. We did identify a certain deficiency in internal control, described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings as item 2019-001 that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

As required by the Audit Guide, immaterial findings excluded from this report have been reported in a separate letter.

The Court’s response to the internal control finding identified in our examination is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings. The Court’s response was not subjected to the procedures applied in the examination and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and the results of that testing based on the requirements of the Audit Guide. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Supplementary Information for State Compliance Purposes

Our examination was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the Court’s compliance with the specified requirements. The accompanying supplementary information for the years ended June 30, 2018, and June 30, 2019, in Schedules 1 through 7 and the Analysis of Operations Section are presented for purposes of additional analysis. Such information is the responsibility of Court management. We have applied certain limited procedures as prescribed by the Audit Guide to the accompanying supplementary information for the years ended June 30, 2018, and June 30, 2019, in Schedules 1 through 7. We have not applied procedures to the accompanying supplementary information for the years ended June 30, 2017, in Schedules 3 through 7 and in the Analysis of Operations Section. We do not express an opinion, a conclusion, nor provide any assurance on the accompanying supplementary information in Schedules 1 through 7 or the Analysis of Operations Section.

SIGNED ORIGINAL ON FILE

Chicago, Illinois
January 14, 2020
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SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS
CURRENT FINDING - STATE COMPLIANCE

2019-001 FINDING (Lack of adequate controls over the review of internal control over service providers)

The Illinois Supreme Court (Court) did not obtain or conduct timely independent internal control reviews over its external service provider.

The Court utilized a service provider to implement a central Electronic Filing Manager (EFM) service to facilitate statewide e-Filing in Illinois’ judiciary. The EFM is an online service/portal, hosted and managed by the service provider, which includes standards and procedures to integrate the EFM directly with the Court’s case management systems and authorized Electronic Filing Service Providers to exchange documents and information from the filer to the court.

During our testing, we noted the Court had not:

- Developed a process for identifying all service providers and assessing the effect on internal controls of these services on an annual basis.
- Performed independent reviews of internal controls associated with outsourced systems at least annually or obtained from its third-party service provider its annual Service Organization Control (SOC) report.
- Reviewed the SOC report to determine the impact and whether assurance could be obtained that internal controls being relied upon at the service provider were effectively operating.
- Determined if complementary user entity controls (CUECs) that should be at the Court are in place.
- Determined if the third-party service provider used subservice organizations. Accordingly, the Court did not obtain and review SOC reports for subservice organizations or perform alternative procedures to determine the impact on its internal control environment.

Additionally, it was noted the contract between the Court and the service provider did not contain a requirement for an independent review to be completed.

The Court is responsible for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal controls related to information systems and operations to ensure resources and data are adequately protected from unauthorized or accidental disclosure, modifications, or destruction. This responsibility is not limited due to the process being outsourced.

Good internal controls require State agencies to establish and maintain a system, or systems, of internal fiscal and administrative controls which provide assurance that revenues, expenditures, and transfers of assets, resources, or funds applicable to operations are properly recorded and accounted for to permit the preparation of accounts and reliable financial and statistical reports and to maintain accountability over the State’s resources. In addition, generally accepted information technology guidance endorses the review and assessment of internal controls related
to information systems and operations to assure the accurate processing and security of information.

Court personnel stated they were unaware of the need for SOC reports from certain types of service providers.

Without having obtained and reviewed a SOC report or another form of independent internal controls review, the Court does not have assurance the external service provider’s and its subservice organization’s internal controls are adequate. (Finding 2019-001)

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the Court identify all third party service providers and determine and document if a review of controls is required. If required, the Court should:

- Obtain SOC reports or perform independent reviews of internal controls associated with third party service providers at least annually.
- Document its review of the SOC reports and review all significant issues with service organizations to ascertain if a corrective action plan exists and when it will be implemented, any impacts to the Court, and any compensating controls.
- Monitor and document the operation of the CUECs relevant to the Court’s operations.
- Either obtain and review SOC reports for subservice organizations or perform alternative procedures to satisfy itself that the existence of the subservice organization would not impact its internal control environment.
- Review contracts with service providers to ensure applicable requirements over the independent review of internal controls are included.

COURT RESPONSE

Agree. The Supreme Court of Illinois is fully committed to ensuring adequate security over the Court’s information systems. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) recently obtained the Service Organization Controls (SOC) report for the vendor identified during the audit period and reviewed the SOC report for weaknesses with the service provider’s internal controls over the services that are performed for the Illinois Courts. No weaknesses were identified with the third-party service provider affecting the Court’s operations.

The Supreme Court of Illinois is implementing procedures for future contracts where SOC reports will be needed. This will include a detailed review of third-party service providers to ensure internal controls are adequate over information systems that impact the court’s operations, that complementary controls within the judicial branch are sufficient, and, if necessary, that alternative procedures are performed to ensure information systems are safeguarded and the delivery of services will not impact the Court’s operations.
### Appropriated Funds

#### General Revenue Fund - 0001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Expenses, Awards, Grants, Permanent Improvements, and Probation Reimbursements</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 344,821,200</td>
<td>$ 339,266,712</td>
<td>$ 5,554,488</td>
<td>$ 344,821,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - General Revenue Fund: $344,821,200

#### Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund - 0030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oversight and Management</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13,793,900</td>
<td>1,722,055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,722,055</td>
<td>12,071,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund: $13,793,900

#### Mandatory Arbitration Fund - 0262

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Arbitration Programs</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29,131,200</td>
<td>2,817,468</td>
<td>66,139</td>
<td>2,883,607</td>
<td>26,247,593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Mandatory Arbitration Fund: $29,131,200

#### Foreign Language Interpreter Fund - 0597

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Language Interpreter Program</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>708,800</td>
<td>71,536</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>76,615</td>
<td>632,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Foreign Language Interpreter Fund: $708,800

#### Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund - 0769

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawyers' Assistance Program</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,032,500</td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>286,108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund: $1,032,500

Total - Appropriated Funds: $389,487,600

---
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**Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2019**

For the Sixteen Months Ended October 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC ACT 100-0586</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL YEAR 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Appropriated Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPREME COURT FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND - 0269</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>$53,392</td>
<td>$53,392</td>
<td>- $53,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>64,083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>89,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>141,992</td>
<td>59,205</td>
<td>201,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>63,910</td>
<td>21,202</td>
<td>85,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>64,628</td>
<td>61,653</td>
<td>126,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund</strong></td>
<td>506,006</td>
<td>146,785</td>
<td>652,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Non-Appropriated Funds</strong></td>
<td>$506,006</td>
<td>$146,785</td>
<td>$652,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL - ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$345,130,169</td>
<td>$5,772,491</td>
<td>$350,902,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Appropriations, expenditures, and lapsed balances were obtained from the State Comptroller’s records as of October 31, 2019, and have been reconciled to Court records.

**Note 2:** Expenditure amounts are vouchers approved for payment by the Court and submitted to the State Comptroller for payment to the vendor.
## Appropriated Funds

### General Revenue Fund - 0001

Operational Expenses, Awards, Grants, Permanent Improvements, and Probation Reimbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - General Revenue Fund</td>
<td>$344,821,200</td>
<td>$330,986,132</td>
<td>$13,835,068</td>
<td>$344,821,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund - 0030

Oversight and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund</td>
<td>$13,793,900</td>
<td>$4,189,016</td>
<td>$2,238,880</td>
<td>$6,427,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,366,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mandatory Arbitration Fund - 0262

Mandatory Arbitration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Mandatory Arbitration Fund</td>
<td>$29,131,200</td>
<td>$3,569,131</td>
<td>$119,495</td>
<td>$3,688,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,442,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foreign Language Interpreter Fund - 0597

Foreign Language Interpreter Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Foreign Language Interpreter Fund</td>
<td>$708,800</td>
<td>$46,624</td>
<td>$3,466</td>
<td>$50,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$658,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund - 0769

Lawyers' Assistance Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Lawyers’ Assistance Program Fund</td>
<td>$1,032,500</td>
<td>$732,394</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$732,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Appropriated Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Lapse Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through June 30</td>
<td>July 1 to October 31</td>
<td>Ended October 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Appropriated Funds</td>
<td>$389,487,600</td>
<td>$339,523,297</td>
<td>$16,196,909</td>
<td>$355,720,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,767,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON-APPROPRIATED FUND

### SUPREME COURT FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND - 0269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Appropriations (Net of Transfers)</th>
<th>Expenditures Through June 30</th>
<th>Lapse Period Expenditures July 1 to October 31</th>
<th>Total Expenditures 16 Months Ended October 31</th>
<th>Balances Lapsed October 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>$86,544</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$86,544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>73,106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>58,595</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Justice Institute Ethics Training - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>143,364</td>
<td>55,722</td>
<td>199,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>31,236</td>
<td>123,614</td>
<td>154,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>63,005</td>
<td>40,416</td>
<td>103,421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund</strong></td>
<td>455,850</td>
<td>248,752</td>
<td>704,602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Non-Appropriated Fund</strong></td>
<td>$455,850</td>
<td>$248,752</td>
<td>$704,602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL - ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$339,979,147</td>
<td>$16,445,661</td>
<td>$356,424,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Appropriations, expenditures, and lapsed balances were obtained from the State Comptroller's records as of October 31, 2018, and have been reconciled to Court records.

Note 2: Expenditure amounts are vouchers approved for payment by the Court and submitted to the State Comptroller for payment to the vendor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Name</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.A. 100-0586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATED FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL REVENUE FUND - 0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 344,821,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses, Awards, Grants, Permanent Improvements, and Probation Reimbursements</td>
<td>$ 344,821,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 344,821,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT SPECIAL PURPOSES FUND - 0030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 13,793,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and Management</td>
<td>$ 1,722,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 1,722,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ 12,071,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATORY ARBITRATION FUND - 0262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 29,131,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Arbitration Programs</td>
<td>$ 2,883,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 2,883,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ 26,247,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETER FUND - 0597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 708,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Interpreter Program</td>
<td>$ 76,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 76,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ 632,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule 3 (Continued)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
SUPREME COURT
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF NET APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPSED BALANCES
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Court-Ordered Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.A. 100-0586</td>
<td>P.A. 100-0021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAWYERS' ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FUND - 0769

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 1,032,500</td>
<td>$ 1,032,500</td>
<td>$ 973,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers' Assistance Program</td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>732,394</td>
<td>510,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>732,394</td>
<td>510,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ 286,108</td>
<td>$ 300,106</td>
<td>$ 462,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Appropriated Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$ 389,487,600</td>
<td>$ 389,487,600</td>
<td>$ 375,413,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>350,249,869</td>
<td>355,720,206</td>
<td>350,150,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$ 39,237,731</td>
<td>$ 33,767,394</td>
<td>$ 25,262,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS

SUPREME COURT SPECIAL STATE PROJECTS FUND - 0230

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPREME COURT FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND - 0269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2015</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 64,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,544</td>
<td>202,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,106</td>
<td>152,517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58,595</td>
<td>145,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Justice Institute Ethics Training - Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>53,392</td>
<td>199,086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>64,083</td>
<td>103,421</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>89,494</td>
<td>154,850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>201,197</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>85,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2018</td>
<td>126,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Justice Institute Technical Training - Fiscal Year 2019</td>
<td>33,232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 652,791</td>
<td>$ 704,602</td>
<td>$ 724,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total - Non-Appropriated Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 652,791</td>
<td>$ 704,602</td>
<td>$ 849,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
SUPREME COURT  
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION  
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF NET APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPSED BALANCES  
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

Note 1: Expenditure authority, appropriations, expenditures, and lapsed balances were obtained from the State Comptroller's records as of October 31, 2019 (for Fiscal Year 2019), as of October 31, 2018 (for Fiscal Year 2018), and as of September 30, 2017 (for Fiscal Year 2017); and have been reconciled to Court records.

Note 2: Expenditure amounts are vouchers approved for payment by the Court and submitted to the State Comptroller for payment to the vendor.

Note 3: The Circuit Court of Cook County in People v. Munger (15 CH 10243) ordered the State Comptroller, in the absence of enacted annual appropriations, to process and pay certified invoice vouchers from the State's judicial branch agencies at the level paid as of June 30, 2015. Therefore, the Court's Fiscal Year 2015 appropriation for Fund 001, 030, 0262, 0597, and 0769 was carried forward to become the Court's Fiscal Year 2017 expenditure authority for Fund 001, 030, 0262, 0597, and 0769.
## Schedule 4

### STATE OF ILLINOIS
### SUPREME COURT
### COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
### COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF NET APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPPED BALANCES
### TOTAL BY MAJOR OBJECT CODE AND BY FUND
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.A. 100-0586</strong></td>
<td>389,487,600</td>
<td>389,487,600</td>
<td>375,413,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.A. 100-0021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court-Ordered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Expenses, Awards, Grants, Permanent Improvements, and Probation Reimbursements</strong></td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight and Management</strong></td>
<td>1,722,055</td>
<td>6,427,896</td>
<td>266,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Arbitration Programs</strong></td>
<td>2,883,607</td>
<td>3,688,626</td>
<td>4,517,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Language Interpreter Program</strong></td>
<td>76,615</td>
<td>50,090</td>
<td>35,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawyers' Assistance Program</strong></td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>732,394</td>
<td>510,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>350,249,869</td>
<td>355,720,206</td>
<td>350,150,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lapsed Balances</strong></td>
<td>39,237,731</td>
<td>33,767,394</td>
<td>25,262,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MacArthur Foundation</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2015</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $64,670</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2015</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $104,674</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2015</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $55,135</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2016</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $202,353</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2016</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $152,517</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2016</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $145,016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2016</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $145,016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Justice Institute Ethics Training - Fiscal Year 2016</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $29,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2017</strong></td>
<td>53,392</td>
<td>199,086</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2017</strong></td>
<td>64,083</td>
<td>103,421</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2017</strong></td>
<td>89,494</td>
<td>154,850</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Basic Program - Fiscal Year 2018</strong></td>
<td>201,197</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Data Program - Fiscal Year 2018</strong></td>
<td>85,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Court Improvement Training Program - Fiscal Year 2018</strong></td>
<td>126,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Justice Institute Technical Training - Fiscal Year 2019</strong></td>
<td>33,232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$652,791</td>
<td>$704,602</td>
<td>$849,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STATE OF ILLINOIS
### SUPREME COURT

#### COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION

**COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF NET APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND LAPPED BALANCES**

**TOTAL BY MAJOR OBJECT CODE AND BY FUND**

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

### Schedule 4
(Continued)

**BY FUND**

### TOTAL - APPROPRIATED FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Authority (Net of Transfers)</td>
<td>$389,487,600</td>
<td>$389,487,600</td>
<td>$375,413,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Revenue Fund - 0001</td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
<td>344,821,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund - 0030</td>
<td>1,722,055</td>
<td>6,427,896</td>
<td>266,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Arbitration Fund - 0262</td>
<td>2,883,607</td>
<td>3,688,626</td>
<td>4,517,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Interpreter Fund - 0597</td>
<td>76,615</td>
<td>50,090</td>
<td>35,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund - 0769</td>
<td>746,392</td>
<td>732,394</td>
<td>510,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$350,249,869</td>
<td>$355,720,206</td>
<td>$350,150,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed Balances</td>
<td>$39,237,731</td>
<td>$33,767,394</td>
<td>$25,262,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL - NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Special State Projects Fund - 0230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund - 0269</td>
<td>652,791</td>
<td>704,602</td>
<td>724,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$652,791</td>
<td>$704,602</td>
<td>$849,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Expenditure authority, appropriations, expenditures, and lapsed balances were obtained from the State Comptroller's records as of October 31, 2019 (for Fiscal Year 2019), as of October 31, 2018 (for Fiscal Year 2018), and as of September 30, 2017 (for Fiscal Year 2017); and have been reconciled to Court records.

**Note 2:** Expenditure amounts are vouchers approved for payment by the Court and submitted to the State Comptroller for payment to the vendor.

**Note 3:** The Circuit Court of Cook County in *People v. Munger* (15 CH 10243) ordered the State Comptroller, in the absence of enacted annual appropriations, to process and pay certified invoice vouchers from the State's judicial branch agencies at the level paid as of June 30, 2015. Therefore, the Court's Fiscal Year 2015 appropriation for Fund 001, 030, 0262, 0597, and 0769 was carried forward to become the Court's Fiscal Year 2017 expenditure authority for Fund 001, 030, 0262, 0597, and 0769.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
SUPREME COURT
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF CASH RECEIPTS AND
RECONCILIATION OF CASH RECEIPTS TO DEPOSITS REMITTED TO
THE STATE COMPTROLLER
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Revenue Fund - 0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro rata share of salaries</td>
<td>$ 169,120</td>
<td>$ 172,516</td>
<td>$ 169,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year refunds</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>7,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>15,837</td>
<td>5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supreme Court</td>
<td>$175,388</td>
<td>$193,373</td>
<td>$190,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Appellate Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fourth Appellate Court</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per Illinois Supreme Court</td>
<td>$175,388</td>
<td>$193,373</td>
<td>191,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - In transit at End of Year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records</td>
<td>$175,388</td>
<td>$193,410</td>
<td>$191,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund - 0030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Clerk</td>
<td>$456,886</td>
<td>$463,037</td>
<td>$478,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate Court</td>
<td>112,491</td>
<td>116,425</td>
<td>128,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Appellate Court</td>
<td>36,880</td>
<td>36,790</td>
<td>39,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Appellate Court</td>
<td>16,325</td>
<td>21,388</td>
<td>19,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Appellate Court</td>
<td>12,515</td>
<td>12,657</td>
<td>15,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Appellate Court</td>
<td>15,329</td>
<td>14,858</td>
<td>17,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per Illinois Supreme Court</td>
<td>650,426</td>
<td>665,155</td>
<td>698,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - In transit at End of Year</td>
<td>(18,158)</td>
<td>(14,700)</td>
<td>(16,627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>16,627</td>
<td>15,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustments</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records</td>
<td>$647,206</td>
<td>$666,996</td>
<td>$696,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL YEAR</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund - 0269</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year refund</td>
<td>$1,451</td>
<td>$3,074</td>
<td>$5,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>693,361</td>
<td>638,087</td>
<td>733,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Justice Institute</td>
<td>57,507</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash receipts per Illinois Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td>752,319</td>
<td>641,161</td>
<td>789,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less - In transit at End of Year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records</strong></td>
<td>$752,319</td>
<td>$641,161</td>
<td>$789,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Foreign Language Interpreter - 0597** | | | |
| Foreign Language Interpreter Program | $32,461 | $25,204 | $37,318 |
| **Total cash receipts per Illinois Supreme Court** | 32,461 | 25,204 | 37,318 |
| **Less - In transit at End of Year** | (801) | (560) | (1,700) |
| **Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year** | 560 | 1,700 | 2,385 |
| **Other adjustments** | - | (100) | - |
| **Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records** | $32,220 | $26,244 | $38,003 |

| **Other Receipts Deposited on Behalf of the Illinois Supreme Court (Court)** | | | |
| **Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund - 0030** | | | |
| Circuit Court Collections (Note 1) | $4,748,801 | $5,017,709 | $3,098,869 |
| **Total cash receipts deposited on behalf of the Court** | 4,748,801 | 5,017,709 | 3,098,869 |
| **Less - In transit at End of Year** | - | - | - |
| **Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year** | - | - | - |
| **Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records** | $4,748,801 | $5,017,709 | $3,098,869 |

*Note 1: Balance at June 30, 2017 was excluded in this schedule previously.*
## STATE OF ILLINOIS
## SUPREME COURT
## COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
## COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF CASH RECEIPTS AND RECONCILIATION OF CASH RECEIPTS TO DEPOSITS REMITTED TO THE STATE COMPTROLLER
## For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

### Mandatory Arbitration Fund - 0262

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Boone</th>
<th>Cook</th>
<th>DuPage</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Henry</th>
<th>Kane</th>
<th>Lake</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>McHenry</th>
<th>McLean</th>
<th>Mercer</th>
<th>Rock Island</th>
<th>St. Clair</th>
<th>Whiteside</th>
<th>Will</th>
<th>Winnebago</th>
<th>Prior Year Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$11,016</td>
<td>2,832,609</td>
<td>244,550</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>11,296</td>
<td>152,119</td>
<td>195,384</td>
<td>416,956</td>
<td>82,572</td>
<td>44,084</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>48,780</td>
<td>206,916</td>
<td>23,752</td>
<td>191,084</td>
<td>92,772</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$12,548</td>
<td>2,792,446</td>
<td>240,880</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>11,552</td>
<td>134,050</td>
<td>199,878</td>
<td>479,752</td>
<td>82,168</td>
<td>41,284</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>50,360</td>
<td>137,184</td>
<td>24,248</td>
<td>191,464</td>
<td>91,076</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cash receipts deposited on behalf of the Court: 4,560,275, 4,497,469, 4,495,626
Less - In transit at End of Year: -
Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year: -
Other adjustments: -
Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records: $4,560,275, $4,761,509, $4,226,672

### Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund - 0769

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Annual fees</th>
<th>Total cash receipts deposited on behalf of the Court</th>
<th>Less - In transit at End of Year</th>
<th>Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$746,794</td>
<td>746,794</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$746,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$744,030</td>
<td>744,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$744,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$733,594</td>
<td>733,594</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$733,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAND TOTAL - ALL FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per Illinois Supreme Court</td>
<td>$1,610,594</td>
<td>$1,524,893</td>
<td>$1,715,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts deposited on behalf of the Court</td>
<td>10,055,870</td>
<td>10,259,208</td>
<td>8,328,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - In transit at End of Year</td>
<td>(18,959)</td>
<td>(15,260)</td>
<td>(289,699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus - In transit at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>15,260</td>
<td>289,699</td>
<td>20,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustments</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>(7,481)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts per State Comptroller's Records</td>
<td><strong>$11,663,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,051,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,774,407</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF ILLINOIS
SUPREME COURT
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND FUND BALANCE (CASH BASIS) OF LOCALLY-HELD FUND
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019, 2018, and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURT'S SAFEKEEPING FUND - 1343</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance, July 1</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance, June 30</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
<td>$5,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Court's Safekeeping Fund (1343) is reported as a locally held fund and is maintained in the State Treasury. The Appellate Court Districts deposit bail bond money for defendants whose cases are on appeal at the Appellate Court.

The above schedule is presented on the cash basis of accounting.
**STATE OF ILLINOIS**  
**SUPREME COURT**  
**COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION**  
**SCHEDULE OF CHANGES IN STATE PROPERTY**  
**For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2019 and 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Library Books (see Notes)</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Site Improvements</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Capital Lease Equipment</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at June 30, 2017</td>
<td>$ 6,081,973</td>
<td>$ 677,042</td>
<td>$ 97,019</td>
<td>$ 38,680,397</td>
<td>$ 20,350,730</td>
<td>$ 10,625</td>
<td>$ 65,897,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions and other adjustments</td>
<td>6,942,703</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>691,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,633,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions and other adjustments</td>
<td>(397,230)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(118,403)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(515,633)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net transfers</td>
<td>(24,614)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159,978</td>
<td>(270,901)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(135,537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at June 30, 2018</td>
<td>$12,602,832</td>
<td>677,042</td>
<td>97,019</td>
<td>38,840,375</td>
<td>20,652,556</td>
<td>10,625</td>
<td>$72,880,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>810,110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>275,620</td>
<td>1,171,468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,257,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions and other adjustments</td>
<td>(217,544)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(167,076)</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>(375,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net transfers</td>
<td>(26,991)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,390,514)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,417,505)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at June 30, 2019</td>
<td>$13,168,407</td>
<td>677,042</td>
<td>97,019</td>
<td>39,115,995</td>
<td>20,266,434</td>
<td>19,395</td>
<td>$73,344,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Library books balance at June 30, 2017, reported by the Supreme Court Librarian, held at the Supreme Court Library and the offices of the Supreme Court Justices.

2. Amounts reported for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 also include library books, reported by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC), held at AOIC, Appellate Offices, and Mandatory Arbitration sites.

3. A $6,217,030 adjustment was made during Fiscal Year 2018 to include library books held at AOIC, Appellate Offices, and Mandatory Arbitration sites. The balance was excluded in this schedule previously.

This schedule has been reconciled to property reports submitted to the Office of the Comptroller by the Supreme Court Librarian and AOIC (see Notes above).
Agency Functions

The Illinois Supreme Court (Court), in addition to being the State’s highest court, is responsible for the State’s unified trial court, one appellate court with five districts, and several supporting units. General administrative and supervisory authority over the court system is vested in the Supreme Court. Several advisory bodies assist with this mission by making recommendations to the Court. These include the Judicial Conference of Illinois and the various committees of the Court.

The Chief Justice is responsible for exercising the Court’s general administrative and supervisory authority in accordance with the Court’s rules. The Court appoints an Administrative Director to assist the Chief Justice in his or her duties. The staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) supports the Administrative Director.

Key support personnel exist at each level of the Court to assist judges with the administration of justice. At the Supreme Court level, this includes the Clerk, Librarian, and Reporter of Decisions, Marshal, Research Director and Chief Internal Auditor.

The Justices of the Supreme Court were as follows:

- Anne M. Burke, Chief Justice (effective October 26, 2019)
- Robert R. Thomas
- Thomas L. Kilbride
- Rita B. Garman
- Lloyd A. Karmeier, Chief Justice (October 26, 2016 to October 25, 2019)
- Mary Jane Theis
- P. Scott Neville, Jr. (Appointed June 15, 2018)
- Charles E. Freeman (Retired June 14, 2018)

At the Appellate Court level, the presiding judge and judges of each Appellate District are assisted by the Clerk of the Appellate Court, Research Director, and their staff, who are appointed by the Appellate Judges.

The three levels of the courts: circuit, appellate, and supreme, all operate within clearly defined boundaries. Cases may be appealed to the appellate court in the district containing the circuit court, or in certain circumstances, directly to the Supreme Court. After an appellate court decision, parties to the case may seek discretionary review by the Supreme Court.
In addition, the Supreme Court administers the appropriation made to the Illinois Courts Commission (Commission). The function of the Commission is to hear complaints against judges based upon investigations performed by the Judicial Inquiry Board. The Commission hears those complaints, makes findings and enters dispositive orders of dismissal or of imposition of sanctions. The Commission consists of five judges (one Supreme Court Justice, two Appellate Court Judges, and two Circuit Court Judges) and two citizen members appointed by the Governor. The Supreme Court Justice and the two Circuit Court Judges are appointed by the Supreme Court. The two Appellate Court Judges are appointed by the Appellate Court.

To assist the Supreme Court in the performance of its duties and functions, the Court appoints the following positions:

_AIOC Administrative Director and Staff_

The Executive Office, which is comprised of the Administrative Director, attorneys, and administrative staff, is largely responsible for coordinating Administrative Office staff support for the Supreme Court, Supreme Court committees and the committees of the Illinois Judicial Conference. Executive Office staff aid the Director in administering certain Supreme Court Rules; securing legal representation through the Office of the Attorney General; negotiating leases and contracts; overseeing the election of associate judges; coordinating the election processes with the Chief Justice; providing secretariat services to the Illinois Courts Commission and inventory control.

The Administrative Services Division develops the Judicial Branch budget; provides procurement; processes payment vouchers; processes AOIC receipts; maintains accounting records; maintains payroll records; coordinates employee benefit programs; maintains petty cash funds for the AOIC and the Supreme Court; and monitors the repair and renovation of State owned facilities.

The Access to Justice Division pursues strategies to leverage and to provide initial access to justice reforms statewide. The Access to Justice Division’s current priorities are to work with the Access to Justice Commission Forms Committee to promulgate statewide standardized forms; provide language access services and support to assist state courts in addressing language barriers and improve interpreter services, including administering for court interpreter certification and the AOIC interpreter registry; develop training materials and education programs for courts, clerks and other judicial stakeholders to assist with interacting with self-represented litigants; expand statewide civil justice data collection, research and analysis to aid in the development of innovative strategies to close the gap between the need for, and the availability of quality legal assistance; and monitor emerging local, state and national best
practices and trends in the civil justice arena, including less lawyer-intensive and court-intensive solutions to certain legal problems.

The Court Services Division (CSD) provides ongoing legislative support services; labor relations services; assistance to circuit clerks and court administrators; administers the automated disposition reporting program; serves as the primary liaison for the Supreme Court’s Peer Judge Mentoring Program; and processes requests for the reimbursement of claims for persons subject to the Sexually Violent Person’s Commitment Act. In addition, the CSD’s responsibilities include the production of various reports.

The Judicial Education Division provides administrative oversight of continuing education programs for judges and court personnel; staffs the Committee on Education which, with the Court’s approval, plans all judicial education programs sponsored by the Illinois Judicial Conference; and operates the Resource Lending Library.

The Judicial Management Information Services (JMIS) Division provides technology services to improve the procedures and efficiencies of court operations and allow the Illinois Courts to exchange data between courts, county agencies and other State organizations. JMIS staff oversees the installation of digital electronic recording.

The Probation Services Division provides services to the chief circuit judges and their probation officers in all circuits. The division sets standards for hiring and promoting probation officers; maintains a list of qualified applicants for probation positions; develops training programs; gathers statewide statistics and publishes reports; establishes standards for probation department compensation plans; develops and monitors probation programs to enhance services and sanctions for offenders supervised in the community and to provide effective alternatives to imprisonment.

The Human Resources Division provides employee and labor relations support to state-paid judicial branch employees and managers. Division staff maintain attendance and leave records for all personnel covered by the Supreme Court’s Leave of Absence Policies and assist individuals with questions regarding the Supreme Court’s personnel policies. The Division is also responsible for administering the judicial branch’s classification and compensation plan, as well as assisting judicial branch managers in the recruitment and selection process. The Division is responsible for EEOC reporting and dissemination of economic interest statements required under Supreme Court Rule 68. The Division’s labor attorneys negotiate collective bargaining agreements state-wide on behalf of chief circuit judges and circuit clerks.
The Office of Communications and Public Information manages internal and external communications for the Illinois Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. The Office coordinates media communications and responds to media inquiries, issues press releases, and services as a resource for trial courts implementing the Supreme Court’s Policy for Extended Media Coverage.

Clerk of the Supreme Court

The Clerk of the Supreme Court directs a staff of deputies who process cases according to Supreme Court Rules, monitor the caseload of the Court, keep Court files and records, and maintain Court statistics. The Clerk’s Office maintains a list of attorneys licensed to practice in the State and oversees the licensing of attorneys. The Clerk also registers and renews legal professional service corporations and associations, keeps files of judicial financial disclosure statements, and serves as a public information office for the Court.

Supreme Court Librarian

The Supreme Court Librarian directs library operations and acquisitions of research materials. Library staff provides research and reference assistance to the Court. The library serves the Court, the judiciary, other State government agencies, attorneys and the public.

Reporter of Decisions

The Reporter of Decisions directs a staff which publishes opinions of the Supreme and Appellate Courts in the “Official Reports”. Employees also verify case citations; compose head notes, attorney lines, table of cases, topical summaries and other materials appearing in the “Official Reports”; and edit opinions for style and grammar.

Supreme Court Marshal

The Supreme Court Marshal attends each session of the Court. In addition, the Marshal directs a staff which provides security for justices and employees and conducts tours of the building.

Supreme Court Research Department

The Supreme Court Research Director supervises a staff of attorneys who provide legal research and writing assistance to the Court.
Supreme Court Internal Audit

The Supreme Court Chief Internal Auditor and staff perform audits of State funded activities of the Judicial Branch. In addition, Internal Audit annually assesses the adequacy of the internal controls for State funded activities.

Agency Planning Program

The Court annually convenes a Judicial Conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice. Supreme Court Rule 41 established the membership of the conference, created the Executive Committee to assist the Supreme Court in conducting the conference and appointed the Administrative Office as the secretary of the Conference. The Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court presides over both the Judicial Conference and the Executive Committee of the Conference, thus providing a strong link between the Judicial Conference and the Supreme Court.

In addition to the Judicial Conference, the Court addresses administrative matters during each Court term. This includes consideration of modifications to Supreme Court Rules and discussions with the Administrative Director regarding administrative and budgetary matters.

The Court releases several publications each year which summarizes the Courts’ operations. These include the “Annual Report of the Illinois Courts”, “Annual Report of the Illinois Judicial Conference”.

During the examination period, the Court continued implementation of several new initiatives as a result of the planning activities outlined above. In addition to the actions taken by the Judicial Conference and the changes made to the Supreme Court Rules, these initiatives included a State Court Improvement Program grant received from the United States Department of Health and Human Services. The purpose of the grant is to assess and improve the role, responsibilities and effectiveness of the State court system in regard to the State laws implementing Titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act and to other judicial aspects of the child welfare system.
The Illinois Supreme Court’s (Court) explanations for significant fluctuations in total expenditures for each fund in excess of 20% and $150,000 as presented in the Comparative Schedule of Net Appropriations, Expenditures, and Lapsed Balances (Schedule 3) are detailed below.

Fiscal Year 2019

Fund 0030 – Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund

Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund total expenditures decreased by $4,705,841 or 73% in Fiscal Year 2019. Significant payments to the vendor for hosting a central online remote access application and implementation of a central electronic filing manager service to facilitate Statewide e-filing were processed from the General Revenue Fund.

Fund 0262 – Mandatory Arbitration Fund

Mandatory Arbitration Fund total expenditures decreased by $805,019 or 22% in Fiscal Year 2019 primarily due to the Judicial Educational Conference held during Fiscal Year 2018 but not in Fiscal Year 2019.

Fiscal Year 2018

Fund 0030 – Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund

Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund total expenditures increased by $6,161,009 or 2308% in Fiscal Year 2018 primarily due to additional services provided by the vendor to host a central online remote access application and implementation of a central electronic filing manager service to facilitate Statewide e-filing in Fiscal Year 2017 for two counties with expansion to additional counties in Fiscal Year 2018.

Fund 0769 – Lawyers’ Assistance Program Fund

Lawyers’ Assistance Program (Program) Fund total expenditures increased by $222,136 or 44% in Fiscal Year 2018 due to adding positions for the Program, expanding the regional offices, and purchasing computer equipment.
The Illinois Supreme Court’s (Court) explanation for significant fluctuations in total cash receipts for each fund in excess of 20% and $50,000 as presented in the Comparative Schedule of Cash Receipts (Schedule 7) are detailed below:

**Fiscal Year 2019**

There were no significant fluctuations in total fund cash receipts noted in Fiscal Year 2019.

**Fiscal Year 2018**

**Other Receipts Deposited on Behalf of the Illinois Supreme Court (Court)**

**Fund 0030 – Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund**

Circuit Court Collections reported as Other Receipts Deposited on Behalf of the Illinois Supreme Court (Court) in Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund increased by $1,918,840 or 62% due to an amendment in the Clerk of Courts Act. Public Act 99-859, effective August 19, 2016, created the $9 e-business filing fee to be collected from all civil case filings and deposited in Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund. Fiscal Year 2018 would have been the first complete fiscal year in which receipts were collected which accounts for the significant increase.
The Illinois Supreme Court’s (Court) explanations for significant lapse period spending as presented in the Schedule of Appropriations, Expenditures, and Lapsed Balances for Fiscal Years 2019 (Schedule 1) and 2018 (Schedule 2) are detailed below. We considered lapse period spending in excess of 20% or more of the total expenditures to be significant.

**Fiscal Year 2019**

**Non-Appropriated Fund**

**Fund 0269 – Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund**

Lapse period spending on the Fiscal Year 2018 State Court Improvement Basic Program, the State Court Improvement Data Program, and the State Court Improvement Training Program, expended in Fiscal Year 2019 was $59,205 (29% of total expenditures), $21,202 (25% of total expenditures), and $61,653 (49% of total expenditures), respectively. The federal Court Improvement Programs in Fund 0269 are generally for a two-year period beginning October 1 of the award year and concluding on September 30, two years later. The federal government permits the Court to pay during the federal lapse period for those items or services that were encumbered, purchased, ordered, and dedicated through and including September 30 of the respective grant period.

**Fiscal Year 2018**

**Appropriated Funds**

**Fund 0030 – Supreme Court Special Purposes Fund**

Lapse period spending for the oversight and management line item in Fiscal Year 2018 was $2,238,880 (35% of total expenditures). Lapse period spending occurred due to timing of billings and subsequent payment of vouchers rendered in relation to additional electronic filing manager services to facilitate statewide electronic filing of civil cases.

**Non-Appropriated Fund**

**Fund 0269 – Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund**

Lapse period spending on the Fiscal Year 2016 State Justice Institute Ethics Training and Fiscal Year 2017 State Court Improvement Basic Program, State Court Improvement Training Program, and State Court Improvement Data Program, expended in Fiscal Year 2018 was
For the Two Years Ended June 30, 2019

$29,000 (100% of total expenditures), $55,722 (28% of total expenditures), $123,614 (80% of total expenditures), and $40,416 (39% of total expenditures), respectively. The federal Court Improvement Programs in Fund 0269 are generally for a two-year period beginning October 1 of the award year and concluding on September 30, two years later. The federal government permits the Supreme Court to pay during the federal lapse period for those items or services that were encumbered, purchased, ordered, and dedicated through and including September 30 of the respective grant period.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
SUPREME COURT
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION
ANALYSIS OF ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE (NOT EXAMINED)
For the Two Years Ended June 30, 2019

General Revenue Fund

The Court had $21,191 and $25,126 of net accounts receivable at June 30, 2019 and 2018, respectively, in the General Revenue Fund (0001). Accounts Receivable balances represented amounts owed to the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC) for reimbursement of lease services and salary overpayments.

Aged accounts receivable as of June 30, 2019 and 2018 were as follows for the General Revenue Fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Outstanding</th>
<th>June 30, 2019</th>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$ 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 90 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 days - 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,913</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>23,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross receivables: $21,191 (100%) in 2019 and $25,126 (100%) in 2018.
Uncollectible: $0 (0%) in both years.
Net receivables: $21,191 (100%) in 2019 and $25,126 (100%) in 2018.

The Supreme Court Specials Purposes Fund (0030), Mandatory Arbitration Program Fund (0262), Supreme Court Federal Projects Fund (0269), Foreign Language Interpreter Fund (0597), Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund (0769) and Court's Safekeeping Fund (1343) had no accounts receivable as of June 30, 2019 and 2018.
The following table, prepared from Court records, presents the average number of employees by pay code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Code</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Personal Services</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Judges Assigned to the Appellate Court</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Judges of the Appellate Court</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Judges of the Appellate Court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistants to Chief Circuit Judges</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks, First Appellate District</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks, Second Appellate District</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks, Third Appellate District</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks, Fourth Appellate District</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks, Fifth Appellate District</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Recalled Judges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Arbitration</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit and Associate Judges</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District Personal Services</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Appellate District Personal Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Appellate District Personal Services</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Appellate District Personal Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Appellate District Personal Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justices</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Support to Chief Circuit Judges</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average number of Full-Time Equivalent Employees</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
SUPREME COURT  
COMPLIANCE EXAMINATION  
ANNUAL COST STATISTICS (NOT EXAMINED)  
For the Two Years Ended June 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supreme Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average caseload per Judicial Officer</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per case filed (in dollars)</td>
<td>$6,929</td>
<td>$6,485</td>
<td>$5,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appellate Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average caseload per Judicial Officer</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per case filed (in dollars)</td>
<td>$6,620</td>
<td>$5,928</td>
<td>$5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circuit Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average caseload per Judicial Officer</td>
<td>2633</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>2818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per case filed (in dollars)</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Arbitration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per civil case filed (in dollars)</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average caseload per probation officer: Adult</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average caseload per probation officer: Juvenile</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual cost per offender: Standard (in dollars)</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
<td>$1,124</td>
<td>$1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual cost per offender: DUI specialized (in dollars)</td>
<td>$1,268</td>
<td>$1,562</td>
<td>$1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual cost per offender: Intensive supervision (in dollars)</td>
<td>$2,332</td>
<td>$2,431</td>
<td>$2,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual cost per offender: Juvenile Detention (in dollars)</td>
<td>$1,631</td>
<td>$1,786</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average caseload per judicial officer was computed by accumulating the number of caseloads within each court divided by the number of judicial officers within the same court. The average cost per case filed was computed by accumulating costs within each court divided by the number of total cases filed.

For the information under Probation Services, the average caseload per probation officer was computed by accumulating the number of caseloads divided by the number of probation officer serving adults and juveniles. The average annual cost per offender: standard was computed by accumulating costs within the probation services division divided by total offenders. The average annual cost per offender: DUI specialized was computed by accumulating costs within the probation services division handling DUI specialized cases divided by total offenders. The average annual cost per offender: intensive supervision was computed by accumulating costs within the probation services division providing intensive supervision of offenders divided by total offenders. The average annual cost per offender: juvenile detention was computed by accumulating costs within the probation services division handling juvenile detentions, divided by total offenders.
# Memorandums of Understanding (Not Examined)

For the Two Years Ended June 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Memorandums of Understanding</th>
<th>Parties Involved Other Than the Court</th>
<th>Dates Involved</th>
<th>Description of Memorandums</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) to provide resource material and continuing education and training.</td>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>07/07/17 - 06/30/18</td>
<td>AOIC will provide resource material and continuing education and training for the benefit of Illinois judges, probation officers, and treatment providers on behalf of the Supreme Court of Illinois, addressing sentencing issues, application of evidence-based practices in the assessment, sanctioning, judicial containment and management strategies of Driving Under the Influence (DUI) offenders, comprehensive case management and oversight arising from DUI cases, and the monitoring and treatment of DUI offenders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dell Emergency Response Agreement</td>
<td>Dell Marketing LLP</td>
<td>10/23/09 - Indefinitely</td>
<td>Dell Marketing LLP will provide Dell hardware products and related software and documentation to AOIC. This agreement is for the purchase or loan of products, in the United States, during times of weather emergencies, regional disasters or national emergencies which might hinder AOIC from purchasing or acquiring products by other standard means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Memorandums of Understanding</td>
<td>Parties Involved Other Than the Court</td>
<td>Dates Involved</td>
<td>Description of Memorandums Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Direct input of obligations/purchase orders (PO) by AOIC</td>
<td>Illinois Office of the Comptroller</td>
<td>06/11/02 - Indefinitely</td>
<td>The Comptroller will allow AOIC to input POs directly into the Statewide Accounting Management System.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Automated system for reporting conviction information</td>
<td>Office of the Illinois Secretary of State (SOS)</td>
<td>09/19/83 - Indefinitely</td>
<td>AOIC shall accept, in tape format, conviction information from circuit clerks’ offices with automated case processing systems. The AOIC shall then send to the SOS, in tape format, the conviction information on criminal offenses and traffic violations relating to unfitness to safely operate motor vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Automated system for reporting conviction information</td>
<td>Law Enforcement, Division of State Police (State Police)</td>
<td>10/11/83 - Indefinitely</td>
<td>AOIC shall accept, in tape format, conviction information from circuit clerks’ offices with automated case processing systems. The AOIC shall then send to the State Police, in tape format, the conviction information on criminal offenses and traffic violations issued and processed on State Police citations and complaints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>