RACINE COUNTY

Basic Jury System Evaluation Report

05-04-2018 08:31 am

County Racine Jury Year 2015 Term of Service 4 # of Judges 10

Completed By Todd Kile Date 03-11-2016 Daily Fee \$16.00 Mileage Rates 0.00/0.510

(Flat/Juror)

Sent to DCA (date) 03-11-2016 Notes

1-Step County

Section 1: Representative and Inclusive Source List

Reports/Statistics:

Census Report: US International Population Estimate 2014

Demographics Import Report, Juror Demographics

Note: Use Juror Demographic Yields to evaluate demographic results at all stages of the jury process.

Persons 18+ Years Old		Census Year	Jury Yea	r Master List	Prospectiv	e Juror List ¹
Gender	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Male	72825	49.02%	0	0.00%	7725	49.92%
Female	75732	50.98%	0	0.00%	7751	50.08%
	148557		0		15476	
Age	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
18-24 yrs	16350	8.38%	0	0.00%	1805	11.66%
25-44 yrs	46950	24.06%	0	0.00%	5110	33.02%
45-64 yrs	56472	28.94%	0	0.00%	5890	38.06%
65+ yrs	28785	14.75%	0	0.00%	2672	17.26%
Unknown	46606	23.88%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	195163		0		15477	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Black/African-Amer	15483	10.42%	0	0.00%	1431	9.25%
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	579	0.39%	0	0.00%	49	0.32%
Asian / Pacific Islander	1842	1.24%	0	0.00%	180	1.16%
White / Caucasian	115806	77.95%	0	0.00%	12645	81.70%
Hispanic ²	14847	9.99%	0	0.00%	1085	7.01%
Other ³	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	69	0.45%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	0.12%
	148557		0		15477	

Notes:

Analysis: Prospective Juror List is representative of the Estimated Population based on the Census information.

¹ Use List after imported when Exception List removed

² See Page 6 of Guide for discussion on counting Hispanic names

³ DOT does not provide a category that matches the US Census category of 'two or more races'.

Section 2: Effective Qualification and Summoning

Section 3: Responsiveness of Jurors

Reports/Statistics:

Juror Yields

Qualification Yield

Potential Available	Number	Ineligible/Unavailable	Number	%
A. Question-Summons Sent	15722	B. Undeliverable	1135	7.22%
		C. Deceased	74	0.47%
		D. Disqualified	1291	8.21%
		E. Exc Jury Year	1504	9.57%
		F. Perm Excused	593	3.77%
		G. Postponed	1386	8.82%
		H. Final No Response	392	2.49%
		I. Final FTA	329	2.09%
		(to get total add B thru I)		
		J. Total Not Available	6704	42.64%
K. Total Eligible and Available	9018 (A - J)			
L. Qualification Yield (%)	57.36% [(K / A) x 100]	M. Total Cancelled / Called Off	5132	
		N. Percentage Cancelled /		
		Called Off	56.91%	[(M / K) x 100]

Overall Yield

Overall Yield % (Measures => 60%)	57.36%	(L)

Analysis: Overall yield is lower than measure/goal but only falls short of goal by less than 3.5 %, which is an improvement over 2014 which yield fell short by almost 10%. 2015 saw an increase in potentially available jurors over 2014. This is due to more aggressive strategies and not allowing jurors to be as easily excused from jury duty. In 2016 continued focus will be put on reducing the number of excusals based on the excusal guidelines set by the judges. By reducing the number of total excusals, a higher overall yield should result.

Section 2: Effective Qualification and Summoning

Section 3: Responsiveness of Jurors

Reports/Statistics:

Follow-up Activity sections on Juror Yields

Effectiveness of Follow-up Actions

Follow-up Actions Used: (i.e., calls, letters, OSC)

OTSC Hearings are being held for failure to appear or fail to return questionnaires. Hearings are held once a month to allow jurors to reschedule their jury duty. Jurors are subject to a \$50 fine if they do not show up at the hearing to reschedule jury duty.

Non-response to Questionnaires

	Number		
Total NRF Codes	2226		
Total SNRF Codes	693		
Total Jurors with NRF or SNRF	2237		
Results of follow-up	Jurors with NRF & SN	RF	
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	883	39.47%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number qualified (postponed & became available)	1186	53.02%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number final no response	168	7.51%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Failure to appear when summoned			
	Number		
Total FTA and SFTA Codes	772		
Total FTA Jurors with FTAF	322		
Results of follow-up	Jurors with FTAF		
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	4	1.24%	Of Total with FTAF
Number became eligible/available (subsequent service)	168	52.17%	Of Total with FTAF
Number postponed to later term	10	3.11%	Of Total with FTAF
Number final FTA	140	43.48%	Of Total with FTAF

Analysis:

Regular weekly NRF coding and NRF mailings for jurors who did not return questionnaire for the following week. This is resulting in a higher percentage of eligible/available jurors for subsequent service. Ensuring accurate coding of FTAF is resulting in a higher percentage of final FTA.

Section 4: Efficient Use of Jurors

Reports/Statistics:

Juror Yields, Jury Summary by Case (Totals on detail page), Daily Juror Use Summary (Totals)

	Number		Report/Location	
Days Jurors Reported for Selection	93	Daily Juror Use Summary "New/Report for Selecti		
New/Reporting for Selection	4218	Daily Ju	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"	
Not Used	1845		Daily Juror Use Summary "Not Used"	
Number of Voir Dires Begun	70		Daily Juror Use Summary "Voir Dires Begun"	
No Trial Start Days	33	Daily Ju	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"	
Sent to Voir Dire	2535		Jury Summary by Case "Sent to Voir Dire"	
Questioned in Voir Dire	1586		Jury Summary by Case "Quest. Voir Dire"	
Not Questioned in Voir Dire	949		Jury Summary by Case "Not Quest. Voir Dire"	
Sworn Jurors	803		Jury Summary by Case "Sworn Jurors"	
Trial Days	153		Jury Summary by Case "Trial Days"	
Cancelled / Called Off	5132		Juror Yields "Cancelled/Called Off"	
Measures		Percent	Goal	
% Sent to Jury Selection		60.10%	(Measures => 90%)	
(# sent to voir dire / # reporting for selection)				
% Selected as Jurors		19.04%	(Measures => 30%)	
(# jurors sworn / # reporting for selection)				
% Used in Voir Dire		62.56%	(Measures => 80%)	
(# questioned in voir dire / # sent to voir dire)				
% No Trial Start Days		35.48%	(Measures =< 10%)	
(# days jurors brought in for no trial / # of days jurors reported for se	election)			

Analysis: % of Jurors sent to Jury Selection needs to be greatly improved. % of Jurors called in then selected as jurors needs to be improved. % of Jurors used in Voir Dire needs to be improved. % of occasions in which jurors are brought/called in and no trials began needs to be improved. None of the Measure/Goals have been met. This has been an issue that we have taken to the judges. We've asked for a conference call the day before jury trials as some jury's fall due due to lack of witnesses being subpoenaed, attorneys being let go, lack of writ to bring defendant from prison....etc. Being informed if jury trials are adjourned the day prior would prevent a jury panel being called in the night before and would improve these statistics.

Section 5: Cost Effectiveness

Reports/Statistics:

Jury Expense Summary, Jury Summary by Case, and local budget

Primary Analysis		Report/Location
Total Expenses	\$143,320.81	/ Jury Expense Summary "Total (\$)"
Trial Days	153	=
Trial Days	\$936.74	(total expenses / # trial days = cost per trial day)
Secondary Analysis (optional)		
All Associated Costs ⁴	\$211,339.56	/
# of Questionnaires Sent	15722	=
Administrative Cost/Juror	\$13.44	(all costs / total # questionnaires sent = administrative cost per juror)
⁴ Associated costs include the total expenses on J	ury Expense Summary,	plus salaries, printing,

postage and any other expenses related to the jury system.

Analysis: Food Supplies: \$706.75; Juror Meals: \$2,491.75; Juror Parking: \$7,200.00; Juror Per Diem: \$56,217.50; Juror Travel: \$56,716.69; Jury Bailiffs: \$22,389.00; Jury Coordinator Salary (with Benefits): \$55,119.47; Other: \$189.10; Postage: \$7,703.78; Printing: \$2,605.52.

Addendum: Inclusiveness & Representativeness

Inclusiveness	Jury Year Census Year Master List		Inclusiveness	
Persons 18+ Years Old	195163	0	0.00%	(Measures => 85%)

Absolute Dispari	ity		Census Year	Jury Yea	ar Master List	Absolute Disparity
Race		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage
	Black/African-Amer	15483	10.42%	0	0.00%	-10.42%
	Amer Indian / Alaska Native	579	0.39%	0	0.00%	-0.39%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	1842	1.24%	0	0.00%	-1.24%
	White / Caucasian	115806	77.95%	0	0.00%	-77.95%
	Hispanic ¹	14847	9.99%	0	0.00%	-9.99%
	Other ²	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
	Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
		148557		0		

Comparative Disparity	Census Year Jury Year Master List		r Master List	Comparative Disparity	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage
Black/African-Amer	15483	10.42%	0	0.00%	-100.00%
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	579	0.39%	0	0.00%	-100.00%
Asian / Pacific Islander	1842	1.24%	0	0.00%	-100.00%
White / Caucasian	115806	77.95%	0	0.00%	-100.00%
Hispanic ¹	14847	9.99%	0	0.00%	-100.00%
Other ²	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
	148557		0		

Notes

¹ See Page 6 of Guide for discussion on counting Hispanic names

 $^{^{2}\,\}mathrm{DOT}$ does not provide a category that matches the US Census category of 'two or more races'.