Basic Jury System Evaluation Report

05-04-2018 08:35 am

County	Racine	Jury Year	2017	Term of Servic	e 4	# of Judges	10
Completed By	Ashley Robash	Date	02-20-2018	Daily Fee	\$16.00	Mileage Rates (Flat/Juror)	0.00/0.510

Sent to DCA (date) 02-20-2018 Notes

1-Step County

Section 1: Representative and Inclusive Source List

Reports/Statistics:

RACINE

COUNTY

Census Report: 2016

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	73048	48.94%	66885	49.24%	7107	48.88%
Female	76207	51.06%	68945	50.76%	7432	51.12%
	149255		135830		14539	
Age	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
18-24 yrs	16424	11.00%	13796	10.16%	1783	12.26%
25-44 yrs	46450	31.12%	43633	32.12%	4816	33.12%
45-64 yrs	56049	37.55%	51135	37.65%	5325	36.63%
65+ yrs	30332	20.32%	27266	20.07%	2615	17.99%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	149255		135830		14539	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Black/African-Amer	15834	10.61%	12794	9.42%	1467	10.09%
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	595	0.40%	332	0.24%	35	0.24%
Asian / Pacific Islander	2088	1.40%	1626	1.20%	177	1.22%
White / Caucasian	115148	77.15%	112223	82.62%	11745	80.78%
Hispanic ²	15590	10.45%	8855	6.52%	997	6.86%
Other ³	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	100	0.69%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	0.12%
	149255		135830		14539	

Notes:

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'.

Analysis: Prospective Juror List is representative of the Estimated Population based on the Census information. The Prospective Jury List more closely resembles the Census Information than the Jury Master List. We do see a slightly higher percentage in the 18-24 yrs and 45-44 yrs age ranges in the Prospective Jury list. We also see a 5% higher percentage in White/Caucasian category on the Jury Year Master List but only slightly higher, 3%, on the Prospective Juror List. Our inclusiveness percentage, 90.93%, exceeds the measure/goal.

Section 2: Effective Qualification and Summoning

Section 3: Responsiveness of Jurors

Reports/Statistics:

Juror Yields

Qualification Yield	Number		Number	0/
Potential Available	Number	Ineligible/Unavailable	Number	%
A. Question-Summons Sent	15573	B. Undeliverable	797	5.12%
		C. Deceased	57	0.37%
		D. Disqualified	1277	8.20%
		E. Exc Jury Year	1215	7.80%
		F. Perm Excused	277	1.78%
		G. Postponed	2186	14.04%
		H. Final No Response	1027	6.59%
		I. Final FTA	196	1.26%
		(to get total add B thru I)		
		J. Total Not Available	7032	45.16%
K. Total Eligible and Available	8541 (A - J)			
L. Qualification Yield (%)	54.84% [(K / A) x 100]	M. Total Cancelled / Called Off	4946	
		N. Percentage Cancelled /		
		Called Off	57.91%	[(M / K) x 100]
Overall Yield				
Overall Yield % (Measures => 6	0%) 54.84%	(L)		

Analysis: Overall yield is lower than measure/goal and falls short of goal by less than 6%. We increased out Overall Yield but just under 1% from 2016. 2017 saw less potential jurors available than 2016. We saw 2% less disqualified jurors and roughly 2% increase in postponements.

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:	Order to Show Cause Hearings are being held for failure to
(i.e., calls, letters, OSC)	appear or fail to return questionnaires. These hearings are held
	before the Judicial Court Commissioner. 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	2052		
Total SNRF Codes	415		
	2054		
Total Jurors with NRF or SNRF	2054		
Results of follow-up	Jurors with NRF & SNRF		
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	414	20.16%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number qualified (postponed & became available)	1106	53.85%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number final no response	534	26.00%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Failure to appear when summoned			
	Number		
Total FTA and SFTA Codes	672		
Total FTA Jurors with FTAF	351		
Results of follow-up	Jurors with FTAF		
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	49	13.96%	Of Total with FTAF

Analysis: Regular weekly coding of jurors with No Response Follow-up (NRF) and mailings for jurors who did not return questionnaire for the following week appear to be effective. This is resulting in a higher percentage of eligible/available jurors for subsequent service. Ensuring accurate coding of Failure to Appear Follow-up (FTAF) is resulting in a higher percentage of final Failure to Appear (FTA).

1 200

101

0.28% Of Total with FTAF

56.98% Of Total with FTAF

28.77% Of Total with FTAF

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	73	Daily Juror Use Summary "New/Report for Selec		
New/Reporting for Selection	3657	Daily Juror Use Summary "New/Report for Selecti		
Not Used	1313		Daily Juror Use Summary "Not Used"	
Number of Voir Dires Begun	69		Daily Juror Use Summary "Voir Dires Begun"	
No Trial Start Days	22	Daily J	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"	
Sent to Voir Dire	2587		Jury Summary by Case "Sent to Voir Dire"	
Questioned in Voir Dire	1532		Jury Summary by Case "Quest. Voir Dire"	
Not Questioned in Voir Dire	1055		Jury Summary by Case "Not Quest. Voir Dire"	
Sworn Jurors	631		Jury Summary by Case "Sworn Jurors"	
Trial Days	168		Jury Summary by Case "Trial Days"	
Cancelled / Called Off	4946		Juror Yields "Cancelled/Called Off"	
Measures		Percent	Goal	
% Sent to Jury Selection		69.40%	(Measures => 90%)	
(# sent to voir dire / # reporting for selection)				
% Selected as Jurors		17.25%	(Measures => 30%)	
(# jurors sworn / # reporting for selection)				
% Used in Voir Dire		59.54%	(Measures => 80%)	
(# questioned in voir dire / # sent to voir dire)				
% No Trial Start Days		30.14%	(Measures =< 10%)	

(# days jurors brought in for no trial / # of days jurors reported for selection)

Analysis: We have seen a 7% increase in the number of jurors sent to Jury Selection over 2016, however, the number still falls well below the 90% measure and does not meet the goal. We have seen a 1.16% increase, from 2016, in the number of potential jurors selected to serve on a trial. However, the percentage of Jurors called in then selected as jurors falls well below the 30% measure and does not meet the goal. We have seen a 2.42% increase from 2016 in the number of jurors used in Voir Dire. However, the percentage of Jurors used in Voir Dire falls significantly below the 80% measure and does not meet the goal. We have seen a 2.42% increase from 2016 in the number of jurors used in Voir Dire. However, the percentage of Jurors used in Voir Dire falls significantly below the 80% measure and does not meet the goal. We have seen a significant 10.6% decrease from 2016 in the number of occasions in which jurors are brought/called in and no trials begin. However, our percentage falls above the 10% measure and does not meet the goal. While we are making small moves in the right directions none of the Measure/Goals have been met. None of the measure/goals have been meet in the last six years.

Section 5: Cost Effectiveness

Reports/Statistics:

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

Primary Analysis		Report/Location			
Total Expenses	\$131,432.57	/ Jury Expense Summary "Total (\$)"			
Trial Days	165	=			
Trial Days	\$796.56	(total expenses / # trial days = cost per trial day)			
Secondary Analysis (optional)					
All Associated Costs ⁴	\$193,739.03	/			
# of Questionnaires Sent	15573	=			
Administrative Cost/Juror	\$12.44	(all costs / total # questionnaires sent = administrative cost per juror)			

⁴ Associated costs include the total expenses on Jury Expense Summary, plus salaries, printing,

postage and any other expenses related to the jury system.

Analysis: All associated costs include: Food Supplies: \$801.25; Juror Meals: \$2,342.31; Juror Parking: \$10,200.00; Juror Per Diem: \$48,854.00; Juror Travel: \$48,268.43; Jury Bailiffs: \$23,836.05; Jury Coordinator Salary (with Benefits): \$48,549.70*; Other: \$439.96; Postage: \$6,419.93; Printing: \$4,026.95. *Todd Kile left position on 03-29-2017; Ashley Robash began position on 06-01-2017; Position filled by Administrative Deputy & Clerk of Court in the interim.

Addendum: Inclusiveness & Representativeness

Inclusiveness	Census Year	Jury Ye Master L		ness			
Persons 18+ Years Old	149255	1358	330 91	.01% (Me	easures => 85%)	Absolute Disparity	
Absolute Disparity			Census Year	Jury Ye	ar Master List		
Race		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage	
BI	ack/African-Amer	15834	10.61%	12794	9.42%	-1.19%	
Amer India	n / Alaska Native	595	0.40%	332	0.24%	-0.15%	
Asian	/ Pacific Islander	2088	1.40%	1626	1.20%	-0.20%	
V	Vhite / Caucasian	115148	77.15%	112223	82.62%	5.47%	
	Hispanic ¹	15590	10.45%	8855	6.52%	-3.93%	
	Other ²	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	
	Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	
		149255		135830			

Comparative Disparity	Census Year		Jury Year Master List		Comparative Disparity	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage	
Black/African-Amer	15834	10.61%	12794	9.42%	-11.21%	
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	595	0.40%	332	0.24%	-38.69%	
Asian / Pacific Islander	2088	1.40%	1626	1.20%	-14.43%	
White / Caucasian	115148	77.15%	112223	82.62%	7.09%	
Hispanic ¹	15590	10.45%	8855	6.52%	-37.59%	
Other ²	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	
	149255		135830			

Notes:

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

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