RACINE COUNTY

# **Basic Jury System Evaluation Report**

03-30-2022 02:22 pm

County Racine Jury Year 2021 Term of Service 4 # of Judges 10

Completed By Samuel A Christensen Date 03-30-2022 Daily Fee \$16.00 Mileage Rates 0.00/0.510

(Flat/Juror)

Sent to DCA (date) 03-30-2022 Notes Changed from a 1-Step to a 2-Step County in 2020.

2-Step County

### Section 1: Representative and Inclusive Source List

### Reports/Statistics:

Census Report: 2020 Census Report

Demographics Import Report, Juror Demographics

Note: Use Juror Demographic Qualifying Yields and Juror Demographic Summoning Yields to evaluate demographic results at all

stages of the jury process.

Persons 18+ Years Old		Census Year	Jury Yea	ar Master List	Prospectiv	/e Juror List <sup>1</sup>
Gender	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Male	74322	49.09%	68014	49.32%	8072	49.39%
Female	77089	50.91%	69880	50.68%	8270	50.61%
	151411		137894		16342	
Age	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
18-24 yrs	16281	10.75%	13224	9.59%	1801	11.02%
25-44 yrs	47420	31.32%	44423	32.22%	5448	33.34%
45-64 yrs	54068	35.71%	49106	35.61%	5617	34.37%
65+ yrs	33642	22.22%	31141	22.58%	3476	21.27%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	151411		137894		16342	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Black/African-Amer	16271	10.75%	12699	9.21%	1645	10.07%
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	663	0.44%	312	0.23%	53	0.32%
Asian / Pacific Islander	2138	1.41%	1595	1.16%	180	1.10%
White / Caucasian	115397	76.21%	106749	77.41%	12492	76.44%
Hispanic <sup>2</sup>	16942	11.19%	9880	7.16%	1328	8.13%
Other <sup>3</sup>	0	0.00%	6659	4.83%	592	3.62%
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	52	0.32%
	151411		137894		16342	

#### Notes:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Use List after imported when Exception List removed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Page 6 of Guide for discussion on counting Hispanic names

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> DOT does not provide a category that matches the US Census category of 'two or more races'.

RACINE COUNTY

## **Basic Jury System Evaluation Report**

03-30-2022 02:22 pm

Analysis:

The Prospective Juror List appears to be representative of the estimated population based on the Census information. We do see a slightly higher percentage in the 25-44 yrs age ranges and lower in the 45-64 yrs and 65+ yrs in the Prospective Jury list when compared to the Census information. This is not necessarily surprising given COVID-19 continued and we continued our very liberal deferment of prospective jurors in vulnerable populations (age 65+) from 2020. We also see percentages in Black/African-American and White/Caucasian categories on the Prospective Juror List that are more in line with the Census data then on the Jury Year Master List. Our inclusiveness percentage, 91.07%, exceeds the measure/goal (85%).

# **Section 2: Effective Qualification and Summoning**

### Section 3: Responsiveness of Jurors

### Reports/Statistics:

Juror Qualifying Yields, Juror Summoning Yields

_						 
n	112	litia	cati	n	٧.	М

Potential Available	Number	Ineligible/Unavailable	Number	%
A. Questionnaires Sent	13792	B. Undeliverable	846	6.13%
	·	C. Deceased	78	0.57%
		D. Disqualified	1178	8.54%
		E. Exc Jury Year	484	3.51%
		F. Perm Excused	431	3.13%
		G. Postponed	875	6.34%
		H. Final No Response	1361	9.87%
		(to get total add B thru H)		
		I. Total Not Available	5253	38.09%
J. Total Qualified to Serve	<u>8539</u> (A - I)			
K. Qualification Yield (%)	61.91% [(J / A) x 100]			
Summoning Yield				
Potential Available	Number	Ineligible/Unavailable	Number	%
L. Summons Sent	8886	M. Undeliverable	67	0.75%
		N. Deceased	7	0.08%
		O. Disqualified	220	2.48%
		P. Exc Jury Year	749	8.43%
		Q. Perm Excused	123	1.38%
		R. Postponed	1520	17.11%
		S. Final FTA	82	0.92%
		(to get total add M thru S)		
		T. Total Not Available	2768	31.15%
U. Total Eligible and Available	6118 (L - T)			
V. Summoning Yield (%)	68.85% [(U / L) x 100]	W. Total Cancelled / Called Off	3515	
<u>-</u> . ,		X. Percentage Cancelled /		
		Called Off	57.45%	[(W / U) x 100]
Owner Wield				

#### **Overall Yield**

K. Qualification Yield (%)	61.91%	
V. Summoning Yield (%)	68.85%	
Overall Yield % (Measures => 60%)	42.63%	[(K x V) x 100]
Overall Undeliverable %	4.03%	$[((B + M) / (A + L)) \times 100]$
Overall Exc. Jury Year %	5.44%	$[((E + P) / (A + L)) \times 100]$
Overall Perm Excused %	2.44%	[((F + Q) / (A + L)) x 100]
Overall Postponed %	10.56%	[((G + R) / (A + L)) x 100]

Analysis: Racine County switched from a 1-step to a 2-step in 2020. We are seeing higher Qualification Yields than in the past. This year was up almost 3% over 2020 and up almost 8% from 2019 (59.09% in 2020 from 54% in 2019). Our overall yield is also up almost 6.7% over 2020 (35.9% in 2020). We still have a relatively high postponement rate, however, we may be able to see an increase in Overall Yield due to an easing of COVID-19 procedures.

# **Section 2: Effective Qualification and Summoning**

### **Section 3: Responsiveness of Jurors**

#### Reports/Statistics:

Follow-up Activity sections on Juror Qualifying Yields and Juror Summoning Yields

### **Effectiveness of Follow-up Actions**

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

Because of the COVID-19 pandemic we did not hold Order to Show Cause Hearings for failure to appear or failure to return questionnaires. We did, however, still follow-up with those jurors that failed to return their questionnaire and failed to appear.

### Non-response to Questionnaires

Total NRF Codes Total SNRF Codes Total Jurors with NRF or SNRF Results of follow-up	Number 3381 1596 3487 Jurors with NRF & SNRF	<del>.</del>	
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	744	21.34%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number qualified (postponed & became available)	1378	39.52%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Number final no response	1365	39.15%	Of Total with NRF & SNRF
Failure to appear when summoned			
	Number		
Total FTA and SFTA Codes	291		
Total FTA Jurors with FTAF	276		
Results of follow-up	Jurors with FTAF		
	Number	%	
Number ineligible/unqualified	47	17.03%	Of Total with FTAF
Number became eligible/available (subsequent service)	0	0.00%	Of Total with FTAF
Number postponed to later term	147	53.26%	Of Total with FTAF
Number final FTA	82	29.71%	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 continues to be effective. Ensuring accurate coding of Failure to Appear Follow-up (FTAF) is resulting in a higher percentage of final Failure to Appear (FTA).

#### Section 4: Efficient Use of Jurors

#### Reports/Statistics:

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

	Number		Report/Location
Days Jurors Reported for Selection	58	Daily Ju	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"
New/Reporting for Selection	2783	Daily Ju	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"
Not Used	763		Daily Juror Use Summary "Not Used"
Number of Voir Dires Begun	61		Daily Juror Use Summary "Voir Dires Begun"
No Trial Start Days	13	Daily Ju	uror Use Summary "New/Report for Selection"
Sent to Voir Dire	2082		Jury Summary by Case "Sent to Voir Dire"
Questioned in Voir Dire	1425		Jury Summary by Case "Quest. Voir Dire"
Not Questioned in Voir Dire	657	,	Jury Summary by Case "Not Quest. Voir Dire"
Sworn Jurors	594		Jury Summary by Case "Sworn Jurors"
Trial Days	148		Jury Summary by Case "Trial Days"
Cancelled / Called Off	3515	Ju	uror Summoning Yields "Cancelled/Called Off"
Measures		Percent	Goal
% Sent to Jury Selection		74.81%	(Measures => 90%)
(# Sent to Voir Dire / # New/Reporting for Selection)			
% Selected as Jurors		21.34%	(Measures => 30%)
(# Sworn Jurors / # New/Reporting for Selection)			
% Used in Voir Dire		68.44%	(Measures => 80%)
(# Questioned in Voir Dire / # Sent to Voir Dire)			
% No Trial Start Days		22.41%	(Measures =< 10%)
(# No Trial Start Days / # Days Jurors Reported for Selection)			

Analysis: In 2021, we have saw over a decrease in the number of jurors sent to Jury Selection over last year. This means more jurors are being summoned in then not sent to a courtroom for Voir Dire. Our percentage of Jurors sent to Jury Selection is 74.81% which falls below the 90% measure . We have saw a slight improvement to the percentage of potential jurors selected to serve on a trial, increase to 21.34% from 20.70% in 2020. It is much improved, by roughly 4%, over the last several years (from 19.67% in 2019 and from 17.26% in 2018). However, the percentage of Jurors called in, reporting in, and being selected to serve on a trial continues to fall below the 30% measure and does not meet the goal. We have seen the number of jurors questioned/used at Voir Dire has increase over 2020. The percentage of Jurors used in Voir Dire continues to fall significantly below the 80% measure and does not meet the goal. We doubled our No Trial Start Days over 2020 and away from the desired measure. However, it is still much improved over 2019. No Trial Start Days in 2020 was 10.53% and 2019 was 32.2%.

### **Section 5: Cost Effectiveness**

### Reports/Statistics:

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

Primary Analysis		Report/Location			
Total Expenses	\$114,846.98	/ Jury Expense Summary "Total (\$)"			
Trial Days	148	=			
Trial Days	\$775.99	(total expenses / # trial days = cost per trial day)			
Secondary Analysis (optional)					
All Associated Costs <sup>4</sup>	\$190,989.08	1			
# of Questionnaires Sent	13792	=			
Administrative Cost/Juror	\$13.85	(all costs / total # questionnaires sent = administrative cost per juror)			
4 ^ : - t - d t - :		alua asladas, adatas			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 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: \$34.99; Juror Meals: \$5,514.79; Juror Parking: \$217.55; Juror Per Diem: \$39,384; Juror Travel: \$40,809.79; Jury Attendants: \$20,216.34; Jury Coordinator Salary (with Benefits): \$72,151.92; Other: \$627.29; Postage: \$9,145.24; Printing: \$2,887.17.

# Addendum: Inclusiveness & Representativeness

Inclusiveness	Census Year	Jury Year Master List	Inclusiveness	
Persons 18+ Years Old	151411	137894	91.07%	(Measures => 85%)

<b>Absolute Disparit</b>	у		Census Year	Jury Yea	ar Master List	<b>Absolute Disparity</b>
Race		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage
	Black/African-Amer	16271	10.75%	12699	9.21%	-1.54%
	Amer Indian / Alaska Native	663	0.44%	312	0.23%	-0.21%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	2138	1.41%	1595	1.16%	-0.26%
	White / Caucasian	115397	76.21%	106749	77.41%	1.20%
	Hispanic <sup>1</sup>	16942	11.19%	9880	7.16%	-4.02%
	Other <sup>2</sup>	0	0.00%	6659	4.83%	4.83%
	Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
		151411		137894		

Comparative Disparity	(	Census Year		ar Master List	Comparative Disparity	
Race	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percentage	
Black/African-Amer	16271	10.75%	12699	9.21%	-14.30%	
Amer Indian / Alaska Native	663	0.44%	312	0.23%	-48.33%	
Asian / Pacific Islander	2138	1.41%	1595	1.16%	-18.08%	
White / Caucasian	115397	76.21%	106749	77.41%	1.57%	
Hispanic <sup>1</sup>	16942	11.19%	9880	7.16%	-35.97%	
Other <sup>2</sup>	0	0.00%	6659	4.83%	0.00%	
Unknown	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	
	151411		137894			

#### Notes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Page 6 of Guide for discussion on counting Hispanic names

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