Recently the United States Supreme Court has instructed us that any contested fact, other than a prior conviction, that increases the penalty for a crime must be determined by a jury. In addition, the highest court for the Commonwealth of Virginia has determined that, in capital cases, a claimed defense of mental retardation raises a jury question. Whether it is a case prompted by these high court rulings, one of the many accounting fraud prosecutions in New York, or scientific evidence presented in a products liability action in the Midwest, the American jury is repeatedly being called upon to make findings in new and complex matters. Unfortunately it is common for jurors to perform these weighty tasks in unfit conditions and without the learning tools that we take for granted in school. While computers and interactive technology are becoming commonplace in our classrooms, juror note-taking and questioning of expert witnesses have customarily been discouraged in courtrooms.

Moreover, despite the wellspring of pride in our democratic ideals after September 11, 2001, corrosive myths and misgivings about the jury trial still abound. In this regard we need only reflect upon several notorious jury verdicts in the 1990s. Laymen and litigators, who fix upon those cases, think juries too often get it wrong. In addition, there is the recently recurring diminishment of governmental funding for trial courts and widespread citizen reluctance to respond to summonses for jury duty. For example, in many large, urban court systems, the response rate to jury summoning is about 20%. Is it any wonder that citizens are dodging jury service in record numbers?

There is good news, though. A growing number of courts are taking steps to perform at a higher level with respect to jury trials. As shown below, a movement started in Arizona has taken hold in a growing number of states. Creative court administrators, courageous judges, and inspired bar leaders are joining together to bring our cherished institution of trial by jury into the 21st century. Articles included in this issue of Court Review show how members of the legal academy are testing and demonstrating the dynamics of jury trial innovations that are founded on principles long recognized by the social sciences and business communities. Indeed, as described in this article, there now exists a National Program to Increase Citizen Participation in Jury Service Through Jury Innovations. Before long, there will be an encyclopedic collection of uniform data called the “State of the States” that will tell us how every state operates each aspect of its jury trial systems. Importantly, the State of the States will provide court leaders with information about how to contact persons in other parts of the country who have undertaken and implemented successful jury trial innovations.

THE RECENT HISTORY OF JURY TRIAL INNOVATION EFFORTS

On September 6, 1999, the Columbus Dispatch reported on an alarming occurrence in Ohio. The column asked the pointed question, “What is being done to get a prospective juror to respond affirmatively to a summons?” While most people may believe this to be a non-issue, the article went on to detail the story of Lucinda Whiting, whose arson case could not begin for one simple reason: only 11 jurors could be found to sit for her case after the conclusion of voir dire. The quoted words of the judge to the jurors who arrived in the courtroom were: “This is important, and maybe it’s because some of your fellow citizens did not recognize how important this was that you and I spent the day here and accomplished nothing.”

The reported example raises the issue: how do we ensure that jurors report for service? For many states, a solution has been to look toward innovations in their jury systems to make the process work more effectively, efficiently, and conveniently for citizens and legal professionals alike. These efforts have been multifaceted, ranging from reforms that seek to increase juror comprehension of evidence and testimony to those that provide greater compensation for service.

Serious discussions about jury trial innovation got underway in the early 1990s with the 1992 publication of Charting a Future for the Civil Jury System by the Brookings Institution. This paper reported the results of a symposium held in Charlottesville, Virginia, in the same year. The three-day conference, organized by Brookings and the Section of Litigation of the American Bar Association, “developed recommendations to improve civil jury procedures based both on their unique perspectives and on the findings of commissioned papers that were presented at the conference.” The gathering marked what some have considered the birth of organized jury trial innovations. Because such endeavors in innovation ultimately reside in the hands of affected jurisdictions, we must look at the innovative practices within the states. To this end, eyes must first turn to Arizona.

The Arizona Supreme Court Committee on More Effective Use of Juries began working on its system in 1993. The committee, chaired by Judge B. Michael Dann, advocated changing procedures to make the trial an educational process for jurors...
and to give jurors a more active voice in the proceedings. The Arizona Supreme Court eventually approved numerous reforms, including granting jurors in civil trials the opportunity to discuss evidence among themselves before final deliberations. This was an effort to improve comprehension, especially in complex proceedings. Arizona was the first state in the country to adopt this and many other juror-empowering policies.

Arizona continued to demonstrate leadership on jury trial issues throughout the 1990s. Many of those efforts have been studied and reported in professional publications. The banner issues raised in Arizona include improvements in judicial communications with jurors during trial, jury note taking, juror questions to witnesses, and increasing responsiveness to the needs of deliberating juries. What followed was a multitude of similar efforts across the country.

To date, research indicates that 30 states have undertaken formal steps to analyze their jury trial systems and establish some innovations. These efforts have included state-organized commissions, jury innovation conferences, and written reports and studies. In general, most states’ efforts follow a “top-down” format. In these instances, the judiciary creates a statewide initiative dedicated to jury innovation efforts. The initiative often produces recommendations leading to varying degrees of implementation, as state rules and procedures are altered accordingly. However, there have also been “bottom-up” jury innovation efforts. “Bottom-up” innovation can be considered more of a grassroots movement, in which some trial judges introduce innovative procedures in their own courtrooms, without instruction or recommendation from a central hub. Although rarer, “bottom-up” innovation efforts put new programs into practice more immediately. Not surprisingly, they can have narrower impact and be more difficult to study.

One noteworthy way some states have generated improvements is the use of pilot programs. Under this methodology, a statewide commission commonly enlists the support of volunteer judges to test certain practices in their courtrooms. The judges report back to the commission about the effectiveness of the innovations before they are instituted on a statewide basis. In other words, this is a combination of the “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches. The states that have followed this procedure have been able to obtain very useful information about the effect of jury innovations. For a taste of these benefits, we look to Massachusetts, Colorado, New Jersey, Hawaii, and the Columbus Dispatch’s home state of Ohio.

In November 1997, Massachusetts hosted a conference on jury trial innovations, during which judges from the trial courts met to hear presentations on jury innovations. The two-day conference led to 16 judges’ participation in a two-year demonstration study, during which they introduced the reforms discussed at the conference into their own courtrooms. It is important to note that this effort was not organized by the state administration—it was a grassroots reform effort that brought together likeminded individuals concerned with reforming the jury system. Sixteen innovations were tested, including juror note-taking, juror questions to witnesses, “plain English” jury instructions, pre-instructing the jury on the law, post-verdict meetings between jurors and the judge, and others. Judges and jurors were both asked to give their opinions of these reforms. Questionnaires were collected from judges and jurors in 150 cases, 66% of which came from criminal trials. Responses were received from 1,264 jurors.

These innovations were tested with varying frequency. For example, juror note-taking was tested in 95% of the trials in which surveys were returned, whereas permitting jurors to submit questions to witnesses was tested in 41% of the cases. Judges overwhelmingly recommended certain innovations, including note-taking, pre-instruction on the law, and post-verdict meetings between judges and jurors. With respect to imposing time limits on parties’ time at trial and providing written copies of instructions to the jury, there was little negative feedback about the effectiveness of these methods in improving the jury process. Some judges recommended every innovation that they tested. One commented that “[a]ll of the practices used in the project seem to involve the jury more actively in the learning process necessary to a rational decision. Jurors in my experience have reacted very favorably to the practices. I have found virtually no drawbacks in or contradictions to using these practices.”

Since the completion of the Massachusetts pilot project,

7. Id.
8. Id.
innovative procedures have been fine-tuned by way of bar CLE programs and judicial conferences.

While programs in Massachusetts may have gone largely unnoticed by the national media, it has been hard to miss the attention given to Colorado’s jury reform projects due to the trial of a certain basketball superstar. The Kobe Bryant sexual assault case drew attention to the new criminal trial procedure in Colorado that enables jurors to ask witnesses written questions. “When Kobe Bryant goes on trial later this year,” according to an Associated Press story, “jurors will be allowed to submit questions for witnesses in the sexual assault case in what is believed to be the first rule of its kind.” Though the national media has focused on juror questions to witnesses, it is simply one reform that has resulted from Colorado’s innovation efforts.

The reform effort resulting in juror questions at criminal trials was the result of a long history of jury reform recommendations in Colorado, beginning with the adoption of reforms suggested in the February 1997 report, “With Respect to the Jury: A Proposal for Jury Reform.” After the Colorado Supreme Court “adopted in principle the recommendations” contained in this report, the chief justice “appointed a Jury Reform Implementation Committee . . . and charged that committee with developing specific proposals to implement the various recommendations in this Report, and reporting back to the Court.” In 1998, the Committee reported back, subdividing their recommendations into seven areas relevant to different areas of possible improvements, including reworking Colorado’s jury instructions, statutory revisions to clarify rules and procedures, and administrative changes such as public education, revision of the master juror list, addressing the need for juror debriefing, and standards for excusing jurors. Additionally, they recommended commencement of pilot programs to test the success of various innovations, specifically relating to pre-deliberation discussion among jurors in civil cases, and the now famous reform regarding juror questions in criminal cases.

The juror questions pilot program was the first to be completed, resulting in the 61-page “Dodge Report” in Fall 2002. The report conveyed results and recommendations relating to “the presence or absence of allowing jurors to submit questions . . . randomly assigned to 239 District and County Court criminal trials.” The study began in September 2000 when Chief Justice Mary Mullarkey “authorized a statewide pilot study to evaluate the effects of permitting jurors to submit written questions during criminal trials.” The study obtained feedback from judges, attorneys, and jurors by means of post-trial questionnaires. Juror questions were permitted in 118 trials, while not permitted in 121. Surveys were collected from both samplings. The resulting data included the reasons jurors asked questions and assessments by judges and attorneys about the quality of the juror questions. Findings were overwhelmingly in favor of the innovation, with 93% of the jurors surveyed reporting that it should be allowed in future trials.

Ultimately, the report supported questioning with judicial supervision, stating that it “will have positive effects with few detrimental results.”

Similarly, New Jersey has focused its efforts on juror inquiries to witnesses. But unlike Colorado, their emphasis has been on juror questions in civil trials. In 1998, a pilot program to investigate this innovation in civil trials was approved by the New Jersey Supreme Court, though it did not begin until nearly two years later. From January 2000 through June 2000, 11 judges were commissioned to allow jurors to pose written questions to witnesses. The effort was chaired by Judge Barbara Byrd Wecker. It covered 147 civil trials, from which surveys were obtained from attorneys, judges, and jurors. New Jersey based parts of their effort on the Massachusetts program, using it to build their own testing ground for the use of juror questions in civil cases. As with the Massachusetts study, the results showed that “it was apparent that jurors and judges were reacting very favorably, whereas attorney reaction was mixed . . . . [T]he jurors virtually all loved it . . . [T]he judges . . . were very pleased . . . [and] the attorneys’ responses were measured.” The pilot recommended that the state adapt their rules to allow juror questions accordingly.

Following the completion of this pilot, the New Jersey Supreme Court approved the pilot's recommended changes, and the revisions went into effect on September 3, 2002. In addition to adopting these rules, the Conference of Civil Presiding Judges initiated a follow-up project to focus on the specific procedures that judges may use when allowing jurors to ask questions. Chaired by Judge Maurice Gallipoli, the goal of this ongoing project is to perfect the process of question asking. The areas of inquiry include whether judges modify questions, whether attorney ask follow-up questions of witnesses, and how much additional trial time is required for the allowance of questions. The inquiry period lasted six months and involved surveys of both judges and jurors. “The jury is still out” regarding the results of this study. The findings of the project are expected to be completed in the fall of 2004.

Though Colorado and New Jersey have focused largely on the field of juror questions, Hawaii has taken the idea of pilot programs further. On June 22, 1993, the Hawaii Supreme Court established their Committee on Jury Innovations for
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the 21st Century with the mission to “study and obtain information about jury trial innovations considered or adopted by other states.”16 At its first meeting, the group decided that a pilot program, to involve five circuit court judges (the number was later increased to six), would be beneficial in testing the effectiveness of innovations in the civil and criminal courts. The Hawaii Supreme Court authorized this pilot program upon request of the committee and set the window of its activity to be July 1, 1998 through October 15, 1999. In the course of this 15-month period, “judges participating in the pilot project . . . conducted seventy-seven criminal trials and ten civil trials.” A key clause in the Hawaii Supreme Court order gave the six judges involved discretionary power over the innovations that they tested in the courtroom, thus leaving the ultimate responsibility for the test in the hands of six individuals.

These six judges ended up testing ten different innovations, including allowing jurors to take notes, juror questions to witnesses in civil and criminal trials, jury instructions prior to closing arguments, and others. Courts that took part in the study responded to surveys regarding their experiences, resulting in 1,063 responses in criminal cases and 136 in civil cases. The responses largely supported innovative procedures. For example, 88% of attorneys in civil trials and 90% of attorneys in criminal trials stated that none of the innovations negatively impacted the trial. In addition, they found “statistically significant evidence supporting the proposed advantages of both juror note-taking and question asking . . . both innovations were found to be supported by jurors, whether they used the opportunities afforded them or not.”17 In the end, all but one of these innovations was recommended by the committee.18 The singular exception concerned pre-deliberation juror discussion of evidence in civil trials. As a result of this report, the Hawaii Supreme Court issued an order, effective July 1, 2000, that altered the court rules related to jury innovations, making virtually all of the changes recommended by the committee’s report.19

It would be mere speculation to state the Hawaii changes may have impacted the previously mentioned case of Lucinda Whiting had it occurred in the Aloha State. Rather, the question becomes, what did Ohio do to correct the problems illustrated by the Columbus Dispatch? In July 2002, Chief Justice Thomas Moyer appointed a jury task force to study the jury system in Ohio and to recommend relevant innovations. The group was independent from the Supreme Court. The task force split itself into two subcommittees, with one focusing on

trial practice and the other on jury administration. While the jury administration subcommittee focused in on survey results on jury administration and previous research, the trial practice committee “used initial surveys to determine what practices are currently in use in Ohio courts and subsequently engaged volunteer judges to participate in pilot projects testing innovative courtroom practices to enhance jurors’ understanding of cases and their satisfaction with service.”20

The pilot projects began in April 2003 and were modeled on the Massachusetts pilot. The pilots were conducted until mid-November 2003. Judges from across the state volunteered to take part in the project. Up to 13 innovations were tested at the discretion of participating judges. Again, like Massachusetts, judges, attorneys, and jurors completed surveys to measure the usefulness of the innovations, resulting in “a total of 1,855 questionnaires . . . completed and analyzed, including 146 judicial questionnaires, 289 attorney questionnaires and 1,420 juror questionnaires.” The analysis, performed by Dr. James Frank of the University of Cincinnati, showed that each innovation tested “was well received by jurors, judges and, to a slightly lesser extent, attorneys.” The conclusion of the report summarized the findings, stating “judges, attorneys and jurors were generally supportive of the courtroom activities . . . ." [T]his support manifested itself in survey responses . . . [O]verall, the innovations examined appear to be helpful to the proceedings and the majority of courtroom participants have responded positively to the processes in general.”21 The report was released in February 2004.

While the foregoing pilot programs have given some vital information as to the successes of innovative efforts, it is once again important to note that these programs are not the only innovation efforts that have occurred in the United States. New York, for example, has done extensive work on jury reform, though not relying exclusively on pilot programs. A standing Commission on the Jury has held public hearings throughout the state in order to obtain wide citizen input on the present and prospective conditions of the jury trial in the Empire State. Through the efforts of that standing commission, there were new recommendations issued and changes enacted with respect to jury trials as recently as June 17, 2004.22 New York also keeps detailed information on their jury selection processes which provides an invaluable data base regarding the efficiency of the court regarding juries.

In contrast, the initiative for jury innovations in Washington, D.C. began in the private sector. There, a non-
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A national project to increase use of effective jury reform methods and to improve the conditions of jury service has begun. It is a joint project of the National Center for State Courts’ Center for Jury Studies, the Council for Court Excellence (Washington, D.C.), and the Trial Court Leadership Center of Maricopa County (Phoenix, Ariz.).

The project—officially the “National Program to Increase Citizen Participation in Jury Service Through Jury Innovations”—seeks to increase citizen awareness of positive aspects of jury service and to improve conditions of jury service. The project will deliver tools and technical assistance needed by judges, attorneys, and court administrators to meet these objectives.

Major projects planned are (1) providing technical assistance to state and local courts to implement innovative jury practices, (2) compiling a “State of the States” database of jury practices throughout the United States, and (3) providing a series of “prescriptive packages” to improve response to jury summonses, comprehension of jury instructions, and effective jury management in urban courts.

A descriptive brochure summarizing the plans of the National Program to Increase Citizen Participation in Jury Service Through Jury Innovations can be found at http://www.ncsconline.org/juries/04-050046%20Jury%20Trends-Flyer.pdf. For more information about the program, contact Tom Munsterman, Director of the National Center’s Center for Jury Studies, by phone (703-841-5620) or by e-mail (tmunsterman@ncsc.dni.us).
through the National Center, the National Judicial College, and state judicial education programs.

To begin implementation, a “to-be-determined” number of courts will be selected. The chief justice and state court administrator will be approached and involved to the fullest extent in each case. When the court selections are made, program staff will work directly with the courts to establish an individualized plan of action from a full menu of jury innovations. Depending on what stage a selected jurisdiction is at in the process of jury system renovation, the technical assistance will follow one of several established paths described below.

For a jurisdiction just getting started, the Program would suggest that the state supreme court appoint a broad based committee to examine many aspects of the state jury system. This committee or task force would report back to the court with recommendations. The National Center staff would guide and assist all along the way.

If a state has already begun a renewal effort that has stalled, the Program staff will help the state re-ignite its innovation actions. In states where reform implementation is discretionary with individual trial judges, the Program will offer a replication of the successful approach undertaken in Massachusetts.

Clearly, the National Program will create crucial benefits for state courts. Measurable results include: the increased use of innovative practices by judges, reduced burden upon jurors and employers, reduced citizen non-response to summonses, a greater proportion of our population actually serving on juries, less juror waiting time in court, fewer questions asked by deliberating juries, and a more well-trained judiciary. Across our land we should see more efficient and cost-effective jury systems. Trial jurors will be better informed. In other words, juror decision-making and satisfaction will be enhanced. Importantly, there should be greater public trust and confidence in jury verdicts and the courts.
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