

spectrum ranging from initial summoning to final dismissal after verdict. Contemporaneously, prescriptive packages will be developed to describe practices that have proven to be highly effective in states that have already undertaken jury trial renovations.

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.

Measurable results of the program are expected to 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 better trained judiciary. There will also be more instances of juries being representative of the community in terms of age, education, occupation, and profession. 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 in jury verdicts and the courts.

Court Review readers are urged to take every opportunity to spread word of the program to bar and community leaders. Moral and financial support for the program is needed. For more information, please contact Tom Munsterman [National Center for State Courts’ Center for Jury Studies] at tmunsterman@ncsc.dni.us or Ms. Priscilla Skillman [Council for Court Excellence] at skillman@courtexcellence.com.



ONLINE JURY NEWSLETTER

The National Center for State Courts publishes a free weekly online newsletter called “Jur-E Bulletin.” To subscribe, go to www.ncsconline.org and select “newsletters.”



The Resource Page



ALCOHOL IGNITION INTERLOCKS & OTHER IMPAIRED DRIVING RESOURCES

In his article in this issue, Judge Andy Fulkerson provides a useful overview of the use of ignition interlock devices that can keep alcohol-impaired drivers from operating their vehicles (*see* page 18). For those who would like additional information, here are some other resources specifically on ignition interlocks and more generally on impaired driving:

DOUGLAS J. BEIRNESS & HERB M. SIMPSON, ALCOHOL INTERLOCKS AS A CONDITION OF LICENCE REINSTATEMENT. Traffic Injury Research Foundation, 2003 (available free on the web). 51 pp. Available at http://trafficingjuryresearch.com/publications/pub_details.cfm?intPubID=176.

The Traffic Injury Research Foundation is an independent, charitable road safety institute in Canada (thus the spelling of “licence” in the publication title). This report arose out of an international symposium on interlock devices held in Toronto in 2001. The symposium included attendees from Canada, the United States, Europe, and Australia. This report reviews research on alcohol interlock programs and common features of these programs. While the Toronto conference and the report were funded at least in part by an interlock manufacturer, the materials include a wealth of research data and a summary of current practice in this area.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS, KNOWLEDGE & INFORMATION SERVICE, IMPAIRED DRIVING: DRUGS & ALCOHOL: RESOURCE GUIDE. National Center for State Courts, 2003. 7 pp. with links to additional materials. Available at http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_ImpDriGuide.pdf.

For a judge newly assigned to a docket that includes impaired drivers—or an experienced judge looking for greater understanding of the problem and potential solutions—this is an excellent starting point. As a web-based resource guide, it contains links to more than 25 resources available on the web, including both specific publications and other useful websites. It also lists many other publications that are available through the National Center for State Courts. The guide ends with a request form that can be used to order a copy of any of the listed resources that are not available on the web.



NATIONAL JURY REFORM PROJECT LAUNCHED

Whether it is an accounting fraud prosecution in New York or a mental retardation determination in a capital murder case in Richmond, the American jury is repeatedly being called upon to render verdicts in weighty and complex matters. Unfortunately, it is common for jurors across the country 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 are customarily discouraged in most courtrooms.

In addition, there is the recurring diminishment of governmental funding for trial courts and widespread citizen reluctance to respond to summonses for jury duty. Is it any wonder that citizens are dodging jury service in record numbers?

It should be good news to readers that court leaders are taking steps to perform at a higher level with respect to jurors. Indeed a **National Program to Increase Citizen Participation in Jury Service**

Through Jury Innovations is being launched. The program builds on momentum from the first-ever National Jury Summit in 2001, led by Chief Judge Judith Kaye of the New York Unified Court System and the National Center for State Courts.

The purpose of the jury summit was to bring together representatives from across the nation to examine the state of America’s jury system, share innovative practices, and plan for continued improvement. Over 400 persons from 45 states attended, including state and federal judges from the trial and appellate benches, court administrators, clerks, attorneys, representatives from community-based organizations, and even jurors. The legacy of the jury summit is to encourage other states to follow suit and expand efforts to improve the jury system nationwide. The results have been encouraging—states like Kentucky, Georgia, and Nevada have begun measurable steps forward.

Following basic themes of the jury summit, this new program will center on citizen outreach and improving the conditions of jury service. The program will provide courts with methods to improve citizen attitudes toward jury service. It will also provide technical assistance to help jurisdictions make the jury trial itself a more information-centered endeavor.

The National Center for State Courts will lead these efforts through its Center for Jury Studies. It will be joined by other jury leadership organizations, including the Council for Court Excellence (Washington, D.C.) and the Maricopa County Trial Court Leadership Center (Phoenix).

The program will undertake a sequence of tasks. First, it will systematically develop a compendium of current state jury management practices known as the “State of the States.” This will establish the baseline measure of the statutes, rules, and customs that define jury systems across the country. The State of the States documentation will span an operational

Continued on page 39