JURY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
JURY DATA REPORT MANUAL
VERSION 1.5 – 9/17/2025

Section 1. Introduction

Overview

The Jury Improvement Program (JIP) was created in 1995 and is charged by the Judicial Council of California (JCC) with undertake improvements to all aspects of the jury system. These include efficient jury operations, trial and case management support, cost-effective improvements to jury service, best practices for jury administration and management, care and treatment of jurors, citizen expectations about jury service, as well as juror comprehension and education.

What is the Jury Data Report?

The annual Jury Data Report (JDR) is a voluntary data collection effort between the JCC and California's 58 trial courts. Collection of aggregate data first began in calendar year (CY) 2004. Individualized reports were compiled beginning in CY 2007 and fiscal year (FY) reports were compiled starting in FY 2008-2009. Throughout this period of time and into the present, the JDR has grown and changed significantly. This report was first designed as an efficiency measure of jury operations and now encompasses a number of other areas. These include tracking court workloads, consequences for jurors who fail to appear, as well as the costs of modern jury administration and management. The purpose of the JDR is to improve jury operations statewide using data-driven decision-making and evidence-based best practices. This includes tracking impacts that may occur from new legislation, modifications to the California Rules of Court (Rules), as well as changes to JCC or court-specific policies and procedures.

Manual Purpose and Organization

This manual serves to assist courts in tabulating their jury data in order to ensure their report is complete, accurate, formatted correctly, and utilizes modern statistical analysis. The report is constructed using key performance indicators (KPI) identified by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) on their CourTools Measure 8. These include juror yield, juror utilization, and

juror postponement ratio, as well as various criteria that are required to calculate these measurements and jury metrics specific to the State of California. The data points contained within the JDR correspond to actual questions from the survey version. Many of the questions are subsets of a larger question category and ideally their totals should match, except in limited circumstances.

This manual will exhibit the jury data elements, their meaning as used in the JDR, their meaning in CourTools Measure 8, as well as their reporting relationships. It will also include hypothetical situations for each element to assist in understanding how data should be processed and tips for navigating areas of uncertainty. This will ensure that all courts, regardless of their Jury Management System (JMS), can rely upon this manual as a resource for reporting standards.

If you have questions or concerns, you may contact the Jury Improvement Program at JuryInfo@jud.ca.gov. This manual was last updated September, 17, 2025.

Section 2. Performing Calculations

Overview

The JDR's questions are designed to be an efficiency measurement that allows the judicial branch to calculate your court's jury yield and utilization percentages, as well as your court's postponement ratio. It also provides useful workload data on changes to jury administration and management, from personnel changes and trial court comments, to outliers in jury operations within a given fiscal year (FY). Lastly, it provides necessary data to allow the branch to estimate jury department costs as well as perform cost projections based on hypothetical scenarios.

General Information

This section is to ensure the JIP can contact courts when necessary as well as maintain updated information regarding their JMS.

Juror Yield and Summonsing

This section collects data on juror yield and summonsing, as well as their related issues. Juror yield is the number of individuals selected for jury service who are qualified and available to serve, expressed as a percentage of the total number of prospective jurors summoned. Summonsing is the process by which prospective jurors are called for jury service. A failure-to-appear (FTA) occurs when a prospective juror summoned for jury service fails to appear on the date they were summoned for and can result in various consequences or follow-up efforts by the court. Juror summonsing, selection, operations, administration, and management are, in general, governed by the Trial Jury Selection and Management, specifically covering California (Cal.) Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) Sections 190 through 259. FTA's are governed by the authority of Cal. CCP Sections 196(c) and 209.

Question 3 should reflect the total number of summonses the court sent for the given reporting period's FY. This includes first, second, and any subsequent summonses. For instance, if you sent 200 summonses, but 30 of those were second or subsequent summonses, then the total number of first summonses is 170 and second or subsequent summonses is 20. Notably, this means the actual number of people summoned will always be the total of first summonses, which is 170 in the above example.

Questions 4 tracks the number of undeliverable summonses. This metric helps courts determine whether source lists are providing accurate contact information for jury pools.

Question 5 tracks the number of individuals who postponed their jury service into the relevant FY reporting period. It is the first of two necessary components in determining a court's overall juror postponement ratio. (This will be further discussed below.)

Question 6 tracks the total of FTAs, specifically meaning those who failed to appear after a first, second, or subsequent summons. An "appearance" means a prospective juror obtained an excusal, a disqualification, or completed their service in person, on call, or telephone standby. As such, an FTA is when a prospective juror has not done any of those and, more specifically, when a prospective juror has failed to respond in any way to a summons. The number of FTAs from fiscal year to fiscal year can help courts determine whether they should consider implementing an FTA program or if their existing FTA program is not being successful.

Question 6a asks if courts conduct follow-up with FTAs. 6b specifically asks courts to select the ways in which they do so: a subsequent notice, an order to show cause, contempt, sanctions, and/or any other action. Question 6c asks about the dollar amount in fines from sanctions or contempt that courts may apply to an FTA that required follow-up under those models.

Example issues:

- Initial summons results in an FTA, but a subsequent summons gets a response and they are released after one day on call. How is this counted? They should be counted as an FTA and their ultimate service disposition coded under question 13b.
- Initial summons results in an undeliverable, but the address is corrected, and a subsequent summons gets a response; they serve in person but are never assigned to a panel. How is this counted? They should be counted as an undeliverable and their ultimately service disposition coded under question 13a.
- Initial summons results in a postponement to another date within the same reporting period. How is this counted? They should not be counted as a postponement and their ultimate service disposition coded as if their service date was always the later date.
- Initial summons results in an FTA prior the reporting period, but a subsequent summons gets a response within the reporting period. How is this counted? The initial summons remains coded as an FTA for the prior reporting period, but their ultimate service disposition is still coded accordingly for the current reporting period.
- Initial summons results in an FTA and a second summons is undeliverable. How is this counted? The initial summons may remain coded as an FTA or disregarded in favor of

coding the second summons as undeliverable. Both options preserve the integrity of calculating juror yield. The true issue is whether coding an FTA will result in undue penalties to the prospective juror. If so, best practice is to give the prospective juror the benefit of the doubt and the original FTA was due to a mailing issue, such as a recent change of address, that was revealed by the undeliverable.

- Initial summons results in postponement request for a date within the relevant reporting period but are not actually re-summoned to appear on that date. How is this counted? The initial summons and postponement should be coded accordingly, even though the prospective juror is never re-summoned. The integrity of calculating juror yield remains preserved.

Excusals

This section collects data on juror excusals, specifically those allowed by the Rules 2.1008 and 2.1009, as provided under the authority of the Cal. CCP Sections 204 and 218. As stated in paragraph (b) of Section 204, "[a]n eligible person may be excused from jury service only for undue hardship, upon themselves or upon the public, as defined by the Judicial Council." In Section 218, it states that, "The jury commissioner shall hear the excuses of jurors summoned, in accordance with the standards prescribed by the Judicial Council. It shall be left to the discretion of the jury commissioner to accept an excuse under subdivision (b) of Section 204 without a personal appearance. All excuses shall be in writing setting forth the basis of the request and shall be signed by the juror." Excusals are a component in determining juror yield and these metrics help court determine what are the primary drivers of individuals being unable to participate in jury service as a component of their overall juror yield.

Question 7 covers the total number of excusals from jury service due to an undue hardship. This total number should be reflected as a portion of the total number of prospective jurors summoned during a given reporting period. Further, the individual totals for questions 7a through 7f should be equal to the grand total of question 7.

Question 7a covers the number of individuals excused from jury service for possessing a physical or mental disability or impairment as described in Rule 2.1008(d)(5) and/or a permanent medical excusal from jury service under Rule 2.1009. This must be true only so long as the disability and/or impairment does not affect that person's competence to act as a juror but would expose the potential juror to undue risk of mental or physical harm. In any individual case, for temporary medical excusals, unless the person is aged 70 years or older, the prospective juror may be required to furnish verification or a method of verification of the disability or impairment, its probable duration, and the particular reasons for the person's inability to serve as a juror. For permanent medical excusals, regardless of age, the prospective must furnish the supporting documentation as required by the rule, which also requires compliance with a number of procedures in evaluating and processing all such requests. Notably, permanent medical excusals are not meant to be coded for temporary impairments and/or disabilities, nor are they meant to be used for any excusals based solely on advanced age.

Question 7b covers the number of individuals excused from jury service for possessing an extreme financial burden as described by Rule 2.1008(d)(3). When considering this excuse, the court must review:

1. The sources of the prospective juror's household income;
2. The availability and extent of income reimbursement;
3. The expected length of service; and
4. Whether service can reasonably be expected to compromise the prospective juror's ability to support himself or herself or his or her dependents, or so disrupt the economic stability of any individual as to be against the interests of justice.

It may be useful to also establish an income chart for reference when processing such excusals, such as in the below example:

Income Chart

The chart is based on 2023 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Guidelines. Household/family size of 1 includes yourself. Household/family sizes of 2 or more include yourself and all other family/household members. Income represents gross annual income. For certain regions, staff should consider increasing the income threshold based on a Cost-of-Living Index (COLI) and/or Consumer Price Index (CPI) to accurately reflect income inequalities where the prospective juror lives that is within the area of the court's jurisdiction.

Household/Family Size	Gross Annual Income
1	$14,580
2	$19,720
3	$24,860
4	$30,000
5	$35,140
6	$40,280
7	$45,420
8	$50,560

For household/family sizes greater than 8, add $5,140 for each person. This threshold may increase depending on the COLI and CPI of the given area of the court's jurisdiction where the prospective juror lives.

Question 7c covers the number of individuals excused from jury service due to an obligation to provide care to another as described in Rule 2.1008(d)(7). This includes sick, aged, or infirm dependents, or a child who requires the prospective juror's personal care and attention, and no comparable substitute care is either available or practical without imposing an undue economic hardship on the prospective juror or person cared for. If the request to be excused is based on care provided to a sick, disabled, or infirm person, the prospective juror may be required to furnish verification or a method of verification that the person being cared for is in need of regular and personal care.

Question 7d covers the number of individuals excused from jury service for possession no reasonably available means of transportation as described by Rule 2.1008(d)(1); and the number of individuals excused from jury service for needing to travel an excessive distance as described by Rule 2.1008(d)(2). Unless otherwise established by statute or local rule, an excessive distance is reasonable travel time that exceeds one-and-one-half hours from the prospective juror's home to the court.

Question 7e covers the number of individuals excused from jury service for prior grand or trial jury service within the previous 12 months as described in Rule 2.1008(e). This includes any state or federal court, as well as those who were only summoned and appeared for service but were ultimately not needed. Notably, a court may establish a longer period of repose at their discretion.

Question 7f covers the number of individuals excused from jury service for any other reason. This includes undue risk of material injury to or destruction of property under Rule 2.1008(d)(4) and for services immediately needed for the protection of public health and safety under Rule 2.1008(d)(6). While technically there are no other reasons for excusal covered under statute or rule of court, courts have historically offered a limited number of other types of excusals that fall outside those listed above. If your court provides these accommodations, the number of individuals excused from jury service should be captured in this category as well.

For the number of individuals excused from jury service for possessing an undue risk of material injury to or destruction of property as described in Rule 2.1008(d)(4). When considering this excuse, the court must review:

1. The nature of the property;
2. The source and duration of the risk;
3. The probability that the risk will be realized;
4. The reason alternative arrangements to protect the property cannot be made; and
5. Whether material injury to or destruction of the property will so disrupt the economic stability of any individual as to be against the interests of justice.

It may be useful to also incorporate an income chart similar to the one listed above.

For the number of individuals excused from jury service because their services are immediately needed for the protection of public health and safety as described in Rule 2.1008(d)(6). When reviewing this excusal, consideration should be given whether it is feasible to make alternative arrangements to relieve the person of those responsibilities during the period of service as a juror without substantially reducing essential public services.

Finally, question 8 asks courts to list who is in charge of deciding on requests for excusals *after* a prospective juror has appeared for service in person. This assumes that any previous excusal requests were reviewed and denied by court staff before the prospective juror arrived in person at the courthouse.

Example issues:

- A prospective juror is excused for an undue hardship by the judge after having been sent to the courtroom. Unless they are reassigned to a new courtroom, they should not be coded under any of the questions above and instead should be coded under question 14b.
- A prospective juror requests an excusal due to being 85 years old. There is no excusal for a solely age-based excuse. However, if the court historically grants such requests, then the individual would be coded under question 7f.
- A prospective juror requests an excusal due to an inability to afford daycare for their child. While the financial issue is the reason they are unable to make arrangements to complete their jury service, the underlying cause is the individual's need to provide care for a dependent coupled with their inability to afford comparable substitute care and should be coded under 7c.
- A prospective juror suffers from a medical condition that will not resolve for approximately two years. They should not be coded under a permanent medical excusal as the impairment and/or disability will eventually resolve. Instead, they should be coded under a temporary medical excusal until such time as they anticipate a complete recovery. However, both of these ultimately remain coded under question 7a.
- If you code prospective jurors with a medical excuse under several different codes based on age and other factors, those codes will need to be combined into a single variable to properly report the total needed for question 7a. Additionally, do not code an excusal under rule 2.1008(d)(5) for individuals over the age of 70 with a temporary medical issue as a "permanent illness" as this could be misunderstood to mean they have been permanently and/or improperly excused under rule 2.1009, particularly since both totals will be reported into the same overarching question category.
- A prospective juror submits a request to be excused for an extreme financial burden through the court's jury portal website. Their request is reviewed and denied by staff. When the prospective juror arrives in person at the assembly room to resubmit their request to be excused for an extreme financial burden, who decides whether to grant or deny their request? Is it by court staff at the assembly room? Then you would select that option. Or is the prospective juror instructed to wait to be assigned to a panel and a courtroom in order to then make their request before a judge? Then you would select that option. If both options are used at your court, then you would select both.

Disqualifications, Dismissals, Exemptions, & Postponements

This section collects data on juror disqualifications, dismissals, exemptions, and postponements. This data is covered Cal. CCP Section 203(a) and Cal. CCP Section 219(b), as well as by Rules 2.1004 and 2.1006, which are supported by the previous code sections as well as the authority of Cal. CCP Sections 210.5 and 219.5. These categories related to whether an individual is eligible and/or able to complete jury service for the time, date, and/or period they are summoned for. Disqualifications, dismissals, exemptions, and postponements are components of determining juror yield. Further, postponements, are also a component in determining the postponement ratio. These metrics help court determine what are the primary drivers of individuals being unable to participate in jury service as a component of their overall juror yield.

Question 9 covers the total number of disqualifications. This is separate from the total number of dismissals, exemptions, and postponements. The total number of disqualifications should be reflected as a portion of the total number of prospective jurors summoned during a given reporting period. Further, the individual totals for questions 9a through 9h should be equal to the grand total of question 9.

Question 9a covers the number of individuals disqualified for not being citizens of the United States of America, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(1).

Question 9b covers the number of individuals disqualified for not being at least 18 years of age, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(2).

Question 9c covers the number of individuals disqualified for not being a resident of the county whose jurisdiction they are summoned to serve in, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(4)

Question 9d covers the number of individuals disqualified for not being domiciliaries of the State of California, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(3).

Question 9e covers the number of individuals disqualified for insufficient knowledge of the English language, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(6). Please note: insufficient knowledge of the English language is distinct from possessing English as a second or subsequent language as well as distinct from not being as proficient in English as any native and/or non-native speaker.

Question 9f covers the number of individuals disqualified for conviction of malfeasance in office and whose civil rights have not been restored; for being on parole, postrelease community supervision, felony probation, or mandated supervision for conviction of a felony; for being incarcerated in any prison or jail; and disqualified for being required to register as a sex offender under PEN Section 290. These categories are described in Cal. CCP Sections 203(a)(5), (a)(9), (a)(10, and (a)(11).

Question 9g covers the number of individuals disqualified for being the subject of a conservatorship, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(8).

Question 9h covers the number of individuals disqualified for currently serving as a grand or trial juror in any court of the State of California, as described in Cal. CCP Section 203(a)(7).

Question 10 covers the total number of individuals exempt for being a peace officer as described in Cal. CCP Section 219(b)(1) and (b)(2). A list of the specific agencies that employ such peace officers can be found in the Sample Jury Services Policy on the Judicial Resource Network (JRN) at https://jrn.courts.ca.gov/programs/jury/documents/Sample_Jury_Services_Policy.pdf.

Question 11 covers the total number of individuals dismissed for being deceased, as implicitly required under the Trial Selection and Jury Management Act.

Question 12 covers the total number of individuals who postponed into the relevant FY reporting period. It is the second of two necessary components in determining a court's overall juror postponement ratio. The postponement ratio specifically shows whether courts are maintaining an adequate supply of prospective jurors within a given reporting period. If the ratio unbalanced in any substantial or significant way, that is an indication that the court is experiencing periods of not having sufficient numbers of prospective jurors and/or periods of having an overabundance of prospective jurors.

Example issues:

- A prospective juror is on currently on parole but will no longer be on parole by the date they are summoned for jury service. Therefore, the individual should not be coded under 9f and be allowed to serve pending confirmation that they are no longer on parole.
- A prospective juror is a peace officer for a University of California or California State University. Therefore, the individual should not be coded under question 10 unless they can only be assigned to a criminal case and not a civil case.
- A prospective juror recently served as a trial juror in a federal district court. They should be coded under question 9h.
- If you code a given prospective juror under several different disqualifications, such as noncitizen, nondomiciliary, nonresident, and non-English-speaking, you should code the prospective juror under the first code in the order of eligibility requirements in order to avoid counting a given prospective juror multiple times under each reporting category.

Jury Service Completion

This section collects data on jury service completion as part of calculating juror utilization, with specific emphasis on the manner in which they participated. Juror utilization is the number of jurors utilized in jury selection and who completed service, expressed as a percentage rate from three underlying components. Those components are sent to courtroom and utilized, sent to courtroom for selection, and completed in-person. These metrics help court determine what are the primary drivers in the utilization of prospective jurors who are qualified and available for service.

The manner in which members of the public complete jury service are governed primarily by the Trial Jury Selection and Management Act, as well as Rule 2.1002. There are three different ways for an individual to complete jury service: in-person, on call, and on telephone standby. In-person service includes those who are sent to a courtroom and those who are not. Conversely, on call and telephone standby often overlap in practice and perception.

Question 13 covers the total number of individuals who completed jury service, regardless of the manner in which they participated as described in Rule 2.1002(c). Further, the individual totals for questions 13a through 13b should be equal to the grand total of question 13.

Question 13a covers the number of individuals who completed jury service in-person by physically appearing at the courthouse, as described in Rule 2.1002(c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(3).

However, this now will also include those who appear via video teleconferencing technology, in keeping with improvements and changes to jury operations due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Question 13b covers the number of individuals who completed jury service on call or on telephone standby, as described in Rule 2.1002(c)(4) and (c)(5).

Question 14 covers the total number of individuals who completed jury service in-person and were sent to the courtroom for jury selection, as described in Rule 2.1002(c)(1) and (c)(2). Further, the individual totals for questions 14a through 14e should be equal to the grand total of question 14. This metric is fundamental in understanding the relationship between a court's effective utilization of its jurors as well as whether it is over-summonsing and/or creating overly large jury panels.

Question 14a covers the number of individuals who were released from service under a challenge for cause, as described in Cal. CCP Sections 222.5, 223, and 226.

Question 14b covers the number of individuals who were released for a hardship, as described in Cal. CCP Section 204, or by stipulation. These hardships should match with those allowed by California Rules of Court, rule 2.1008.

Question 14c covers the total number of individuals who were released upon the exercise of a peremptory challenge, as described by Cal. CCP Section 222.5, 223, 226, and 231. Further, the individual totals for questions 12ci through 12cii should be equal to the grand total of question 12c.

Question 14ci covers the number of individuals who were released upon the exercise of a defendant's peremptory challenge, as described by Cal. CCP Section 222.5, 223, 226, and 231.

Question 14cii covers the number of individuals who were released upon the exercise of a plaintiff's peremptory challenge, as described by Cal. CCP Section 222.5, 223, 226, and 231.

Question 14d covers the number of individuals not reached or needed during jury selection, as described by Rule 2.1002(c)(2). The larger the number of individuals in this category, the greater the waste in cost and prospective jurors by the court, which drives down their overall utilization.

Question 14e covers the total number of individuals who were sworn as jurors, including alternates, as described by Rule 2.1002(c)(1) and Cal. CCP Section 234.

Question 15 covers the total number of individuals sworn as jurors who completed their service by rendering a verdict in the trial/case they participated in. This metric helps courts determine whether their sworn jurors are rendering verdicts and at what rate compared to their total number of sworn jurors, which can provide insights on any deficiencies in educating jurors about the requirements and necessity of their service to avoid costly mistrials.

Example issues:

- An alternate juror served through the trial/case but were never needed to replace a seated sworn juror. Therefore, they should not be coded under question 15.
- A prospective juror was challenged for cause, but ultimately released by stipulation of the parties after considering a hardship raised during voir dire. Therefore, they should be coded under 14b.
- A prospective juror was challenged for cause and requested a hardship but were not released under either option. However, the prospective juror was later released by one of the parties under a peremptory challenge. Therefore, they should be coded under 14c and, if known, under 14ci or 14cii depending on the side exercising the peremptory challenge.
- A prospective juror was not questioned during jury selection or voir dire despite being assigned to multiple panels for different cases and ended their service in the assembly room at the conclusion of the court's usual business hours. Therefore, they should be coded under 14d.

One Day, One Trial Service Completion

This section collects data California's one day/one trial jury service model. This section is unique to our state as it measures the efficiency and effectiveness of the one day/one trial model, which is meant to reduce the burden imposed by jury service on members of the public. However, it also serves as a useful component of juror utilization because it seeks similar data to the above section, albeit only for those who completed their jury service in one day.

Question 16 covers the total number of prospective jurors who completed jury service in one day, as described in Rule 2.1002(c). The individual totals for questions 17 through 18 should be equal to the grand total of question 16.

Question 17 covers the total number of prospective jurors who completed jury service in one day in person (including via video teleconferencing technology), as described in Rule 2.1002(c)(1) through (c)(3), which correlates with A through C listed at the top of this section in the survey.

Question 18 covers the total number of prospective jurors who completed jury service in one day either on call or telephone standby, as described in Rule 2.1002(c)(4) through (c)(5), which correlates with D through E listed at the top of this section in the survey. It is important to note that telephone standby allows for serving up to no more than five court days. However, it is still considered part of the one day/one trial model and the total number of prospective jurors who completed their jury service in this manner should still be counted in this question.

Example issues:

- A prospective juror serves on call or telephone standby but is then required to arrive at the courthouse for assignment to a panel, only to be dismissed at the end of the day. Therefore, the individual should be coded under Question 17.
- A prospective juror serves on call or telephone standby but is then required to arrive at the courthouse for assignment to a panel and is dismissed after two days of jury selection,

including voir dire, but never reached for questioning. Therefore, the individual should be coded under Question 14d.

Juror Days

This section collects data on the number of juror days for those who completed their jury service in person. It further delineates this into first days as well as second and subsequent days, including criminal second and subsequent days. This section does not seek to count the number of juror days for those who fulfill their service through on-call or standby procedures. The number of juror days is equal to the number of prospective jurors multiplied by the number of days that each individual serves in person. For example, 100 jurors serving 5 days each is equal to 500 juror days. 100 of those are first juror days and 400 are second and subsequent juror days. This information is particularly useful for calculating juror per diem costs as well as which case types typically require more juror days and court resources.

Question 19 covers the total number of juror days. This means first, second, and subsequent days of jury service. Further, the individual totals for questions 20 and 21 should be equal to the grand total of question 19.

Question 20 covers the total number of first juror days only.

Question 21 covers the total number of second and subsequent juror days only.

Question 22 covers the total number of second and subsequent juror days in criminal cases only.

Example issues:

- There are a total of 555,555 juror days but only 1,001 first juror days and 554,554 second and subsequent juror days. How many jurors served those days? The answer is 555 jurors. 555 jurors times 1,001 first days equals 555,555, leaving the remaining 554,554 days as second and subsequent days.

Juror Pools & Panels

This section collects data on the number of jury pools and panels created, including for the number of cases that panels were created for and of the total number of panels created how many were actually sent for jury selection. This is further delineated into case types, including felony, misdemeanor, and other. While not specifically stated, the “other” case type is typically assumed to be juries of inquest, civil grand juries, and criminal grand juries. These components also contribute to calculating juror utilization and determining which cases as well as case types require more jury panels than others, including whether they require more than a single panel per case. Additionally, knowing whether one or more jury pools were created can help provide insight into how often a court is relying on its source lists in a given fiscal year to create a group of prospective qualified jurors, which may reveal whether a court is over or underestimating the number of prospective jurors they believe they will need in that given fiscal year.

Question 23 covers the total number of jury pools that were created, as described in Cal. CCP Section 194(e).

Question 24 covers the total number of cases that jury panels were created for.

Question 25 covers the total number of jury panels that were created, as described in Cal. CCP Section 194(q).

Question 26 covers the total number of jury panels that were created and sent for jury selection, as described in Cal. CCP Section 201, Section 219, and Section 222. The individual totals for question 27 in all case types should be equal to the grand total of question 26.

Question 27 covers the total number of jury panels that were created by case type: criminal cases, both felony and misdemeanor; civil cases; as well as other cases. As noted above, while not specifically stated, the "other" case type is typically assumed to be juries of inquest, civil grand juries, and criminal grand juries. The individual totals for question 27 felony and misdemeanor should be equal to the grand total of question 27 criminal.

Example issues:

- How were there 100 jury panels created but only 95 cases that they were created for? The likely reason is that some cases required more than one panel to complete jury selection.
- How were there 100 criminal jury panels created but only 99 panels between the underlying felony and misdemeanor categories? The likely reason is that the remainder of a given criminal panel were reused and not counted in the underlying category because they were already an existent jury panel.

Sworn Juries

This section collects data on the number of sworn juries for trial, which typically should correlate closely with the totals in question 25. Further, it typically should correlate closely with the number of jury trials reported in the Court Statistics Report (CSR) compiled from the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). This data is further delineated into case types, including felony, misdemeanor, and other. As noted in the previous section, while not specifically stated, the "other" case type is typically assumed to be juries of inquest, civil grand juries, and criminal grand juries. These measurements allow determinations to be made on the number of jury trials per case type in order to also allow for determinations to be inferred on the number of prospective jurors summoned per case type.

Question 28 covers the total number of actual juries sworn for trial, as described in Cal. CCP Section 194(p). The individual totals for question 29 in all case types should be equal to the grand total for question 28.

Question 29 covers the total number of juries sworn for trial by case type: criminal cases, both felony and misdemeanor; civil cases; as well as other cases. As noted above, while not

specifically stated, the "other" case type is typically assumed to be juries of inquest, civil grand juries, and criminal grand juries. The individual totals for question 29 felony and misdemeanor should be equal to the grand total of question 29 criminal.

Example issues:

- How is the total number of juries sworn for criminal cases different from the added totals for felony and misdemeanor cases? This is likely due to a counting error with the sworn juries in the underlying case categories if the count is off by a small amount. If the count is off by a large amount (>5%) then the issue may be a systemic under or overcount of sworn juries in applicable categories.

Comments

This section collects qualitative data, including rationales for underlying discrepancies and explanatory information related to a given court's report, whether unresolved inconsistencies, metrics not tracked, unique court practices affecting tabulating jury statistical data, or any other relevant issue. This section also allows courts to leave feedback regarding the JDR itself, including areas for improvement, difficult sections, and areas of jury operations that warrant further attention. When completing this optional section, please be as specific as possible.

Section 3. Totals & Underlying Categories

Tabulating Statistical Jury Data & Metrics

This section is meant to assist courts in reviewing their data for internal consistency, particularly when comparing overarching measurements to their underlying categories.

- Questions 1 through 2 collect background information regarding your court.
- Questions 3 through 6 cover yield and summonsing.
    - Totals for 3 plus 5 should equal the totals for 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13
- Questions 6a through 6c focus on Failure-to-Appear (FTA) practices.
- Question 7 through 7f cover excusals.
    - Totals for 7a through 7f should add up to the total of 7.
- Question 8 provides context on who the jury commissioner has delegated authority to for deciding excusal requests.
- Questions 9 through 11 cover disqualifications, dismissals, and exemptions, including for those who are peace officers ineligible for voir dire in a given case and those who are actually deceased.
    - Totals for questions 9a through 9h should add up to the total of 9.
    - Questions 10 and 11 are not included in the totals for disqualifications under 9.
- Question 13 through 15 cover those who completed jury service.
    - Totals for questions 13a and 13b should add up to the total of 13.
    - Totals for questions 14a through 14e should add up to the total for 14.

  - Totals for questions 14ci and 14cii should add up to the total for 14c.
- Questions 16 through 18 cover one day / one trial completion rates.
  - Totals for questions 17 and 18 should add up to the total of 16.
- Questions 19 through 22 cover juror days and does not include those who fulfilled their service on call or standby. The number of juror days is equal to the number of people multiplied by the number of days that each person serves in-person: 100 people serving 5 days each is equal to 500 juror days, 100 of which are first juror days and 400 of which are second and subsequent juror days.
  - Totals for questions 20 and 21 should add up to 19.
- Questions 23 through 29 cover jury pools and jury panels.
  - Totals for question 27 for criminal, civil, and other should add up to question 26.
  - Totals for question 27 for felony and misdemeanor should add up to 27 criminal.
  - Totals for question 29 for criminal, civil, and other should add up to 28.
  - Totals for question 29 for felony and misdemeanor should add up to 29 criminal.

Section 4. Understanding Key Performance Indicators

Jury KPIs are the primary efficiency and effectivity measurements of a jury-related performance in trials, administration, management, and operations. They are useful measurements whose purpose is to minimize the amount of effort expended to summon and qualify prospective jurors, as well as maximize the rate at which they are used to select sworn juries. These KPIs allow for reliable and reproducible data on juror yield, utilization, and postponement ratios, as well as related metrics pertinent to the State of California's jury system. As noted above, most of these KPI's are based on the NCSC's CourTools Measure 8.

Juror yield is the number of individuals selected for jury service who are qualified and available to serve, expressed as a percentage of the total number of prospective jurors summoned. Juror utilization is the rate at which qualified and available jurors are used at least once in trial or voir dire, expressed as a percentage of the total number of qualified and available jurors (the yield). Postponement ratio is the number of potential jurors who have postponed their service in or out of a relevant reporting period expressed as a whole or decimal number against a one-to-one baseline.

Lastly, California's one day/one trial model of jury service is expressed in the number of jurors who complete their service in one day, as compared to the number of prospective jurors who are qualified and available to serve.

Section 5. Reviewing Existing Jury Management System Settings

In order to ensure that JDR survey fields all add up correctly and reflect the appropriate information, you should codify policies and procedures for JMS data entry to reflect the needs of

your court and how they translate into the data reported or extracted from the JMS. For detailed information, please review the example issues listed in each section.

When preparing your JMS, such as when setting up code combinations, it is always beneficial to work directly with your JMS vendor or IT staff in order to avoid doubling up or missing codes, as well as to help check that your data is tabulating correctly after cross-checking. This is especially important when cross-checking totals between a discrete category and its underlying subsets. Use codes that correspond to court processes without creating potential conflicts between them and applicable rules of court or statutes.

For notation values, "NA" (not applicable) is the value that should be used in all situations where data is not tracked, captured, or otherwise collected by your JMs or your court. This is distinct from "0" which reflects an actual value of zero. Refrain from using alternative notations such as "###", "TBD", "null", or a blank cell, which leaves it unclear whether the data does or does not exist and what is the rationale behind that status.

Finally, when possible, work with your vendor or IT staff to set any data you wish to extract or download from your JMS to appear as a comma-separated value (CSV) file. CSV formats are preferred when working with modern data analytics software, allowing for more efficient processing that does not require time consuming hand-tabulation and/or copy-pasting. It will also minimize instances of or opportunities for errors.

Section 6. Process and Procedure

Data Request

The JIP typically requests data for the JDR on or around the beginning of September of every year with a deadline to respond of on or around the beginning of November of that same year. Later dates may occur due to workload, staffing, or other issues. General and targeted follow-ups are sent to courts as needed in advance of the deadline date. Late submissions are accepted but may impact the accuracy of a given court's data when reviewing measurements on data confidence related to completeness and timeliness.

Data Entry

Currently, the JIP utilizes a data warehouse, inputting data received from individual court submissions using an automated process. The data collection instrument is a survey created using Microsoft Forms and hosted on the JCC's servers. For example, the FY2024-2025 is hosted at https://forms.office.com/g/j4rBgx0pE6.

Data Publication

The JIP provides courts an opportunity to review the initial draft of the latest FY's JDR to provide comments, changes, edits, and/or resolve any errors. This occurs on or around the beginning of January of the year subsequent to the previous November, but within the same FY. Once courts have provided any optional updates to their data, the JDR is processed through quality control checks to identify KPIs, discrepancies, and other metrics for review and analysis.

The JDR is submitted to JCC management personnel and the JCC Executive Office for review and approval for publication as the official JDR for the given FY being reported. An executive summary is prepared and submitted to the Court Executive Officers of the Superior Courts of California for their edification when approved by JCC management.

Data Retention

Every JDR is retained indefinitely and utilized as an ongoing resource for the JIP's core functions. Updates may be completed on older reports on a periodic basis and used to reevaluate previous determinations if warranted.

This concludes the Jury Data Report Manual.