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EDITOR’S NOTE

One of the challenges faced by a journal serving a specialized audience, like judges, is to balance general-interest articles with ones on a single topic. Some topics are of sufficient significance, though, that we will devote most or all of an issue of Court Review to that topic. When we do this, we work hard to find authors who are in the forefront of work in that area. For this issue on jury reform, we think you’ll be pleased with the result. The authors who have contributed to this issue are unquestionably among the top experts in the field.

In the first article, Greg Mize and Chris Connelly provide an overview of jury reform in the United States today. They include information on a national program now underway to increase use of effective jury reform methods. Mize cochaired the District of Columbia Jury Project from 1996-1998 and remains active today in the jury reform movement.

Our second article, by Mike Dann and Valerie Hans, reviews the most recent empirical evaluations of several jury trial innovations, including note taking, questions from jurors, preliminary substantive instructions, and juror discussions of evidence during trial. Dann cochaired the Arizona Jury Trial Reform Committee in 1993; Hans has written two books and numerous articles on juries and jury reform.

Our third article, by Shari Seidman Diamond, Mary Rose, and Beth Murphy, reviews the practice of letting jurors ask questions during trial. They focus on an in-depth look at a single question: what are the effects when jurors are allowed to ask questions, but the judge doesn’t ask one of the questions submitted? These researchers were able to observe unanswered questions in 39 jury trials. They provide an excellent overall review of the value of letting jurors ask questions and whether any negative effects arise when that is done. Seidman Diamond is one of the leading experts on juries, with dozens of published articles. Rose has conducted empirical research on juries for many years. And Murphy has been previously published in Court Review on ways to improve jury deliberations.

We appreciate the effort of each of these authors in making this a special and valuable issue. We also acknowledge the help of Paula Hannaford-Agor at the National Center for State Courts in helping to recruit some of the authors; and of Greg Mize and Shari Seidman Diamond in making suggestions for the Resource Page: Focus on Jury Reform on page 42.

As always, we hope you’ll take a moment while reading the issue to look at the Resource Page section, which starts on page 44. And, as you come across information that you believe might be appropriately listed on the Resource Page or otherwise of interest to other judges, please let us know.—SL