Ratified - Meeting Minutes (voted on at the 11/5/26 meeting)
Task Force on Removing Barriers to Jury Service

Date: September 29, 2026

Time: 11:30am-1:00pm

Location: Virtual via WebEx Webinar

Members in Attendance: Derek Sangston, Chair Kimberly McCullough, Representative Tom Andersen, Royce Williams, Honorable Tucker Rossetto, Aaron Felton, Keren Farkas, Honorable Chanpone Sinlapasai, Matt Keating for Senator James Manning, Jr.

Members Not in Attendance: Senator Kim Thatcher, Honorable Matthew Shirtcliff, Representative Kim Wallan, Kia Tolbert, Nansi López, Tim Dooley

Quorum: Yes (6)

Ratify Prior Meeting Minutes

- Chair McCullough moved voting on the minutes to later in the meeting when there would be a quorum

Discussion About Whether to Extend the Task Force

- Chair McCullough moved this discussion to later in the meeting when there would be a quorum

Public Education

- Oregon Judicial Department's (OJD's) Juror Orientation Video
    - Chair McCullough asked for feedback on the video and if the task force wanted to recommend updating it
    - Not everyone was able to watch the video in full before the meeting, so the group decided to have those who did watch it provide feedback and those who did not, provide feedback at the next meeting or to Chair McCullough directly
    - Farkas noted that, while the length of it allowed time to walk through all the processes so there's less surprise when jurors show up for service, it being 20 minutes felt too long/complicated
        - She questioned if the video medium is best for those unfamiliar with the processes
            - Chair McCullough asked whether a video would be better if it was a supplement to a discussion/training
                - Farkas replied that even having the video broken into identifiable chapters could help viewers navigate it
                    - Having words along the side of the video to highlight the takeaways could also help

- Farkas appreciated that it showed the perspective of different stakeholders, but asked if it provided a petitioner or respondent's perspective too?
    - Molly Harvis (Statewide Jury Coordinator, OJD), replied that that perspective is not included in the video
        - Farkas noted that showing the connection with individuals and access to justice seems like a powerful/important component
- Sangston agreed with Farkas that the video is long and outdated
    - He asked when jurors are shown the video? In the jury room while waiting to be called as prospective jurors? Or prior to that day?
        - Chair McCullough noted that it varies by court
        - Harvis noted that if courts have the ability to show it on the day jurors are appearing for service they will generally show it then with the other trainings, but many courts that don't have the space, time, or ability to do so will require jurors to watch it prior to appearing and they may ask them to confirm they watched it
            - Chair McCullough identified the issue that not everyone may be able to view it (due to access or time constraints) prior to serving and asked if everything in the video is also provided in written form?
                - Harvis replied that a lot of the general concepts from the video are listed in an FAQs document/general jury brochures and that there is a transcript of the video, but, generally, if folks are not watching the video, reading the transcript, or getting that information at the reporting service, then they likely aren't getting much of that information at all without doing their own research
- Chair McCullough asked if OJD has tried to get feedback on the video from members of the public?
    - Harvis noted that OJD has never done a concerted effort to solicit feedback on the video, but in the last few years there have been discussions on revamping the video and finding ways to fund that
        - As part of that effort, Harvis has asked jury coordinators to gather anecdotal feedback on the video
            - The general feedback has been that it's outdated, looks old, and the content is a bit slow, and that having words on the screen may be helpful

    - Williams noted that the video looks outdated
    - Felton agreed the video looks outdated and the content needs updating to address current trends/issues
    - Harvis noted that the 2008 juror orientation video cost around $132,000 to make and it was done with a work group that helped with producing and funding it
        - OJD did an estimate for what it would take to fund a full revamp of the video, and the range was $90,000-$275,000 (low range to full production)
- OJD's Public Service Campaign
    - Harvis explained what the three materials she provided for the meeting were (broad statewide resource, and two examples of outreach efforts, one at the statewide and one at the local level)
        - She noted that she would also share the visuals of the statewide campaign banner for inclusion in the meeting materials
    - Juror Outreach Toolkit
        - OJD's statewide resource to help courts communicate more effectively about the importance of jury duty
        - Created by OJD's Communication's Team and Harvis
        - OJD works to update this annually and support courts in using it
        - Many courts use this during juror appreciation events
        - Used to help courts communicate more effectively about the importance of jury duty and to help circulate public awareness of jury scams
    - Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB) Outreach Recap
        - Public service awareness campaign OJD ran in partnership with OPB in March 2026
        - A radio and digital ad were ran for 30 days
        - Done using the remainders of a grant from the State Justice Institute
        - Ads were developed based on the National Center for State Courts' Jury Activation Participation Toolkit
        - With public communication, when it comes to jury service, in prior years there was a focus on it being a democratic and civil duty where jurors were thanked for their service and time
            - That messaging has been shown to not be as effective or positively perceived as opposed to the messaging of supporting and making an impact on fair trials and sharing your voice by being a juror

        - The campaign reached Oregonians across the state with over 1.5 million impressions
        - This served as a beta-test for OJD campaigning for jury service
    - Columbia County Juror Appreciation Photos
        - Depict Columbia County and Oregon's first juror appreciation luncheon event
        - Honored 200 jurors who served in 2025
        - Brought together judges, jurors, the district attorney's office, defense representatives, and court staff
        - Funded by a grant from the American Board of Trial Advocates
            - Could not have been done without the external funding ($5500)
    - Harvis noted that larger scale public education efforts (social media, regular statewide campaigns, expanding community partnerships) are heavily dependent on grant funding, which is limited and competitive
    - Chair McCullough asked how much grant funding OJD received for the public education campaign?
        - Harvis replied it was $7700
            - Chair McCullough noted that that would not be an overwhelmingly large ask to the legislature if the Task Force asked for that to fund public education
    - Matt Keating (in attendance for Senator James Manning) asked how long of a timeslot the OPB/OJD broadcast received? Was it a slot or a mention coupled with the digital ad component?
        - Harvis replied that the broadcast was a rotating mention on 41 radio spots over the span of one month and the digital ads rotated on a sponsor cycle on OPB's main page
        - Keating suggested that, with more funding, there could be an opportunity to extend that reach through commercial outlets as well by pitching it as a PSA
            - Keating asked if there is an opportunity to extend it beyond OPB into the commercial space and beyond just one month?
        - Keating asked if the ads were on OPB's site? Or were they targeted to certain demographics/persons so they would follow the persons on whatever reputable platform they went to?
            - Harvis replied that it was targeted to going to the OPB site
                - Keating suggested there could be more room for outreach there

        - Keating asked if the Task Force could hear a recording of the audio ad?
            - Harvis was not sure but would check if she could get a copy
    - Felton asked what the scope of the grand funding was?
        - He noted that Polk County Courts once bought mugs as appreciation gifts for jurors, but he wants to see what can be done to improve the juror experience (e.g., food, better coffee, etc.) rather than just providing post-service thanks
            - Harvis noted that the Juror Improvement Fund is where compensation that jurors waive goes and that that fund can be used to purchase things to improve the juror experience
                - Funding for that is dependent on if jurors are in a position to be able to waive their compensation
                    - Felton noted that OJD is the host and jurors are the guests, so there should be a way for jurors to get paid and still have a positive experience
    - McCullough noted our barriers/policies list doesn't include the Juror Improvement Fund, but that we could add getting money for that Fund to improve the jury experience and help courts that don't have independent funding to make improvements

Ratify Meeting Minutes

- Chair McCullough asked if anyone had changes to the 9/1/26 minutes
    - None were heard
- Chair McCullough asked if there were objections to ratifying the 9/1/26 minutes
    - There were none
    - Judge Sinlapasai's audio was not working, so she wrote to Chair McCullough to note she had no objections
- Chair McCullough stated that the 9/1/26 minutes were ratified

Discussion About Whether to Extend the Task Force

- It initially took some time to get the Task Force started due to the length of the appointment process
- The group has been regularly meeting since January 2026, but a lot of the initial meetings were about getting everyone up to speed on what jury service involves and the related statutes
    - It took some time to get into discussing the barriers and policy solutions

- The Task Force has identified a number of topics for further discussion and there has been some discussion of the policy options, but there are so many that we need to sort through them and determine what we do and do not want to pursue
- If the Task Force is going to make a budget request, including a request for a jury compensation increase, then it doesn't seem likely that would work in the upcoming legislative session
    - Extending the Task Force could allow time to build up more support
- Chair McCullough suggested that, if the Task Force were extended, that it not continue meeting during the 2027 legislative session and that it start back up in August 2027
    - Suggested extending until December 2027 or until the Task Force's work is completed
- Judge Sinlapasai wrote to Chair McCullough to say that she was in favor of extending the Task Force
- Felton stated he was in favor of extending the Task Force
- Sangston noted that as long as the Task Force wouldn't meet during the 2027 legislative session or July 2027, then he felt it could be extended and resume in August 2027
- Farkas agreed with extending the Task Force if Chair McCullough and Harvis thought there was more work to be done
- Judge Rossetto agreed with extending the Task Force
- Williams was in favor of extending the Task Force but asked that there be more discussions about how to move forward
    - He noted that there's a lot of information about jury service being provided, but the group needs more time to discuss and create plans for what should be recommended
- Chair McCullough noted that OJD has a placeholder bill to introduce for the 2027 legislative session that's related to juries (LC 137)
    - The bill essentially says that OJD shall conduct a study related to juries, but that can be amended to put in provisions saying the Task Force will be extended
- Chair McCullough noted that the Task Force should provide a presentation to the legislative judiciary committees about the Task Force's work (likely after the SB 1175 report is due) so we can update them on where the work is at, where it's heading, and how we plan to extend the Task Force

Where We Are Going From Here

- November 5, 2026, meeting
    - Chair McCullough will start working on the final report

        - The report will include a summary of what the Task Force has discussed so far and an annotation of the Overview of Barriers and Policy Options document
    - Discuss edits to the draft report
    - Come up with a workplan to know what more the Task Force wants to do as far as education, guest speakers, etc.
        - Plan on which policy options we discuss first and which topics the Task Force does a deeper dive into
- Chair McCullough asked if there were feedback or other ideas for the plan for the November 5 meeting
    - Judge Sinlapasai wrote to Chair McCullough to note that it sounded like a good plan
    - No one else had any feedback

Overview of Barriers and Policies Document

- Updates since the last meeting are shown in redline
    - Chair McCullough tried to capture the recommendations that were made at the meeting on juror trauma and anxiety
    - Added:
        - Requirement about potential resource lists for jurors
            - Ensure those are diverse and meet the needs of diverse jurors (i.e., culturally specific organizations and organizations that serve specific communities' needs)
        - Check-ins with jurors during and after jury service
        - Providing access to peer support
        - Provide critical incident stress debriefing sessions
        - Funding:
            - State funding to support district attorneys paying for staff to provide trauma-related training, support, and resources to grand jurors
            - State funding to support OJD paying for staff to provide trauma-related training, support, and resources to petit jurors
            - Funding for OJD to develop trainings for courts and district attorneys who want to make improvements in addressing juror trauma and anxiety
                - Ensuring that that development process includes consultation with individuals with lived experiences, jurors, and diverse community groups, particularly those that provide trauma support

- Funding for OJD to pay for development of training for judges and attorneys on trauma-informed practices

- Chair McCullough asked if anyone had anything else to add? Particularly ideas about policy options related to the trauma/anxiety category that should be added? Or if anyone had thoughts about how best to prioritize the ideas in the document?
    - Judge Sinlapasai wrote to Chair McCullough to ask that it be noted that, as part of the training and jury orientation, sometimes jurors have to come back for part two of a case (e.g., for dangerous offender hearings)
    - Felton asked for more discussion about the culture of what a jury is and how practitioners perceive it
        - Why do we use terms jurors don't understand? (e.g., petit juror, voir dire, etc.)
            - Chair McCullough will add into the policy options that we should work on improving the language
                - Chair McCullough noted that we can get feedback from jurors with lived experiences, Harvis' experiences working with the jury coordinators, and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to see where language creates barriers or hardship
    - Chair McCullough received a note from Judge Sinlapasai that trauma-informed court rooms and staff are also very important
        - Chair McCullough suggested that the Task Force could potentially look into barriers created by courtroom design
            - Judge Sinlapasai noted the issue of the defendant's table facing the witness stand
            - Chair McCullough noted that we can get more information from NCSC to discuss this further
    - Chair McCullough noted that, when looking at other states and the OJD pilot, so much of the focus is on post-jury service access to counseling, but there is so much more that could be done to help support jurors during service
- Chair McCullough asked if there were other policy options or anything else that folks wanted to discuss at the November 5 meeting?
    - No one noted anything
    - Reach out to Chair McCullough if you have anything to add
- Chair McCullough will come up with a list of topics she would like the group's feedback on for the next meeting

Public Comment

- None

Next Meeting

- Date: November 5, 2026
- Time: 11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
- Via: Webex Webinar