

CGJA Best Grand Jury Report Evaluation
DUE: August 31, 2023, to basommer@ucdavis.edu

Reviewer's name:

NOTE: Save As with a new name before filling this out.

Report County:

IMPACT OF THE REPORT – Rate using the following scale:

very much	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all				
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Item * = <i>double weight</i>	Rating	Score
1. Summary addresses the main issues, findings, and recommendations.		
2. Report identifies and addresses a significant current issue.*		
3. Selection of topic is explained in the Background section. The purpose of the investigation is clear (why this topic, why now , and outlines what was investigated). The information puts the study into context.		
4. Methodology section describes the investigative techniques used. The description is clear and quantified, while not revealing the identity of witnesses.		
5. Discussion section lays out the facts in a logical order and flows well.		
6. Discussion section avoids vague quantifiers and “wobble language.” No unsupported or incomplete statements. None are inconsistent.		
7. Findings – each finding is based on and follows logically from the verified facts gathered during the investigation.*		
8. Each finding is a judgment and conclusion (not a fact).		
9. All problems identified in the findings are accompanied by suggested means for resolution (Recommendations).		
10. Each Recommendation is Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-boxed for completion of the recommended action.*		
11. Each Recommendation states who should do what by when .		
12. The correct respondents are identified. Time for response is indicated. It is clear whether the response is required or invited.		
13. The tone of the report is objective and fair .		

continued

CGJA Best Grand Jury Report Evaluation
DUE: August 31, 2023, to basommer@ucdavis.edu

IMPACT OF THE REPORT – Rate using the following scale:

very much	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all				
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Item	Rating	Score
14. The report is clear and understandable , such that each statement makes sense to everyone reading the report, even if they have little background in the subject. Good use of graphs, maps and photos.*		
15. All statements are direct, specific and accurate – and quantified, if possible.		
16. The report had a positive impact on the citizens in the community.*		
17. The investigation was a difficult one, e.g., many agencies, bureaucratic interference (e.g., denials, subpoenas), complex issues, etc.		
18. The grand jury’s report (or the civil grand jury itself) was made public (media coverage was significant).		
19. The agency or agencies involved agreed with or implemented the findings/recommendations .*		
20. There was additional public acknowledgement/change in procedure (e.g., reassignment, resignation, establishment of oversight, changes in policy, etc.).*		
TOTAL POINTS		

COMMENT: Is there anything extraordinary about this report that is not covered in any of the above criteria? Any other comments?