**Example of a Report Editing Process**

1. The Editorial Committee (EC) reviews the draft report for compliance with the jury’s approved report format and the Report Content Checklist.

* If the draft report does not follow the format or does not meet the requirements of the checklist, EC returns it to the investigating committee with a description of the shortcomings. If the investigating committee and the EC disagree, the committee may take the issue up with the entire jury panel for resolution.

1. When the draft report is ready for editing, the EC selects a lead editor for the report, who is not a member of the investigating committee.

* The lead editor is in charge of editing the draft report using MS Word with Track Changes (or similar software). One or more other members of the EC may assist in the initial editing.
* The draft report is edited for both content and conformance with editorial standards.
* The investigating committee provides the EC its Report Logic Matrix to allow the EC to confirm that the facts have been verified.
* The lead editor may inquire about source documentation of facts and findings.
* The lead editor completes the Checklist for Review and Editing of Draft Reports.
* The representative of the investigating committee is consulted as required to enable the EC to confirm its understanding of the intent of the report text and ensure that editorial revisions do not inadvertently change the report’s meaning.

1. When editing is substantially complete, the lead editor distributes copies of the edited draft report (hard copy or electronically) to at least two other EC members for review. Their combined edits are submitted to the full EC for input.
2. After the EC agrees on the edits, the draft report is returned to the investigating committee. The lead editor explains the editorial changes as requested by the investigating committee.
3. The investigating committee conducts any needed additional investigation and revises the draft report as appropriate and re-submits it to the EC, which may suggest further edits. The two committees should meet as needed if further discussion would be helpful.
4. The investigating committee shares the draft report with the entire jury panel for its input and guidance, conducts any further investigation as needed, and modifies the draft as appropriate.
5. The investigating committee provides this draft for submittal to the jury’s legal advisor for review.
6. The investigating committee makes changes to the draft report based on the legal advisor’s input.
7. The investigating committee continues to re-draft the report and sends it to the EC for further editing. This back-and-forth process may result in additional research and interviews and the production of several drafts.
8. When both the investigating committee and the EC believe the report is in its last draft, the investigating committee submits it to the full panel for approval to conduct one or more exit interviews.

* The draft report should be distributed to the entire jury panel members a week prior to the request for a vote for approval.

1. After approval of the draft report by the full jury panel (except for any recused jurors), the investigating committee conducts the exit interview(s), conducts any further investigation as needed, and then produces the final draft of the report.
2. The EC edits the final draft of the report and returns it to the investigating committee for any last modifications.
3. The Foreperson (unless recused, in which case the pro tem) forwards the final draft to the jury’s legal advisor for review.
4. The jury, the investigating committee, and the EC work together to make appropriate changes based on the legal advisor’s input.
5. A supermajority vote of the full jury (except for any recused jurors) is required for the adoption of the report.
6. Once the report is adopted by the jury, the Foreperson (unless recused) delivers it to the judge for input or approval.
7. The jury, the investigating committee, and the EC work together to make appropriate changes based on the judge’s input.
8. After approval by the judge, arrangements are made for distribution of the approved report to the affected entities two days prior to its public release. The public release is accomplished by posting the report on the jury’s website.