

**GMS Report
Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI)
2015-AK-BX-K003
Report Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 30 Jun 2016**

The following report covers grantee reported activity for grant number 2015-AK-BX-K003 awarded to Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice for the period 01 Oct 2015 - 30 Jun 2016. The award, in the amount of \$1,999,680.00, was issued as part of the BJA FY 15 SAKI solicitation. Any funds reported only represent an estimate of dollars allocated or used for activities covered by this award.

This report covers 2 reporting period(s) of data, represented as follows:

- 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

- 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016

Project Description

The National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) provides funding to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, and prosecutor's offices to support multidisciplinary community response teams engaged in the comprehensive reform of jurisdictions' approaches to sexual assault cases resulting from evidence found in previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs) - i.e. those SAKs that have never been submitted to a crime laboratory. The goal of the SAKI is the creation of a coordinated community response that ensures just resolution to these cases whenever possible through a victim-centered approach, as well as to build jurisdictions' capacity to prevent the development of conditions that lead to high numbers of unsubmitted SAKs in the future. The holistic program provides jurisdictions with resources to address their unsubmitted SAK issue, including support to inventory, test, and track SAKs; create and report performance metrics; access necessary training to increase effectiveness in addressing the complex issues associated with these cases and engage in multidisciplinary policy development, implementation, and coordination; and improve practices related to investigation, prosecution, and victim engagement and support in connection with evidence and cases resulting from the testing process. The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice will use this 2015 SAKI award to reform the handling of sexual assault cases in Salt Lake County, Utah, by establishing a multidisciplinary, victim-centered approach to resolve cases from unsubmitted SAKs, and developing community measures to prevent future collections of unsubmitted SAKs. The recipient will establish a multidisciplinary working group, The Salt Lake County Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit (USAK) Working Group, to develop comprehensive strategies to track, investigate and prosecute all sexual assault cases stemming from DNA analysis of previously USAKs. The USAK will verify the 2014 inventory of unsubmitted SAKs; establish guidelines for SAK evidence destruction; track the unsubmitted SAKs; test the unsubmitted SAKs; identify challenges related to testing SAKs; identify solutions to improve efficiency of DNA screening and analysis; produce protocols and policies to support improved coordination between all agencies involved in sexual assault cases; establish resources for investigations and prosecutions resulting from testing the previously unsubmitted SAKs; establish resources to optimize and support victim notification protocols and services; and develop a tracking system linking data on SAKs from UBFS, SANEs, law enforcement, and prosecutors to improve coordination of all services while allowing victims full access to upload information about their SAKs and cases. CANCF

Grantee

The grantee indicated the award had grant activity during the report period. Performance data can be found in the "Performance Measures" section. Narrative information for the award can be found in the "Grantee Comments" and "Goals and Objectives" sections.

Award Synopsis

The following table displays whether the grantee was operational, not operational, or closed out during the report period.

Reporting Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

	Operational	Not Operational	Closed Out
Grantee	Yes		No

Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016

	Operational	Not Operational	Closed Out
Grantee	Yes		No

Goals & Objectives

The following goals and objectives were entered by the grantee during the report period.

Direct Grantee: (Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016)

#	Goal	Status	Progress & Barriers	Planned Activities
1	Reduce the number of unsubmitted sexual assault kits by implementing a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary plan to inventory, test, and track unsubmitted sexual assault kits through final adjudication.	In progress	In the last six months we completed our inventory of unsubmitted sexual assault kits. We identified 1,751 unsubmitted sexual assault kits. Of those, 1,421 have been submitted to the lab leaving only 330 unsubmitted. We have begun testing some of the unsubmitted sexual assault kits through Bode Technology Group with money the Utah State Legislature provided in 2014, however since the DANY grant was accepted, we will go through another competitive bid process with lab vendors to test the remaining kits.	The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice finalized a sub-grant to the Unified State Lab in Salt Lake County Utah in June 2016. The Unified State Lab will begin the process of tracking unsubmitted sexual assault kits through the system. Tracking will begin in July 2016 and will continue until September 2018. Also in the next six months we will work on the competitive bid process for the vendor lab to test the remaining unsubmitted sexual assault kits. We will also continue efforts to get the remaining unsubmitted sexual assault kits submitted to the Unified State Lab and then sent to the vendor for testing.
2	Establish a multi-disciplinary working group to identify the underlying factors that contribute to unsubmitted sexual assault kits and devise a comprehensive plan to inventory, track, and maintain accountability for the sexual assault kits.	In progress	In October 2015 the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice formed the Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit (USAK) multi-disciplinary working group to address the factors contributing to unsubmitted sexual assault kits and to work together to create protocols and drive policy changes related to sexual assault investigations and prosecutions. The USAK working group meets monthly. Since October 2015, three subcommittees have been working to address the problem of unsubmitted sexual assault kits; policy, victim notification, and tracking. Other subcommittees may be formed as the need arises.	The USAK multi-disciplinary working group will continue meeting monthly to address the accumulation of unsubmitted sexual assault kits in Salt Lake County. Updates will be provided about the SAKI and DANY grants. A 10-15 minute educational presentation will occur and the subcommittees will meet for discussion and work. The policy subcommittee will meet to discuss policy and protocol changes. The two large issues being discussed are kit retention/destruction and legislation to mandate testing of all sexual assault kits. Interested policy makers will be invited to join the group discussion. The victim notification subcommittee will continue working on the victim notification protocol. At this time a protocol has been developed, however the committee is working to develop a more specific protocol to include guidelines and resources for more challenging types of scenarios such as notifications to minors, notifications with the suspect is an intimate partners, secondary victim notifications if the primary victim is dead, etc. The victim notification subcommittee is also preparing to train local law enforcement on the protocol. The tracking subcommittee will resume meeting in July 2016 following a brief break. The tracking committee will begin completing focus groups to generate ideas about which electronic tracking system will work best for victims in Salt Lake County and potentially the state of Utah. They will also meet with vendors to identify the types of tracking systems currently available or vendors who will be able to create a tracking system specifically for Utah's needs.
3	Improve the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault kit cases through the adoption of improved protocols, technology, and management svstems.	Not yet started	At this time Salt Lake County has not begun adopting protocols for investigations or prosecutions. We are in the very beginning stages of creating protocols and testing sexual assault kits.	The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice is working with 11 local law enforcement agencies in Salt Lake County. We plan to begin working with Salt Lake City Police Department first to implement protocols in August 2016. Salt Lake City Police Department is the largest of the 11 local police departments and housed the majority of unsubmitted sexual assault kits. They have also turned in all of their unsubmitted sexual assault kits to the lab and have begun receiving CODIS hits back from kits tested with the states

				contribution of \$750,000. We have met with Salt Lake City Police Department to begin the process of reviewing their unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases.
4	Develop victim notification protocols and evaluate efficacy to enhance victim services and support victims of sexual assault.	In progress	As previously mentioned, we have begun developing our victim notification protocol and are in the process of discussing more specific topics related to victim notification. We completed the competitive bid process for the Evaluator position. We expect the sub grant for the evaluator position will be signed by August 2016, which is currently pending budget approval through BJA. We are also awaiting budget approval to hire an Investigator and Justice Advocate who will work to implement the victim notification protocol used by local law enforcement, enhance victim services and provide support to victims navigating the criminal justice process.	We anticipate the budget approval for the Justice Advocate and Evaluator position to be complete by August 2016, which will allow us to begin hiring. At that time we will begin implementing the victim notification protocol. The evaluator will begin the process of identifying methods used to evaluate the process of victim notification.

Other Goals and Objectives Measures (Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016)

Option	Text Response(s)
Did you receive or do you desire any assistance from BJA or a BJA-funded technical assistance provider? A list of technical assistance providers can be found at https://www.bjatraining.org/ . Check all that apply.	
A. Yes, we received assistance	A. Yes, we received assistance
B. Yes, we would like assistance or additional assistance	
C. No	
If yes to A or B above, please explain:	
D. If Yes, please explain	D. In April 2016 the Training and Technical Assistance Team (RTI) completed a site visit here in Salt Lake County. We discussed many topics (inventory, investigations, overcoming barriers, additional needs, training, etc.) The visit was immensely helpful for our site. Rose Werth has coordinated and facilitated at least two phone calls with our federal grant partners. We consider her to be our advocate and are very happy to have her in our corner. The Salt Lake County Site Coordinator checks in with Rose weekly and is pleased with her speedy communication. In addition we have a monthly phone call with Sam Capagrossi. His regular check ins have kept our spirits up as we address complicated challenges. Sam, Rose, and James were helpful at the SAKI meeting in

Washington DC. They introduced us to other sites, which has been extremely valuable. We have also attended webinars hosted by the Training and Technical Assistance Team and have referenced the website and facebook page generated by RTI.

Based on your knowledge of the criminal justice field, are there any innovative programs/success stories that you would like to share with BJA?

A.

A. At this time we have not input.

Performance Measures

Performance measures data for the GMS report period are displayed below. Only sections with reported data are shown. "Cumulative Total" includes both quarters represented in this report and any other data reported on previous GMS reports since the start of the award.

Grant Activity

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
2. For this initiative, have you appointed a dedicated site coordinator?			
A. Name	A. April Ensign	A. April Ensign	A. -
B. Phone number	B. 801-538-1062	B. 801-538-1062	B. -
C. E-mail address	C. aensign@utah.gov	C. aensign@utah.gov	C. -

Baseline

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
4. Was an inventory of unsubmitted SAKs completed prior to the grant being awarded?			
A. Yes	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. No	B. 2

5. Enter the date the inventory was completed.

	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total
Measure			

6. Please enter the number of SAKs that had the following results or resulted in the following actions as recorded in your inventory.

Inventory and Tracking

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total
7. Please enter the number of SAKs which fit in each category below for the reporting period.			
A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)	A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)	A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)	A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)
1. Cumulative (since start of award)		1. 0	
2. During this reporting period	1. 0	2. 1	
B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs	B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs	B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs	B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs
1. Cumulative (since start of award)		1. 0	1. 0
2. During this reporting period	1. 0	2. 1	2. 1
C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs	C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs	C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs	B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs
1. Cumulative (since start of award)		1. 0	1. 0
2. During this reporting period	1. 0	2. 0	2. 1
D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing	D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were	D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing	C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs
1. Cumulative (since start of award)	2. 0	1. 0	1. 0
		2. 0	2. 1

During this reporting period	determined not to require testing		tested SAKs
	1. 0		1. 0
E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need DNA testing	2. 0	E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need DNA testing	2. 0
1. Cumulative (since start of award)		1. 0	
2. During this reporting period		2. 1	
	1. 0		D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing
F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing	2. 1750	F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing	1. 0
1. Cumulative (since start of award)		1. 0	2. 0
2. During this reporting period		2. 0	
			E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need DNA testing
G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)	1. 0	G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)	1. 0
1. Cumulative (since start of award)	2. 0	1. 0	2. 1
2. During this reporting period		2. 0	
			F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing
	1. 0		1. 0
	2. 0		2. 0
			G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)

1.0

2.0

8. During the reporting period, how many unsubmitted SAKs were determined to not need testing for each of the following reasons.

A. Not able to retrieve evidence	A. 0	A. 0	A. 0
B. Evidence contained in SAK would not impact investigation or prosecution	B. 0	B. 0	B. 0
C. Statute of limitations	C. 0	C. 0	C. 0
D. Other	D. 0	D. 0	D. 0
E. If other, please explain	E. 0	E. -	
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals

9. During the reporting period, were DNA profiles from forensic analysis uploaded into CODIS from SAKs submitted for testing?

A. Yes	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. No	B. 2
C. If Yes, how many?	C. -	C. -	C. -
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total

10. Of the total number of DNA profiles uploaded into CODIS during the reporting period (identified in question 9), how many of the following confirmed hits were recorded? (If no hits were confirmed, enter "0".)

11. Of the total number of CODIS hits (identified in question 10A), how many hits fit in the following categories?

<p>A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative (since start of award) During this reporting period <p>B. Number of states where hits have occurred: enter the total number of other states where hits have occurred. Remember: do not count the same state twice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative (since start of award) During this reporting period 	<p>A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>B. Number of states where hits have occurred: enter the total number of other states where hits have occurred. Remember: do not count the same state twice.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p>	<p>A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>B. Number of states where hits have occurred: enter the total number of other states where hits have occurred. Remember: do not count the same state twice.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p>	<p>A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>B. Number of states where hits have occurred: enter the total number of other states where hits have occurred. Remember: do not count the same state twice.</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p>
--	--	--	--

12. Of the number of **Offender/Arrestee Hits** during the reporting period identified in question 10C, how many fit each of the following categories?

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
<p>13. During the reporting period, what factors contributed to successfully submitting SAKs or improving your submission of SAKs? Select all that apply.</p> <p>A. Effective in-house records management system</p> <p>B. Proper protocols in place</p> <p>C. Coordination with departmental leadership</p> <p>D. Sufficient amount of staff</p>	<p>A. -</p> <p>B. -</p> <p>C. Coordination with departmental leadership</p>	<p>A. -</p> <p>B. Proper protocols in place</p> <p>C. Coordination with departmental leadership</p>	<p>A. 0</p> <p>B. 1</p> <p>C. 2</p> <p>D. 1</p>

D. Sufficient amount of staff available	D. Sufficient amount of staff available	D. -	D. 1
E. Sufficient amount of laboratory staff available	E. Sufficient amount of laboratory staff available	E. Sufficient amount of laboratory staff available	E. 2
F. Effective in-house Training	F. Effective in-house Training	F. Effective in-house Training	F. 2
G. Access to money and/or other resources	G. -	G. Access to money and/or other resources	G. 1
H. Diligent community-based victim services	H. -	H. -	H. 0
I. Understanding and responding to victim trauma	I. Understanding and responding to victim trauma	I. -	I. 1
J. Understanding of basic forensic investigative techniques	J. Understanding of basic forensic investigative techniques	J. Understanding of basic forensic investigative techniques	J. 2
K. Understanding the importance of properly handling and testing SAKs	K. Understanding the importance of properly handling and testing SAKs	K. -	K. 1
L. If other, please explain	L. -	L. -	L. 0

14. During the reporting period, what factors does your jurisdiction see as contributing to unsubmitted SAKs? Select all that apply.

A. Input Numeric Value	A. -	A. -	A. -
B. Employees questioning the validity of victims' reports/allegations	B. Employees questioning the validity of victims' reports/allegations	B. Employees questioning the validity of victims' reports/allegations	B. 2
C. Employees would benefit from more training	C. Employees would benefit from more training	C. Employees would benefit from more training	C. 2
D. New and improved protocols needed	D. New and improved protocols needed	D. New and improved protocols needed	D. 2
E. Employees would benefit from a better understanding of appropriate victim trauma response	E. -	E. Employees would benefit from a better understanding of appropriate victim trauma response	E. 1
F. Need for additional/increased ties with community-based victim services	F. -	F. -	F. 0
G. Need for a better evidence tracking system	G. Need for a better evidence tracking system	G. -	G. 1
H. Chronic instability in departmental leadership	H. -	H. -	H. 0
		I. Need for greater understanding of the value of testing kits	I. 2

i. Need for greater understanding of the value of testing kits	I. Need for greater understanding of the value of testing kits	J. -	J. 0
J. If other, please explain	J. -		

15. Were any cases forwarded by the working group for investigation related to the SAKs tested during the reporting period?

A. Yes	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. No	B. 2
C. If yes, how many cases were forwarded for investigation	C. -	C. -	C. -
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total

16. During the reporting period, enter the number of victims located, contacted, or agreeing to participate (associated with previously unsubmitted SAK) as a result of the SAKI.

A. Number of Victims located (have found where victim resides)	A. 0	A. 0	A. 0
B. Of those located, how many Victims were contacted	B. 0	B. 0	B. 0
C. Of those contacted, how many agreed to actively participate in a new investigation resulting from the SAKI	C. 0	C. 0	C. 0

17. How many SAKI cases were forwarded for prosecution during the reporting period?

• Number	• 0	• 0	• 0
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals

18. What case elements did the working group consider when prioritizing cases during the reporting period? Select all that apply.

A. Age of victim	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. Victim/victim's family cooperation	B. -	B. -	B. 0
C. Public safety concerns	C. -	C. Public safety concerns	C. 1
D. Statute of limitations	D. Statute of limitations	D. Statute of limitations	D. 2
E. DNA of known offender	E. -	E. -	E. 0
F. Other/new evidence and/or witnesses have come to light (not SAK related)	F. -	F. -	F. 0
G. Other	G. -	G. -	G. 0
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total

19. Please enter the number of cases which fit in each category below for the reporting period.

A. How many cases were charged? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	A. How many cases were charged? 1. 0 2. 0	A. How many cases were charged? 1. 0 2. 0	A. How many cases were charged? 1. 0 2. 0
B. Had the charges dismissed? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	B. Had the charges dismissed? 1. 0 2. 0	B. Had the charges dismissed? 1. 0 2. 0	B. Had the charges dismissed? 1. 0 2. 0
C. Resulted in a plea bargain? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	C. Resulted in a plea bargain? 1. 0 2. 0	C. Resulted in a plea bargain? 1. 0 2. 0	C. Resulted in a plea bargain? 1. 0 2. 0

D. Ended with a conviction following a trial? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	D. Ended with a conviction following a trial? 1. 0 2. 0	D. Ended with a conviction following a trial? 1. 0 2. 0	D. Ended with a conviction following a trial? 1. 0 2. 0
E. Ended with an acquittal? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	E. Ended with an acquittal? 1. 0 2. 0	E. Ended with an acquittal? 1. 0 2. 0	E. Ended with an acquittal? 1. 0 2. 0
F. Ended in mistrial? 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. During this reporting period	F. Ended in mistrial? 1. 0 2. 0	F. Ended in mistrial? 1. 0 2. 0	F. Ended in mistrial? 1. 0 2. 0
Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
20. During the reporting period, were there cases where prosecution was denied? (e.g., case was deemed to have insufficient evidence)?			
A. Yes	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. No	B. 2
C. If Yes, how many times during the reporting period did this occur?	C. -	C. -	C. -
21. During the reporting period, please select the reasons prosecution was denied. Select all that apply.			
22. Have you publicly shared any progress or success stories during this reporting period?			

A. Yes	A. -	A. Yes	A. 1
B. No	B. No	B. -	B. 1
C. If Yes, provide the link to your progress or success story	C. -	C. http://www.ksl.com/?sid=39839692&nid=148	C. -

Measure

Text Response(s)

23. Are there any other ways you are sharing information about this effort with the public?

(01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016)

We are currently in the process of creating a webpage where we will publicly share data.

(01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016)

The Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit multi-disciplinary working group meets monthly in Salt Lake County and the Rape Kit Processing multi-disciplinary working group meets quarterly statewide. A project update is provided at each meeting. The SAKI Coordinator also provided updates about the project at the Sexual Violence Council public meeting, the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice public meeting, the Crime Victim's Council public meeting, and at the Statewide Advocates for Victims Organization quarterly conference. Once all SAKI personnel have been hired, the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice will distribute a press release as well as post updates on the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice's website.

Working Group and Partners

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
24. Do you have an established regularly convening multidisciplinary working group ?			
A. Yes	A. Yes	A. Yes	A. 2
B. No	B. -	B. -	B. 0
C. If no, please explain:	C. -	C. -	C. -
25. How often did your multidisciplinary working group meet during the reporting period? Check the one option that best applies.			
A. We did not meet during the reporting period	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. Daily	B. -	B. -	B. 0
C. Weekly	C. -	C. -	C. 0

D. Monthly	D. Monthly	D. -	D. 1
E. Quarterly	E. -	E. -	E. 0
F. Other	F. -	F. Other	F. 1
G. If other, please explain	G. -	G. Our multi-disciplinary working group normally meets monthly, however we were unable to meet in June due to the SAKI conference in Washington DC.	G. -

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Cumulative Total
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------

26. Please enter the total number of active and new partners participating in the SAKI during the reporting period.

A. Number participating in the working group 1. Number of ACTIVE partners during the reporting period 2. Number of NEW partners during the reporting period	A. Number participating in the working group 1. 46 2. 19	A. Number participating in the working group 1. 41 2. 8	A. Number participating in the working group 1. 41 2. 8
B. Number of victim advocacy partners 1. Number of ACTIVE partners during the reporting period 2. Number of NEW partners during the reporting period	B. Number of victim advocacy partners 1. 14 2. 11	B. Number of victim advocacy partners 1. 6 2. 2	B. Number of victim advocacy partners 1. 6 2. 2

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
----------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

27. How would you rate the following **working group** partners based on the statement "This partner is actively involved in the program."

A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked 2. Strongly Disagree 3. Disagree	A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. - 2. -	A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. - 2. -	A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. 0 2. 0
--	--	--	--

	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. 2
B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)	B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)	B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)	B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. Agree	5. 1
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0
C. Federal law enforcement agencies	C. Federal law enforcement agencies	C. Federal law enforcement agencies	C. Federal law enforcement agencies
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0
D. State law enforcement agencies	D. State law enforcement agencies	D. State law enforcement agencies	D. State law enforcement agencies
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. 2
E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)	E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)	E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)	E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. Agree	5. 1

6. Strongly Agree

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. 1

F. Crime victim/witness services

F. Crime victim/witness services

F. Crime victim/witness services

F. Crime victim/witness services

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. -

1. 0

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2. 0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3. 1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4. 0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5. 0

6. Strongly Agree

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. 1

G. Pretrial service organizations

G. Pretrial service organizations

G. Pretrial service organizations

G. Pretrial service organizations

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. 1

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2. 0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3. 1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4. 0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5. 0

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. -

6. 0

H. U.S. Attorney's Office

H. U.S. Attorney's Office

H. U.S. Attorney's Office

H. U.S. Attorney's Office

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. 1

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2. 0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3. 1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4. 0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5. 0

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. -

6. 0

I. Prosecution

I. Prosecution

I. Prosecution

I. Prosecution

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. -

1. 0

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2. 0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. -

3. 0

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4. 0

5. Agree

5. -

5. Agree

5. 1

6. Strongly Agree

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. 1

J. Public defender/indigent defense

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

J. Public defender/indigent defense

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

J. Public defender/indigent defense

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. Disagree
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

J. Public defender/indigent defense

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0

K. Courts

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

K. Courts

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

K. Courts

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. Disagree
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

K. Courts

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0

L. Community corrections (probation/parole)

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

L. Community corrections (probation/parole)

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

L. Community corrections (probation/parole)

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. Disagree
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

L. Community corrections (probation/parole)

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0

M. Corrections

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

M. Corrections

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

M. Corrections

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. Disagree
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

M. Corrections

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0

N. Health care providers

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree

N. Health care providers

- 1. -
- 2. -

N. Health care providers

- 1. -
- 2. -

N. Health care providers

- 1. 0
- 2. 0

	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 1

O. Mental health care providers	O. Mental health care providers	O. Mental health care providers	O. Mental health care providers
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. Agree	5. 1
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 1

P. Substance abuse treatment providers	P. Substance abuse treatment providers	P. Substance abuse treatment providers	P. Substance abuse treatment providers
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0

Q. Child protective services	Q. Child protective services	Q. Child protective services	Q. Child protective services
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0

R. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment)	R. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment)	R. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment)	R. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5.0

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. -

6.0

S. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)

S. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)

S. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)

S. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1.1

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2.0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3.1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4.0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5.0

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. -

6.0

T. Faith-based organizations

T. Faith-based organizations

T. Faith-based organizations

T. Faith-based organizations

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1.1

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2.0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3.1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4.0

5. Agree

5. -

5. -

5.0

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6. -

6.0

U. Subject matter experts

U. Subject matter experts

U. Subject matter experts

U. Subject matter experts

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. -

1.0

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2.0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. -

3.0

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. -

4. -

4.0

5. Agree

5. -

5. Agree

5.1

6. Strongly Agree

6. Strongly Agree

6. -

6.1

V. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations

V. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations

V. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations

V. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations

1. NA/Not Tracked

1. -

1. -

1.0

2. Strongly Disagree

2. -

2. -

2.0

3. Disagree

3. -

3. Disagree

3.1

4. Neither Agree nor Disagree

4. Neither Agree nor

4. -

4.1

	Disagree		
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0
W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)	W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)	W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)	W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. Agree	5. 1
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 1
X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)	X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)	X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)	X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. 1
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0
Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies	Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies	Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies	Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. Disagree	3. 1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. 1
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. -	6. 0
A@. Forensic Laboratories	A@. Forensic Laboratories	A@. Forensic Laboratories	A@. Forensic Laboratories
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1. -	1. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. Strongly Agree	6. 2

AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. Strongly Agree

AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. Strongly Agree

AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses

- 1. 0
- 2. 0
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 2

AB. Other

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

AB. Other

- 1. NA/Not Tracked
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

AB. Other

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. Agree
- 6. -

AB. Other

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 1
- 6. 0

If other please explain
 • Other

AC. If other please explain

- Victim Rights Attorneys

AC. If other please explain

- 0

28. During the reporting period, did your working group identify any other entities, groups, organizations, or programs (e.g. private sector entities such as evidence tracking providers) that were **not on the working group**?

A. Yes

A. Yes

A. -

A. 1

B. No

B. -

B. No

B. 1

C. If yes, please describe who this partner is and the nature of this partnership.

C. The working group identified and invited community based advocates from the Rape Recovery Center and law

C. -

C. -

enforcement advocates from the various law enforcement agencies in Salt Lake County to join the working group. We also identified and invited diverse community partners from the Urban Indian Center, Kava Talks (Pacific Islander & Polynesian cultures), and Sego Lily Center for the Abused Deaf. In addition, we identified local law enforcement agencies not attending the working group and invited them to attend the monthly meetings.

29. Please select which working group partner is doing which role in the initiative. Mark all that apply:

<p>A. Inventorying the SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. Law enforcement 3. Lab Personnel 4. Investigator 5. Prosecutors 6. Victim advocates 7. Other 	<p>A. Inventorying the SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. - 3. - 4. - 5. - 6. - 7. - 	<p>A. Inventorying the SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - 2. Law enforcement 3. - 4. - 5. - 6. - 7. - 	<p>A. Inventorying the SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 1 3. 0 4. 0 5. 0 6. 0 7. 0
<p>B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. Law enforcement 3. Lab Personnel 4. Investigator 5. Prosecutors 6. Victim advocates 7. Other 	<p>B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. - 3. - 4. - 5. - 6. - 7. - 	<p>B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - 2. Law enforcement 3. - 4. - 5. - 6. - 7. - 	<p>B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 1 3. 0 4. 0 5. 0 6. 0 7. 0
<p>C. Collecting information from SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. Law enforcement 3. Lab Personnel 4. Investigator 5. Prosecutors 	<p>C. Collecting information from SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. - 3. - 4. - 	<p>C. Collecting information from SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - 2. Law enforcement 3. - 4. - 	<p>C. Collecting information from SAKs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 1 3. 0 4. 0

5. Prosecutors			5.0
6. Victim advocates	5. -	5. -	6.0
7. Other	6. -	6. -	7.0
	7. -	7. -	
D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system	D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system	D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system	D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system
1. NA			1.2
2. Law enforcement	1. NA	1. NA	2.0
3. Lab Personnel	2. -	2. -	3.0
4. Investigator	3. -	3. -	4.0
5. Prosecutors	4. -	4. -	5.0
6. Victim advocates	5. -	5. -	6.0
7. Other	6. -	6. -	7.0
	7. -	7. -	
E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)	E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)	E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)	E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)
1. NA			1.2
2. Law enforcement			2.0
3. Lab Personnel	1. NA	1. NA	3.0
4. Investigator	2. -	2. -	4.0
5. Prosecutors	3. -	3. -	5.0
6. Victim advocates	4. -	4. -	6.0
7. Other	5. -	5. -	7.0
	6. -	6. -	
	7. -	7. -	
F. Recommending victim services	F. Recommending victim services	F. Recommending victim services	F. Recommending victim services
1. NA			1.2
2. Law enforcement			2.0
3. Lab Personnel	1. NA	1. NA	3.0
4. Investigator	2. -	2. -	4.0
5. Prosecutors	3. -	3. -	5.0
6. Victim advocates	4. -	4. -	6.0
7. Other	5. -	5. -	7.0
	6. -	6. -	
	7. -	7. -	
G. Helping victims understand the court process	G. Helping victims understand the court process	G. Helping victims understand the court process	G. Helping victims understand the court process
1. NA			1.2
2. Law enforcement			2.0
3. Lab Personnel	1. NA	1. NA	3.0
4. Investigator	2. -	2. -	4.0
5. Prosecutors	3. -	3. -	

6. Victim advocates	-	-	5.0
7. Other	4. -	4. -	6.0
H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims	5. -	5. -	7.0
1. NA	6. -	6. -	H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims
2. Law enforcement	7. -	7. -	1.2
3. Lab Personnel	H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims	H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims	2.0
4. Investigator	1. NA	1. NA	3.0
5. Prosecutors	2. -	2. -	4.0
6. Victim advocates	3. -	3. -	5.0
7. Other	4. -	4. -	6.0
I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case	5. -	5. -	7.0
1. NA	6. -	6. -	I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case
2. Law enforcement	7. -	7. -	1.2
3. Lab Personnel	I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case	I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case	2.0
4. Investigator	1. NA	1. NA	3.0
5. Prosecutors	2. -	2. -	4.0
6. Victim advocates	3. -	3. -	5.0
7. Other	4. -	4. -	6.0
	5. -	5. -	7.0
	6. -	6. -	
	7. -	7. -	

Policies, Procedures, and Protocols

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
30. For each of the following policies/procedures please indicate if it has been established, it is under development, or has not yet been established/developed.			
A. SAK Evidence collection, storage, inventory, testing and tracking	A. SAK Evidence collection, storage, inventory, testing and tracking	A. SAK Evidence collection, storage, inventory, testing and tracking	A. SAK Evidence collection, storage, inventory, testing and tracking
1. NA			
2. Yes		1. -	
3. In Draft Form/ Under Development	1. -	2. -	1.0
4. No	2. -	3. -	2.0
	3. -	4. No	3.0

4. No

4. 2

B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information

- 1. -
- 2. Yes
- 3. -
- 4. -

B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information

- 1. -
- 2. Yes
- 3. -
- 4. -

B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information

- 1. 0
- 2. 2
- 3. 0
- 4. 0

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

- 1. 0
- 2. 0
- 3. 2
- 4. 0

D. The management of the multidisciplinary working group, to include case management, establishment of memoranda of understanding, information sharing methods, and active engagement of community based victim advocacy resources

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

D. The management of the multidisciplinary working group, to include case management, establishment of memoranda of understanding, information sharing methods, and active engagement of community based victim advocacy resources

- 1. -
- 2. Yes

D. The management of the multidisciplinary working group, to include case management, establishment of memoranda of understanding, information sharing methods, and active engagement of community based victim advocacy resources

- 1. -
- 2. Yes
- 3. -
- 4. -

D. The management of the multidisciplinary working group, to include case management, establishment of memoranda of understanding, information sharing methods, and active engagement of community based victim advocacy resources

- 1. 0

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing protocols and

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing

investigation (e.g., based on statute of limitations issues; the imminent release of an identified suspect from incarceration; an active serial offender; etc.)

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

F. Outsourcing of SAK testing and subsequent laboratory review and certification required, where applicable.

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

G. The reopening of previously closed cases as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

H. Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.) Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation

3. -

4. -

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing protocols and investigation (e.g., based on statute of limitations issues; the imminent release of an identified suspect from incarceration; an active serial offender; etc.)

1. -

2. Yes

3. -

4. -

F. Outsourcing of SAK testing and subsequent laboratory review and certification required, where applicable.

1. -

2. Yes

3. -

4. -

G. The reopening of previously closed cases as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process

1. -

2. -

3. In Draft Form/ Under Development

4. -

H. Training requirements

protocols and investigation (e.g., based on statute of limitations issues; the imminent release of an identified suspect from incarceration; an active serial offender; etc.)

1. -

2. Yes

3. -

4. -

F. Outsourcing of SAK testing and subsequent laboratory review and certification required, where applicable.

1. -

2. Yes

3. -

4. -

G. The reopening of previously closed cases as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process

1. -

2. -

3. In Draft Form/ Under Development

4. -

H. Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.) Training requirements specific to the SAKI project

2. 2

3. 0

4. 0

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing protocols and investigation (e.g., based on statute of limitations issues; the imminent release of an identified suspect from incarceration; an active serial offender; etc.)

1. 0

2. 2

3. 0

4. 0

F. Outsourcing of SAK testing and subsequent laboratory review and certification required, where applicable.

1. 0

2. 2

3. 0

4. 0

G. The reopening of previously closed cases as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process

1. 0

2. 0

3. 2

4. 0

methods; prosecution best practices, etc.)

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

I. Publicly sharing information regarding progress of SAKI in your jurisdiction, including the type of information that is listed on a departmental website (e.g., total number of unsubmitted kits, Number of SAKs submitted for testing to date, Number of CODIS Hits to date, Number of cases prosecuted and outcomes).

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

J. How CODIS hits are followed up on by the working group

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

K. Other 4

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. No

If other please explain

- Other

requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.)

Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.)

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

I. Publicly sharing information regarding progress of SAKI in your jurisdiction, including the type of information that is listed on a departmental website (e.g., total number of unsubmitted kits, Number of SAKs submitted for testing to date, Number of CODIS Hits to date, Number of cases prosecuted and outcomes).

- 1. -
- 2. -

(e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.)

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

I. Publicly sharing information regarding progress of SAKI in your jurisdiction, including the type of information that is listed on a departmental website (e.g., total number of unsubmitted kits, Number of SAKs submitted for testing to date, Number of CODIS Hits to date, Number of cases prosecuted and outcomes).

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

J. How CODIS hits are followed up on by the working group

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. In Draft Form/ Under Development
- 4. -

K. Other 4

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -

H. Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.) Training requirements specific to the SAKI project (e.g., victim-centered, cross-disciplinary approaches; the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs; investigation methods; prosecution best practices, etc.)

- 1. 0
- 2. 0
- 3. 2
- 4. 0

I. Publicly sharing information regarding progress of SAKI in your jurisdiction, including the type of information that is listed on a departmental website (e.g., total number of unsubmitted kits, Number of SAKs submitted for testing to date, Number of CODIS Hits to date, Number of cases prosecuted and outcomes).

	<p>3. In Draft Form/ Under Development</p> <p>4. -</p> <p>J. How CODIS hits are followed up on by the working group</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. -</p> <p>3. In Draft Form/ Under Development</p> <p>4. -</p> <p>K. Other 4</p> <p>1. NA</p> <p>2. -</p> <p>3. -</p> <p>4. -</p>	<p>cases prosecuted and outcomes).</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 2</p> <p>4. 0</p> <p>J. How CODIS hits are followed up on by the working group</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 2</p> <p>4. 0</p> <p>K. Other 4</p> <p>1. 2</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 0</p> <p>4. 0</p>
--	---	---

31. What information are you collecting from the SAKs? Select all that apply.

A. Victim Sex, Age, Race	A. Victim Sex, Age, Race	A. Victim Sex, Age, Race	A. 2
B. Suspect Sex, Age, Race	B. Suspect Sex, Age, Race	B. Suspect Sex, Age, Race	B. 2
C. How long ago the assault occurred (in years)	C. How long ago the assault occurred (in years)	C. How long ago the assault occurred (in years)	C. 2
D. Victim-Suspect relationship	D. Victim-Suspect relationship	D. Victim-Suspect relationship	D. 2
E. If assault involved multiple perpetrators	E. If assault involved	E. If assault involved multiple	E. 2

	multiple perpetrators	perpetrators	
F. If alcohol and/or drugs were involved	F. If alcohol and/or drugs were involved	F. If alcohol and/or drugs were involved	F. 2
G. Was a weapon used	G. Was a weapon used	G. Was a weapon used	G. 2
H. Time between assault and medical forensic exam	H. Time between assault and medical forensic exam	H. Time between assault and medical forensic exam	H. 2
I. If other, please explain	I. -	I. -	I. 0

32. Please indicate the development status for the following resources for victims and victim service providers as of the last day of the reporting period.

A. FAQ brochures	A. FAQ brochures	A. FAQ brochures	A. FAQ brochures
1. NA	1. -	1. NA	1. 1
2. Completed	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Currently drafting	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Plan on developing	4. Plan on developing	4. -	4. 1
B. Packet of community resources	B. Packet of community resources	B. Packet of community resources	B. Packet of community resources
1. NA	1. -	1. NA	1. 1
2. Completed	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Currently drafting	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Plan on developing	4. Plan on developing	4. -	4. 1
C. Flyers	C. Flyers	C. Flyers	C. Flyers
1. NA	1. -	1. NA	1. 1
2. Completed	2. -	2. -	2. 0
3. Currently drafting	3. -	3. -	3. 0
4. Plan on developing	4. Plan on developing	4. -	4. 1

D. Training materials
 1. NA
 2. Completed
 3. Currently drafting
 4. Plan on developing

D. Training materials
 1. -
 2. -
 3. -
 4. Plan on developing

D. Training materials
 1. NA
 2. -
 3. -
 4. -

D. Training materials
 1. 1
 2. 0
 3. 0
 4. 1

E. Other 3
 1. NA
 2. Completed
 3. Currently drafting
 4. Plan on developing

E. Other 3
 1. NA
 2. -
 3. -
 4. -

E. Other 3
 1. NA
 2. -
 3. -
 4. -

E. Other 3
 1. 2
 2. 0
 3. 0
 4. 0

If other please explain
 • Other

33. During the reporting period, did you share resources developed for victims with any of the following partners and/or other groups?

A. Victims
 1. NA
 2. Yes
 3. No

A. Victims
 1. -
 2. -
 3. No

A. Victims
 1. NA
 2. -
 3. -

A. Victims
 1. 1
 2. 0
 3. 1

B. Victim Advocacy Groups
 1. NA
 2. Yes
 3. No

B. Victim Advocacy Groups
 1. -
 2. -
 3. No

B. Victim Advocacy Groups
 1. NA
 2. -
 3. -

B. Victim Advocacy Groups
 1. 1
 2. 0
 3. 1

C. Law enforcement

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

C. Law enforcement

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. No

C. Law enforcement

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

C. Law enforcement

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. No

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1

E. Forensic Laboratories

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

E. Forensic Laboratories

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. No

E. Forensic Laboratories

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

E. Forensic Laboratories

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1

F. Investigative Officers

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

F. Investigative Officers

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. No

F. Investigative Officers

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

F. Investigative Officers

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1

G. Prosecutors

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

G. Prosecutors

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. No

G. Prosecutors

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

G. Prosecutors

- 1. 1
- 2. 0
- 3. 1

H. Other 1

- 1. NA
- 2. Yes
- 3. No

H. Other 1

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

H. Other 1

- 1. NA
- 2. -
- 3. -

H. Other 1

- 1. 2
- 2. 0
- 3. 0

If other please explain
 • Other

34. Do you have an electronic tracking system?

A. Yes

B. No

C. If yes, when was it implemented (Month/Year)

D. If no, please explain:

A. -

B. No

C. -

D. A request for proposal has been drafted and sent to the Utah State Procurement Office for our tracking system. To track performance

A. -

B. No

C. -

D. A request for proposal has been drafted and sent to the Utah State Procurement Office for our tracking system. To track performance measure data, we are using an excel spreadsheet. We have a demonstration scheduled to view Portland PD's Sexual

A. 0

B. 2

C. -

D. -

measure data, we are using an excel spreadsheet.

Assault Management System (SAMS) database on July 19, 2016.

35. How often did your program conduct the following activities during the reporting period?

A. Conduct analysis to better understand the problems with current SAK collection and storage

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. Don't know
- 3. Weekly
- 4. Monthly
- 5. Quarterly

A. Conduct analysis to better understand the problems with current SAK collection and storage

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

A. Conduct analysis to better understand the problems with current SAK collection and storage

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

A. Conduct analysis to better understand the problems with current SAK collection and storage

- 1. 2
- 2. 0
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0

B. Tracked activity, progress, or performance using a database or spreadsheet

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. Don't know
- 3. Weekly
- 4. Monthly
- 5. Quarterly

B. Tracked activity, progress, or performance using a database or spreadsheet

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

B. Tracked activity, progress, or performance using a database or spreadsheet

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

B. Tracked activity, progress, or performance using a database or spreadsheet

- 1. 2
- 2. 0
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. Don't know
- 3. Weekly
- 4. Monthly
- 5. Quarterly

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. 2
- 2. 0
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0

D. Performed public outreach (e.g., contacted potential victims, implemented focused media outreach)

1. Not Applicable
2. Don't know
3. Weekly
4. Monthly
5. Quarterly

E. Participated in community engagement activities (e.g. roundtables, community advisory boards)

1. Not Applicable
2. Don't know
3. Weekly
4. Monthly
5. Quarterly

F. Other 2

1. Not Applicable
2. Don't know
3. Weekly
4. Monthly
5. Quarterly

If other please explain
• Other

D. Performed public outreach (e.g., contacted potential victims, implemented focused media outreach)

1. Not Applicable
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -

E. Participated in community engagement activities (e.g. roundtables, community advisory boards)

1. Not Applicable
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -

F. Other 2

1. Not Applicable
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -

D. Performed public outreach (e.g., contacted potential victims, implemented focused media outreach)

1. Not Applicable
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -

E. Participated in community engagement activities (e.g. roundtables, community advisory boards)

1. -
2. -
3. -
4. Monthly
5. -

F. Other 2

1. Not Applicable
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -

D. Performed public outreach (e.g., contacted potential victims, implemented focused media outreach)

1. 2
2. 0
3. 0
4. 0
5. 0

E. Participated in community engagement activities (e.g. roundtables, community advisory boards)

1. 1
2. 0
3. 0
4. 1
5. 0

F. Other 2

1. 2
2. 0
3. 0
4. 0
5. 0

36. Are you or a partner conducting an evaluation of the SAKI program?

A. Yes	A. -	A. Yes	A. 1
B. No	B. No	B. -	B. 1
C. If Yes, please provide the following contact information for the person conducting the evaluation.	C. -	C. -	C. -
D. Name	D. -	D. Dr. Heather Melton	D. -
E. E-mail address	E. -	E. heather.melton@soc.utah.edu	E. -
F. Phone number	F. -	F. 801-581-3108	F. -

Training

Measure	01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016	01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016	Option Response Totals
37. Was training conducted for the working group members during the reporting period?			
A. Yes	A. Yes	A. -	A. 1
B. No	B. -	B. No	B. 1
38. During the reporting period, which of the following topics were covered in training sessions for the working group members? Select all that apply.			
A. Appropriate evidence collection techniques	A. -	A. -	A. 0
B. Value of forensic evidence	B. Value of forensic evidence	B. -	B. 1
C. Victimization and trauma response training	C. -	C. -	C. 0
D. Community/public relations	D. -	D. -	D. 0
E. Training to improve investigative or prosecutorial practices	E. -	E. -	E. 0
F. Training to optimize victim notification protocols	F. -	F. -	F. 0

G. If other, please explain

G. -

G. -

G. 0

Measure

01 Jan 2016 -
31 Mar 2016

01 Apr
2016 -
30 Jun
2016

**Cumulative
Total**

39. How many working group members were trained during the reporting period?

A. Law enforcement supervisors

A. 5

A. -

A. 5

B. Detectives/Investigators

B. 3

B. -

B. 3

C. Sexual assault nurse examiners/Forensic nurses

C. 4

C. -

C. 4

D. Forensic lab personnel

D. 4

D. -

D. 4

E. Prosecutors

E. 1

E. -

E. 1

F. Community-based victim advocates

F. 4

F. -

F. 4

G. System-based victim advocates

G. 5

G. -

G. 5

H. Other

H. 11

H. -

H. 11

Budget and Employment

Measure

01 Jan 2016 -
31 Mar 2016

01 Apr 2016 -
30 Jun 2016

Cumulative Total

40. During the reporting period, how many NEW positions were created using BJA-program funds?

A. Full-time positions

A. 1

A. 0

A. 1

B. Part-time positions

B. 0

B. 0

B. 0

Closeout Question (Last Reporting Period Only)

Measure

Text Response(s)

42. Please identify the main factors contributing to unsubmitted SAKs in your jurisdiction.

Measure

-

Option Response Totals

43. Does your working group feel the SAKI program enabled your jurisdiction to address the problems with unsubmitted SAKs?

44. Does your working group feel the SAKI program enabled policies and procedures to be enacted to solve sustainability and to make sure the problem of unsubmitted SAKs does not happen in the future?

Grantee Comments

No comments entered