



BJA BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

GMS Report Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) 2015-AK-BX-K003 Report Period: 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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 Sep 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 1 reporting period(s) of data, represented as follows:

- 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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. CAN/CF

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 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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: -)

#	Goal	Status	Progress & Barriers	Planned Activities
---	------	--------	---------------------	--------------------

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

3. Please enter the approximate **percentage** of funds allocated to each category below.

Baseline

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Cumulative Total
4. Was an inventory of unsubmitted SAKs completed prior to the grant being awarded?		
A. Yes	A. -	A. -
B. No	B. No	B. -
Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Option Response Totals
5. Enter the date the inventory was completed.		
Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Cumulative Total
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 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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)

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

2. During this reporting period

B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

2. During this reporting period

C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

2. During this reporting period

D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

2. During this reporting period

E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need

A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)

1. 0

2. 0

B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs

1. 0

2. 0

C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs

1. 0

2. 0

D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing

1. 0

2. 0

E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need

A. Number of SAKs counted during the reporting period (i.e. number of SAKS inventoried during the reporting period)

1. -

2. 0

B. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as unsubmitted SAKs

1. -

2. 0

C. Of those reported SAKs inventoried, how many were identified as previously tested SAKs

1. -

2. 0

D. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined not to require testing

1. -

2. 0

E. Of the unsubmitted SAKs inventoried, how many were determined to need

<p>DNA testing</p> <p>1. Cumulative (since start of award)</p> <p>2. During this reporting period</p> <p>F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing</p> <p>1. Cumulative (since start of award)</p> <p>2. During this reporting period</p> <p>G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)</p> <p>1. Cumulative (since start of award)</p> <p>2. During this reporting period</p>	<p>DNA testing</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 1349</p> <p>G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 814</p>	<p>DNA testing</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>F. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs determined to need DNA testing, how many were sent out for DNA testing</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. 1349</p> <p>G. How many kits have been tested to completion (i.e. a final laboratory report has been submitted)</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. 814</p>
<p>8. During the reporting period, how many unsubmitted SAKs were determined to not need testing for each of the following reasons.</p>		
<p>A. Not able to retrieve evidence</p> <p>B. Evidence contained in SAK would not impact investigation or prosecution</p> <p>C. Statute of limitations</p>	<p>A. 0</p> <p>B. 0</p> <p>C. 0</p> <p>D. 0</p>	<p>A. 0</p> <p>B. 0</p> <p>C. 0</p> <p>D. 0</p>

<p>D. Other</p> <p>E. If other, please explain</p>	<p>E. -</p>	
<p>Measure</p>	<p>01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016</p>	<p>Option Response Totals</p>
<p>9. During the reporting period, were DNA profiles from forensic analysis uploaded into CODIS from SAKs submitted for testing?</p>		
<p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. No</p> <p>C. If Yes, how many?</p>	<p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. -</p> <p>C. 302</p>	<p>A. 1</p> <p>B. 0</p> <p>C. -</p>
<p>Measure</p>	<p>01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016</p>	<p>Cumulative Total</p>
<p>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".)</p>		
<p>A. CODIS Hits (For the next two questions, make sure the numbers do not exceed the total number of CODIS hits)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of hits during the reporting period <p>B. Forensic Hits: the new profile matches DNA from an unknown forensic sample collected at a crime scene (i.e. the match is to a sample in the</p>	<p>A. CODIS Hits (For the next two questions, make sure the numbers do not exceed the total number of CODIS hits)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 105 <p>B. Forensic Hits: the new profile matches DNA from an unknown forensic sample collected at a crime scene (i.e. the match is to a sample in the</p>	<p>A. CODIS Hits (For the next two questions, make sure the numbers do not exceed the total number of CODIS hits)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 105 <p>B. Forensic Hits: the new profile matches DNA from an unknown forensic sample collected at a crime scene (i.e. the match is to a sample in the forensic</p>

forensic index)

- Number of hits during the reporting period

C. Offender/Arrestee Hits: the new profile matches the DNA of an offender of the arrestee profile already in CODIS (i.e. the match is to a sample in the offender index)

- Number of hits during the reporting period

forensic index)

- 3

C. Offender/Arrestee Hits: the new profile matches the DNA of an offender of the arrestee profile already in CODIS (i.e. the match is to a sample in the offender index)

- 102

index)

- 3

C. Offender/Arrestee Hits: the new profile matches the DNA of an offender of the arrestee profile already in CODIS (i.e. the match is to a sample in the offender index)

- 102

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

A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.

1. Cumulative (since start of award)
2. During this reporting period

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.**

1. Cumulative (since start of award)
2. During this reporting period

A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.

1. 0
2. 7

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.**

1. 0
2. 4

A. Hits in other state(s): the new profile matches the DNA of an unknown or known perpetrator in another state.

1. -
2. 7

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.**

1. -
2. 4

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

A. **Cold Hits:** when the DNA hits to an offender who was not previously listed as a suspect/person of interest in the case

- Number of hits during the reporting period

B. **Warm Hits:** when the DNA hits to a known/listed suspect in the case (an offender's profile may or may not have been uploaded to CODIS).

- Number of hits during the reporting period

C. **Serial Sex Offender:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were for a **Serial Sex Offender** (the sexual assault of two or more victims by the same offender(s), in separate events)?

- Number of hits during the reporting period

D. **Non-Sex Offender Hits:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were to offenders charged/convicted of **non-sexual offenses**

A. **Cold Hits:** when the DNA hits to an offender who was not previously listed as a suspect/person of interest in the case

- 8

B. **Warm Hits:** when the DNA hits to a known/listed suspect in the case (an offender's profile may or may not have been uploaded to CODIS).

- 4

C. **Serial Sex Offender:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were for a **Serial Sex Offender** (the sexual assault of two or more victims by the same offender(s), in separate events)?

- 0

D. **Non-Sex Offender Hits:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were to offenders charged/convicted of **non-sexual offenses**

A. **Cold Hits:** when the DNA hits to an offender who was not previously listed as a suspect/person of interest in the case

- 8

B. **Warm Hits:** when the DNA hits to a known/listed suspect in the case (an offender's profile may or may not have been uploaded to CODIS).

- 4

C. **Serial Sex Offender:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were for a **Serial Sex Offender** (the sexual assault of two or more victims by the same offender(s), in separate events)?

- 0

D. **Non-Sex Offender Hits:** Out of the **Previous CODIS hits to known offenders/arrestees**, how many were to offenders charged/convicted of **non-sexual offenses**

(e.g., robbery, assault, homicide)? • Number of hits during the reporting period	(e.g., robbery, assault, homicide)? • 12	(e.g., robbery, assault, homicide)? • 12
Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Option Response Totals
13. During the reporting period, what factors contributed to successfully submitting SAKs or improving your submission of SAKs? Select all that apply.		
A. Effective in-house records management system	A. -	A. 0
B. Proper protocols in place	B. Proper protocols in place	B. 1
C. Coordination with departmental leadership	C. Coordination with departmental leadership	C. 1
D. Sufficient amount of staff available	D. -	D. 0
E. Sufficient amount of laboratory staff available	E. -	E. 0
F. Effective in-house Training	F. -	F. 0
G. Access to money and/or other resources	G. -	G. 0
H. Diligent community-based victim services	H. -	H. 0
I. Understanding and responding to victim trauma	I. -	I. 0
J. Understanding of basic forensic investigative techniques	J. Understanding of basic forensic investigative techniques	J. 1
K. Understanding the	K. -	K. 0
L. -	L. -	

K. Understanding the importance of properly handling and testing SAKs

L. 0

L. If other, please explain

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. -

B. Employees questioning the validity of victims' reports/allegations

B. -

B. 0

C. Employees would benefit from more training

C. -

C. 0

D. New and improved protocols needed

D. -

D. 0

E. Employees would benefit from a better understanding of appropriate victim trauma response

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. 0

G. Need for a better evidence tracking system

G. -

G. 0

H. Chronic instability in departmental leadership

H. -

H. 0

I. Need for greater understanding of the value of testing kits

I. Need for greater understanding of the value of testing kits

I. 1

J. -

J. 0

J. If other, please explain

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

A. Yes

A. Yes

A. 1

B. No

B. -

B. 0

C. If yes, how many cases were forwarded for investigation

C. 79

C. -

Measure

**01 Jul 2016 -
30 Sep 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. 5

A. 5

B. Of those located, how many Victims were contacted

B. 4

B. 4

C. Of those contacted, how many agreed to actively participate in a new investigation resulting from the SAKI

C. 2

C. 2

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

• Number	• 5	• 5
----------	-----	-----

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

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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)	A. How many cases were charged? 1. 0	A. How many cases were charged? 1. -
---	---	---

2. During this reporting period

2.0

2.0

B. Had the charges dismissed?

B. Had the charges dismissed?

B. Had the charges dismissed?

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

1.0

1.-

2. During this reporting period

2.0

2.0

C. Resulted in a plea bargain?

C. Resulted in a plea bargain?

C. Resulted in a plea bargain?

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

1.0

1.-

2. During this reporting period

2.0

2.0

D. Ended with a conviction following a trial?

D. Ended with a conviction following a trial?

D. Ended with a conviction following a trial?

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

1.0

1.-

2. During this reporting period

2.0

2.0

E. Ended with an acquittal?

E. Ended with an acquittal?

E. Ended with an acquittal?

1. Cumulative (since start of award)

1.0

1.-

2. During this reporting period

2.0

2.0

<p>F. Ended in mistrial?</p> <p>1. Cumulative (since start of award)</p> <p>2. During this reporting period</p>	<p>F. Ended in mistrial?</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p>	<p>F. Ended in mistrial?</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. 0</p>
<p>Measure</p>	<p>01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016</p>	<p>Option Response Totals</p>
<p>20. During the reporting period, were there cases where prosecution was denied? (e.g., case was deemed to have insufficient evidence)?</p>		
<p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. No</p> <p>C. If Yes, how many times during the reporting period did this occur?</p>	<p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. -</p> <p>C. 3</p>	<p>A. 1</p> <p>B. 0</p> <p>C. -</p>
<p>21. During the reporting period, please select the reasons prosecution was denied. Select all that apply.</p>		
<p>A. Victims declined to participate</p> <p>B. Investigations resulted in insufficient evidence</p> <p>C. Cases involved expired statute of limitations</p>	<p>A. Victims declined to participate</p> <p>B. Investigations resulted in insufficient evidence</p> <p>C. -</p> <p>D. -</p>	<p>A. 1</p> <p>B. 1</p> <p>C. 0</p>

D. Report was determined to be unfounded by investigator or prosecutor	E. -	D. 0
E. Resource constraints	F. -	E. 0
F. Offender is already serving a long sentence for another crime	G. -	F. 0
G. Other		G. 0

22. Have you publicly shared any progress or success stories during this reporting period?

A. Yes	A. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. 1
C. If Yes, provide the link to your progress or success story	C. -	C. -

Measure	Text Response(s)
----------------	-------------------------

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

	<p>(01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016)</p> <p>We are currently working on a website to share information with the public. We also meet monthly with our multi-disciplinary team in Salt Lake County and quarterly with our statewide multi-disciplinary team where we share the information. When all of our SAKI team members are hired, we plan to have a press release.</p>
--	---

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Option Response Totals
24. Do you have an established regularly convening multidisciplinary working group ?		
A. Yes B. No C. If no, please explain:	A. Yes B. - C. -	A. 1 B. 0 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 B. Daily C. Weekly D. Monthly E. Quarterly F. Other G. If other, please explain	A. - B. - C. - D. Monthly E. - F. - G. -	A. 0 B. 0 C. 0 D. 1 E. 0 F. 0 G. -
Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Cumulative Total

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

<p>A. Number participating in the working group</p> <p>1. Number of ACTIVE partners during the reporting period</p> <p>2. Number of NEW partners during the reporting period</p> <p>B. Number of victim advocacy partners</p> <p>1. Number of ACTIVE partners during the reporting period</p> <p>2. Number of NEW partners during the reporting period</p>	<p>A. Number participating in the working group</p> <p>1. 45</p> <p>2. 7</p> <p>B. Number of victim advocacy partners</p> <p>1. 10</p> <p>2. 2</p>	<p>A. Number participating in the working group</p> <p>1. 45</p> <p>2. 7</p> <p>B. Number of victim advocacy partners</p> <p>1. 10</p> <p>2. 2</p>
<p>Measure</p>	<p>01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016</p>	<p>Option Response Totals</p>

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

<p>A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office)</p> <p>1. NA/Not Tracked</p> <p>2. Strongly Disagree</p> <p>3. Disagree</p> <p>4. Neither Agree nor Disagree</p> <p>5. Agree</p> <p>6. Strongly Agree</p>	<p>A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office)</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. -</p> <p>3. -</p> <p>4. -</p> <p>5. -</p> <p>6. Strongly Agree</p>	<p>A. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office)</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 0</p> <p>4. 0</p> <p>5. 0</p> <p>6. 1</p>
---	--	---

B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)

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

C. Federal law enforcement agencies

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

D. State law enforcement agencies

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

E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)

B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)

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

C. Federal law enforcement agencies

- 1. -
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. -
- 6. -

D. State law enforcement agencies

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

E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)

B. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office)

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

C. Federal law enforcement agencies

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

D. State law enforcement agencies

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

E. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators)

- 1. 0

1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	2.0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	3.0
3. Disagree	3. -	4.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	5.1
5. Agree	5. Agree	6.0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	

F. Crime victim/witness services	F. Crime victim/witness services	F. Crime victim/witness services
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. -	1.0
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2.0
3. Disagree	3. -	3.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4.0
5. Agree	5. Agree	5.1
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6.0

G. Pretrial service organizations	G. Pretrial service organizations	G. Pretrial service organizations
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1.1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2.0
3. Disagree	3. -	3.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4.0
5. Agree	5. -	5.0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6.0

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
	2. -	2.0
		3.0

- 2. Strongly Disagree
- 3. Disagree
- 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

- 3.0
- 4.0
- 5.0
- 6.0

I. Prosecution

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

I. Prosecution

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

I. Prosecution

- 1.0
- 2.0
- 3.0
- 4.0
- 5.1
- 6.0

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

- 1.1
- 2.0
- 3.0
- 4.0
- 5.0
- 6.0

K. Courts

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

K. Courts

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

K. Courts

- 1.1
- 2.0
- 3.0
- 4.0
- 5.0
- 6.0

Disagree		0.0
5. Agree	6. -	
6. Strongly Agree		
L. Community corrections (probation/parole)	L. Community corrections (probation/parole)	L. Community corrections (probation/parole)
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 0
M. Corrections	M. Corrections	M. Corrections
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 0
N. Health care providers	N. Health care providers	N. Health care providers
1. NA/Not Tracked	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
2. Strongly Disagree	2. -	2. 0
3. Disagree	3. -	3. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	4. -	4. 0
5. Agree	5. -	5. 0
6. Strongly Agree	6. -	6. 0
O. Mental health care	O. Mental health care	O. Mental health care

	providers	providers
O. Mental health care providers	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
1. NA/Not Tracked	2. -	2. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	3. -	3. 0
3. Disagree	4. -	4. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	5. -	5. 0
5. Agree	6. -	6. 0
6. Strongly Agree	P. Substance abuse treatment providers	P. Substance abuse treatment providers
P. Substance abuse treatment providers	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
1. NA/Not Tracked	2. -	2. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	3. -	3. 0
3. Disagree	4. -	4. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	5. -	5. 0
5. Agree	6. -	6. 0
6. Strongly Agree	Q. Child protective services	Q. Child protective services
Q. Child protective services	1. NA/Not Tracked	1. 1
1. NA/Not Tracked	2. -	2. 0
2. Strongly Disagree	3. -	3. 0
3. Disagree	4. -	4. 0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	5. -	5. 0
5. Agree	6. -	6. 0
6. Strongly Agree	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. 1
	2. -	2. 0

	--	
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	3.0
2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	4.0
3. Disagree	5. -	5.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. -	6.0
5. Agree		
6. Strongly Agree		
	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	1.1
1. NA/Not Tracked	2. -	2.0
2. Strongly Disagree	3. -	3.0
3. Disagree	4. -	4.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	5. -	5.0
5. Agree	6. -	6.0
6. Strongly Agree		
	T. Faith-based organizations	T. Faith-based organizations
T. Faith-based organizations	1. NA/Not Tracked	1.1
1. NA/Not Tracked	2. -	2.0
2. Strongly Disagree	3. -	3.0
3. Disagree	4. -	4.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	5. -	5.0
5. Agree	6. -	6.0
6. Strongly Agree		
	U. Subject matter experts	U. Subject matter experts
U. Subject matter experts	1. -	1.0

U. Subject matter experts

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

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. Strongly Agree

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.0

6.1

V. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations

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

1. NA/Not Tracked

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. -

1.1

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.0

6.0

W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)

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

W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)

1. -

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. Agree

6. -

W. Researcher, evaluator, or Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)

1.0

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.1

6.0

X. Training and technical

X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)

1. NA/Not Tracked

X. Training and technical assistance provider(s)

1.1

2.0

assistance provider(s)	2. -	2.0
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	3.0
2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	4.0
3. Disagree	5. -	5.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. -	6.0
5. Agree	Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies	Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies
6. Strongly Agree	1. NA/Not Tracked	1.1
Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies	2. -	2.0
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	3.0
2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	4.0
3. Disagree	5. -	5.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. -	6.0
5. Agree	A@. Forensic Laboratories	A@. Forensic Laboratories
6. Strongly Agree	1. -	1.0
A@. Forensic Laboratories	2. -	2.0
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	3.0
2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	4.0
3. Disagree	5. -	5.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. Strongly Agree	6.1
5. Agree	AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses	AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses
6. Strongly Agree	1. -	1.0
AA. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners/Forensic Nurses	2. -	2.0
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	3.0
		4.0

2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	5.0
3. Disagree	5. -	6.1
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. Strongly Agree	AB. Other
5. Agree	AB. Other	1.1
6. Strongly Agree	1. NA/Not Tracked	2.0
AB. Other	2. -	3.0
1. NA/Not Tracked	3. -	4.0
2. Strongly Disagree	4. -	5.0
3. Disagree	5. -	6.0
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree	6. -	
5. Agree		
6. Strongly Agree		
If other please explain		
• Other		

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. -	A. 0
B. No	B. No	B. 1
C. If yes, please describe who this partner is and the nature of this partnership.	C. -	C. -

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

A. Inventorying the SAKs

- 1. NA
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. Lab Personnel
- 4. Investigator
- 5. Prosecutors
- 6. Victim advocates
- 7. Other

A. Inventorying the SAKs

- 1. -
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -
- 7. -

A. Inventorying the SAKs

- 1. 0
- 2. 1
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0
- 7. 0

B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing

- 1. NA
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. Lab Personnel
- 4. Investigator
- 5. Prosecutors
- 6. Victim advocates
- 7. Other

B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing

- 1. -
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -
- 7. -

B. Submitting SAKs for forensic testing

- 1. 0
- 2. 1
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0
- 7. 0

C. Collecting information from SAKs

- 1. NA
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. Lab Personnel
- 4. Investigator
- 5. Prosecutors
- 6. Victim advocates

C. Collecting information from SAKs

- 1. -
- 2. Law enforcement
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. -
- 6. -

C. Collecting information from SAKs

- 1. 0
- 2. 1
- 3. 0
- 4. 0
- 5. 0
- 6. 0
- 7. 0

7. Other

D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

F. Recommending victim services

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

7. -

D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system

1. NA

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. -

7. -

E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)

1. -

2. Law enforcement

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. -

7. -

F. Recommending victim services

1. -

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

D. Entering status of SAKs into tracking system

1. 1

2. 0

3. 0

4. 0

5. 0

6. 0

7. 0

E. Following up on CODIS hits (i.e., informing workgroup members)

1. 0

2. 1

3. 0

4. 0

5. 0

6. 0

7. 0

F. Recommending victim services

1. 0

2. 0

3. 0

4. 0

5. 0

6. 1

7. 0

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

G. Helping victims understand the court process

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case

1. NA

2. Law enforcement

3. Lab Personnel

4. Investigator

5. Prosecutors

6. Victim advocates

7. -

G. Helping victims understand the court process

1. -

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. Victim advocates

7. -

H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims

1. -

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

6. Victim advocates

7. -

I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case

1. -

2. -

3. -

4. -

5. -

G. Helping victims understand the court process

1.0

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.0

6.1

7.0

H. Coordinating meetings and appointments with victims

1.0

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.0

6.1

7.0

I. Keeps victim(s) informed about their case

1.0

2.0

3.0

4.0

5.0

6.1

7.0

6. Victim advocates

6. Victim advocates

7. Other

7. -

Policies, Procedures, and Protocols

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 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
1. NA	1. -	1. 0
2. Yes	2. Yes	2. 1
3. In Draft Form/ Under Development	3. -	3. 0
4. No	4. -	4. 0
B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information	B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information	B. Type of information collected from SAKs and personnel responsible for collection of information
1. NA	1. -	1. 0
2. Yes	2. Yes	2. 1
3. In Draft Form/ Under Development	3. -	3. 0
4. No	4. -	4. 0

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

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

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing protocols and investigation (e.g., based on statute of limitations issues; the

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

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

C. Victim engagement notification, information sharing and support services

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

E. Identification of cases that require expedited testing protocols and

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

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. Yes
- 3. -
- 4. -

H. Training requirements

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. 1
- 3. 0
- 4. 0

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

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

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

I. Publically 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

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. Publically 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

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. 1
4. 0

I. Publically 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

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

1. NA

2. Yes

3. In Draft Form/ Under Development

4. No

If other please explain

- Other

up on by the working group

1. -

2. -

3. In Draft Form/ Under Development

4. -

K. Other

1. NA

2. -

3. -

4. -

date, number of CODIS Hits to date, Number of cases prosecuted and outcomes).

1. 0

2. 0

3. 1

4. 0

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

1. 0

2. 0

3. 1

4. 0

K. Other

1. 1

2. 0

3. 0

4. 0

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

<p>A. Victim Sex, Age, Race</p> <p>B. Suspect Sex, Age, Race</p> <p>C. How long ago the assault occurred (in years)</p> <p>D. Victim-Suspect relationship</p> <p>E. If assault involved multiple perpetrators</p> <p>F. If alcohol and/or drugs were involved</p> <p>G. Was a weapon used</p> <p>H. Time between assault and medical forensic exam</p> <p>I. If other, please explain</p>	<p>A. Victim Sex, Age, Race</p> <p>B. Suspect Sex, Age, Race</p> <p>C. How long ago the assault occurred (in years)</p> <p>D. Victim-Suspect relationship</p> <p>E. If assault involved multiple perpetrators</p> <p>F. If alcohol and/or drugs were involved</p> <p>G. Was a weapon used</p> <p>H. Time between assault and medical forensic exam</p> <p>I. -</p>	<p>A. 1</p> <p>B. 1</p> <p>C. 1</p> <p>D. 1</p> <p>E. 1</p> <p>F. 1</p> <p>G. 1</p> <p>H. 1</p> <p>I. 0</p>
---	--	---

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.

<p>A. FAQ brochures</p> <p>1. NA</p> <p>2. Completed</p> <p>3. Currently drafting</p> <p>4. Plan on developing</p>	<p>A. FAQ brochures</p> <p>1. -</p> <p>2. -</p> <p>3. -</p> <p>4. Plan on developing</p>	<p>A. FAQ brochures</p> <p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 0</p> <p>4. 1</p>
--	--	---

B. Packet of community resources

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

B. Packet of community resources

1. -
2. -
3. -
4. Plan on developing

B. Packet of community resources

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

C. Flyers

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

C. Flyers

1. -
2. -
3. -
4. Plan on developing

C. Flyers

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

E. Other

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

E. Other

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

E. Other

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

A. Victims

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

B. Victim Advocacy Groups

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

B. Victim Advocacy Groups

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

B. Victim Advocacy Groups

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

C. Law enforcement

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

C. Law enforcement

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

C. Law enforcement

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

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

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

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

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

D. Sexual Assault Forensic Officers

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

E. Forensic Laboratories

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

E. Forensic Laboratories

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

E. Forensic Laboratories

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

F. Investigative Officers

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

F. Investigative Officers

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

F. Investigative Officers

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

G. Prosecutors

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

G. Prosecutors

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

G. Prosecutors

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

H. Other

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

H. Other

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

H. Other

- 1. 1
- 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 measure data, we are using an excel spreadsheet. We viewed Portland PD's Sexual Assault Management System (SAMS) database on July 19, 2016 and planned to install the database, however have struggled with installation. We are currently exploring other options. We have are planning to demo Idaho's software currently being developed, speak again to Stacs DNA, and discuss options within Utah's current infrastructure.

A. 0

B. 1

C. -

D. -

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. -
- 2. -
- 3. -
- 4. -
- 5. Quarterly

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

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

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

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

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

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. Don't know

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. Not Applicable
- 2. -

C. Administered victim/community satisfaction survey(s)

- 1. 1
- 2. 0

3. Weekly

3. -

3. 0

4. Monthly

4. -

4. 0

5. Quarterly

5. -

5. 0

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

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

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

1. Not Applicable

1. Not Applicable

2. Don't know

2. -

1. 1

3. Weekly

3. -

2. 0

4. Monthly

4. -

3. 0

5. Quarterly

5. -

4. 0

5. 0

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

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

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

1. Not Applicable

1. -

2. Don't know

2. -

1. 0

3. Weekly

3. -

2. 0

4. Monthly

4. Monthly

3. 0

5. Quarterly

5. -

4. 1

5. 0

F. Other

F. Other

F. Other

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

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

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

If other please explain

- Other

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

A. Yes

A. Yes

A. 1

B. No

B. -

B. 0

C. If Yes, please provide the following contact information for the person conducting the evaluation.

C. -

C. -

D. Dr. Heather Melton

E. heather.melton@soc.utah.edu

D. -

F. 801-581-3108

E. -

D. Name

E. E-mail address

F. -

F. Phone number

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Option Response Totals
37. Was training conducted for the working group members during the reporting period?		
A. Yes	A. Yes	A. 1
B. No	B. -	B. 0
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. 0
B. Value of forensic evidence	B. Value of forensic evidence	B. 1
	C. -	C. 0
C. Victimization and trauma response training	D. -	D. 0
D. Community/public relations	E. Training to improve investigative or prosecutorial practices	E. 1
E. Training to improve investigative or prosecutorial practices	F. Training to optimize victim notification protocols	F. 1
F. Training to optimize victim notification protocols	G. -	G. 0
G. If other, please explain		
Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Cumulative Total

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

A. Law enforcement supervisors	A. 8	A. 8
B. Detectives/Investigators	B. 6	B. 6
C. Sexual assault nurse examiners/Forensic nurses	C. 3	C. 3
D. Forensic lab personnel	D. 6	D. 6
E. Prosecutors	E. 3	E. 3
F. Community-based victim advocates	F. 3	F. 3
G. System-based victim advocates	G. 7	G. 7
H. Other	H. 9	H. 9

Budget and Employment

Measure	01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016	Cumulative Total
40. During the reporting period, how many NEW positions were created using BJA-program funds?		
A. Full-time positions	A. 0	A. 0
B. Part-time positions	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