Westat

Improving Lives Through Research®

The Evaluation of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Sexual Assault Kit Initiative

Case Analysis and Feasibility Assessment Report

December 2020

Submitted to:
Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

Submitted by:
Westat
An Employee-Owned Research Corporation®
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3129
(301) 251-1500

College of Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77340

SAKI CASE ANALYSIS AND FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT REPORT
(Award No. 2016-AK-BX-K020)

Co-Primary Investigators:
Debra Rog, Westat
Susan Chibnall, Westat
William Wells, Sam Houston State University

Project Director:
Jessica Taylor
Westat
1700 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-314-5852
Email: JessicaTaylor@Westat.com

Research Associates:
Bernadette Blanchfield, Westat
Erin Bauer, Westat

**This research project was supported by Award No. 2016-AK-BX-K020 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. We would like to thank the four sites that participated in the instrument development and two sites that participated in data collection for their involvement and assistance in this study. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice or of the participating SAKI sites.

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

Appendices

Introduction

Overview of the National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) Program and Evaluation Project

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) established the National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) in 2015 awarding over $30 million of grant funds to 20 sites across the country 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)" (U.S. Department of Justice, FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement, 2015). The goals of the initiative are to: (1) eliminate unsubmitted SAK issues and solve violent crimes by creating a coordinated community response that ensures just resolution to cases through a victim-centered approach, and (2) build jurisdictions' capacity to prevent the development of conditions that lead to high numbers of unsubmitted SAKs. Funding may be used to inventory, test, and track previously unsubmitted SAKs, upload all eligible DNA profiles obtained with SAKI funding to the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS), and produce necessary protocols and policies in support of improved coordination and collaboration among laboratories, police, prosecutors, and victim service providers in response to the emergent evidence and casework. Sites may also use the funding to assign designated personnel to pursue new investigative leads and prosecutions that result from evidence and CODIS hits produced by tested SAKs and to support victims throughout the investigation and prosecution process (U.S. Department of Justice, FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement, 2015).

In 2016, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) awarded the Westat Team (hereafter referred to as Westat) a contract to conduct an initial evaluation of sites funded in FY 2015 to inform plans for a long-term outcome evaluation of the SAKI program. This report summarizes findings from the case analysis and feasibility study component, for which Westat assessed case characteristics and outcomes of previously unsubmitted SAK cases as well as the feasibility of collecting and using case level data for an evaluation of the SAKI program.

Examining Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit Case Files

Responding to sexual assault victims is a complex, potentially iterative process that requires hospitals, police departments, crime labs, victim advocacy service providers, and prosecutor's offices to coordinate in a community-wide effort. These agencies and organizations have often encountered challenges in responding to victims due to insufficient resources and capacity, historical biases and beliefs about sexual assault crimes, unclear protocols, or inadequate staff training, resulting in sexual assault kits (SAKs) being uncollected, collected improperly, unsubmitted, or untested. Examining criminal case files can provide information about the circumstances by which sexual assault cases proceed through the justice system and highlight ways to reduce the number of unsubmitted SAKs through improved policy and training. Detailed information regarding the incidents, victims, and suspects may be obtained from case files, as well as the course of action taken by investigators and prosecutors in both the original and follow-up investigations after SAK testing is completed. Case files may also contain contextual details not typically captured by administrative data regarding key reasons for suspending investigations such as the nature and degree of victim participation in the investigation, victim credibility concerns, whether police personnel interviewed suspects, and whether police requested prosecutors issue an arrest warrant.

Purpose of Case Analysis and Feasibility Assessment

Given the potential utility of criminal case file data, the original purposes of these case analyses were to (1) gain an understanding of unsubmitted SAK case characteristics (at the time of the offense) using a large sample of cases across multiple jurisdictions and (2) to document forensic testing results, investigation activities, and prosecution outcomes of these cases after SAK testing. By examining data disaggregated to the criminal case level, the aim of the case-level analysis was to assess critical variables across multiple SAKI sites and shed light on the way testing impacted criminal case processing and case outcomes. Due to unanticipated challenges, as discussed throughout this report, Westat broadened the purpose of the case analysis component to assess the feasibility and utility of collecting and analyzing case-level data from multiple sites as part of a future SAKI outcome evaluation. The two primary research questions addressed by this case analysis and feasibility assessment are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Case Analysis and Feasibility Assessment Research Questions

1. In selected sites, what are the key characteristics associated with unsubmitted sexual assault incidents, victims, and offenders, including those characteristics associated with post-testing case decisions and outcomes?

2. What is the feasibility/utility of collecting case-level data for an outcome evaluation and what are the requirements?

Methodology

This section describes the methodology Westat employed to address the first research question, which involved collecting and analyzing case-level data from a subset of FY 2015 SAKI sites. To answer research question 2, we drew on our direct experience conducting this case analysis, such as seeking sites willing to participate in data sharing activities, to inform the recommendations regarding the feasibility and utility of case-level data for a future national evaluation of SAKI. Although the methodology described in this section focuses on research question 1, executing the methodology served as the primary data source for answering research question 2.

Sampling Approach and Site Recruitment

Using a set of defined criteria, Westat identified sites well-suited for participating in sharing case-level data. Of the 17 FY 2015 SAKI sites involved in the evaluability assessment, Westat contacted nine to assess further the site's capacity to provide case-level data and to solicit participation. Figure 2 lists the initial sampling criteria used for selecting sites to participate in this study component.

Figure 2. Initial Sampling Criteria for Site Selection

- ✓ Engaging in activities across all stages of kit processing (inventory, submission/testing, investigation, and prosecution)
- ✓ Organized framework for collecting and sharing case-level data
- ✓ Demonstrated interest in participating

Westat shared potential benefits of participating in the case analysis and feasibility assessment with these nine sites, including receipt of a de-identified multi-site case-level data file, opportunities to collaborate on study products, and information sharing regarding case-level outcomes of the participating sites' SAKI efforts. Although many of the sites were interested in participating, recruiting sites for participation presented many challenges. For example, though sites were engaged in all stages of kit processing, several sites had only begun work in latter stages of kit processing and would therefore not yet have data on SAK testing results or post-SAK testing case outcomes (i.e., follow-up investigation and prosecution activities). Many sites lacked sufficient staffing and other resources necessary for participating, and sites frequently faced administrative and legal constraints to data sharing (e.g., needing to obtain authorization from multiple layers of city administrators prior

to sharing case-level data). Four of the nine sites participated in the initial stages of the case-level data sharing project, including development of the data collection instrument. Westat ultimately obtained case-level data from two sites—one city-level (Site 1) and one county-level (Site 2) site.

Development of the Data Collection Instrument

Westat worked with four sites to develop a data collection instrument that captured information about the incident, victim, suspect, and investigation activities of each case. The instrument included measures of characteristics and activities at the time of the original investigation (i.e., before SAK testing) and at the time of the follow-up investigation (after SAK testing). Personnel from the participating sites and the Westat Team held several meetings during which they reached agreement upon a final set of variables. This group also undertook the challenging task of interpreting terms, definitions, and case processes that differed across sites. These differences resulted from the somewhat distinct nature of state and local criminal justice systems, policies, and laws. The items included in the final data collection instrument were also grounded in previous research that collected data from sexual assault criminal investigation files. The final data collection instrument and guide is presented in Appendix A.

Data Sharing and Collection

Westat established Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs) with three partner sites[1]; the MOA described site-specific terms of participation and details about data sharing. It took significant time and resources to finalize the MOAs between Westat and the partner sites, which had to be completed before data collection and sharing could begin. This was largely due to bureaucratic delays in identifying procedures, writing the MOAs, and reviewing and approving documents.

The data collection and data sharing methods differed between the two participating sites. Site 1, a city-level site without a research partner, provided electronic law enforcement agency case files and spreadsheets that contained SAK forensic testing results to Westat for all cases in their SAKI inventory. Site 2, a county-level site with a research partner, shared an electronic database with Westat that contained case-level data as specified in the data collection instrument for all cases in

[1] Although Westat secured data sharing agreements with three sites, ultimately only two sites were able to provide case-level data for this study. The third site opted out of the project because personnel were over-extended with SAKI and other project commitments.

their SAKI inventory. The sites initially shared information on a combined total of 1,287 previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits and associated cases. Due to time and resource constraints, as well as participating sites' focus on cases associated with kits that contained foreign DNA and resulted in CODIS hits, Westat research staff extracted and recorded information from Site 1's case files for only those cases in which foreign DNA was identified during SAK forensic testing (n = 137 of 557 cases). Research staff did not extract information from files associated with cases in which DNA was not identified during SAK forensic testing. Site 1's initial dataset included information on the 137 DNA cases. Site 2's initial dataset included information on 730 cases (439 cases in which foreign DNA was identified during SAK testing and 291 cases in which foreign DNA was not identified). Because data availability and data collection methodologies for this study differed between the two participating sites, Westat research staff expended substantial time and effort to closely examine and compare each dataset to identify and resolve any inconsistencies prior to combining them for analysis. Westat combined the two data files once all inconsistencies between the two files were resolved.

Analysis Sample, Measures, and Approach

Westat defined the analysis sample, measures, and analytic approach with the intent to answer the first research question: What are the key characteristics associated with unsubmitted sexual assault incidents, victims, and offenders, including those characteristics associated with post-testing case decisions and outcomes? Conducting the case-level analysis also informed findings for research question 2 on the feasibility and utility of case-level data for a national SAKI evaluation.

Analytic Sample

Westat defined two analytic samples for the case analysis: (1) cases in which foreign DNA was identified during SAK forensic testing (n=576) and (2) cases in which SAK testing resulted in a CODIS hit (n=154). Westat also conducted analyses on cases from two distinct time periods: (1) at the time of the original investigation (before SAK testing) and (2) at the time of the follow-up investigation (after SAK testing). Analyses conducted on variables measured at the time of the original investigation are presented for all DNA cases (n=576). Findings related to the follow-up investigation are presented for CODIS-hit cases only (n=154). Because a CODIS hit represents a potentially new investigative lead in a case, examining the sample of CODIS-hit cases at the time of

the follow-up investigation is of particular interest to assess the progression of SAKI cases through the justice system.

Measures

Forensic Testing Results

The data collection instrument captured data on SAK screening and testing results, including whether a DNA profile was uploaded to CODIS and whether the uploaded CODIS profile resulted in a CODIS hit. Although not captured by the data collection instrument, both sites also provided information on whether SAK testing resulted in a foreign DNA profile and whether the foreign DNA profile was eligible for CODIS upload. These measures are all dichotomous (i.e., coded 1 = yes, 0 = no).

Victim Characteristics

The data collection instrument also captured information on victim characteristics including victim age, gender (i.e., Male/Female), and race/ethnicity (White non-Hispanic; Black non-Hispanic; Latina, Chicana, Hispanic; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander). Westat also created a dichotomous measure for victim age (0 = juvenile, 1 = adult) and victim race (0 = non-White, 1 = White non-Hispanic). Victim characteristics were measured at the time of the offense.

Case and Investigation Characteristics

The data collection instrument also included items measuring case characteristics. Most case characteristics were measured only once on the data collection instrument because they remain constant over time (i.e., they do not change with the evolution of the case). The instrument captured critical dates including the date the offense occurred, date the offense was reported to the police, and the SAK collection date. Westat calculated the number of days between the offense and SAK collection date and between the offense and date offense was reported to police. We also created a dichotomous variable to measure whether the offense was promptly reported to the police (within 7 days; 0 = no, 1 = yes). Additional items on case characteristics measured whether the offense involved one victim or multiple victims (0 = one victim, 1 = multiple victims) and whether the

victim reported additional injuries by the suspect during the offense (0 = no, 1 = yes). These case characteristics were measured once by the instrument (i.e., they remain constant over time). Whether a victim advocate was involved with the case (0 = no, 1 = yes), which is critical to a victim-centered approach when responding to sexual assault cases, was measured during both the original and the follow-up investigations.

The data collection instrument also captured whether the case files included any victim credibility concerns, which may influence whether an investigator moves forward with a case. The concerns captured in the instrument include, for example, inconsistency in the victim's story, evidence contradicts victim's story, victim's inability to verbalize/articulate details, lack of witness corroboration, and/or victim engaged in risky behavior. Westat created a dichotomous variable to indicate whether or not any victim credibility concerns were documented in the case file at any time (0 = no, 1 = yes). Victim credibility concerns were measured only once in the instrument and are not tied specifically to either the original investigation or follow-up investigation.

The data collection instrument also included items measuring investigation activities including whether investigators made contact with the victim during the investigation (0 = no, 1 = yes) and the number of suspects interviewed. Westat created an indicator variable for suspect interviewed, which was coded 1 = yes if one or more suspects were interviewed and 0 = no if no suspects were interviewed. These variables were measured at the time of both the original investigation and follow-up investigation.

Finally, the instrument captured whether the victim agreed to participate in the investigation for both time periods (0 = no, 1 = yes). Similar to victim credibility concerns, whether a victim participated in the investigation may influence whether an investigator moves forward with a case.

Case Outcomes

The data collection instrument also captured information on investigation and prosecution outcomes for both the original investigation and follow-up investigation. First, the instrument captured information about why law enforcement ended the original investigation and follow-up investigation (if applicable) in these cases, which is distinct from the official case closure status. Because these items were "select all reasons that apply," the categories are not mutually exclusive. Reasons for ending the investigation include, for example, cases where investigators were unable to

contact the victim, victim declined to participate in the investigation, and there was insufficient evidence to continue. The data collection instrument also measured several dichotomous case outcomes, measured at both time periods, including whether the case was presented to the district attorney (DA) for charges/arrest warrant, whether the DA accepted the charges, and whether an arrest was made (0 = no, 1 = yes). For the follow-up investigation time period, the instrument also measured whether a suspect was convicted (0 = no, 1 = yes). Finally, the data collection instrument captured information on the official case closure status at the time of the original investigation and follow-up investigation, categories which were treated as mutually exclusive (i.e., not "select all that apply"). The few cases with multiple responses to the case closure status at either time point were treated as missing.

Suspect Characteristics

Finally, the data collection instrument captured suspect characteristics for only those cases in which a primary suspect was investigated during the follow-up investigation, after SAK testing. Similar to victim characteristics, suspect characteristics measured included suspect age, sex, race/ethnicity, and relationship between the suspect and victim (i.e., stranger, current intimate partner, former intimate partner, family member, friend, acquaintance). Westat also created a dichotomous suspect age variable (0 = juvenile, 1 = adult).

Analytic Approach

Westat first conducted univariate analyses on data elements capturing forensic testing results to identify the analytic sample. Westat also conducted univariate analyses on variables measured at the time of the original investigation for all DNA cases. For descriptive purposes, we present the following case-level univariate findings: forensic testing results, victim characteristics, case characteristics, investigation activities, and case outcomes. For forensic testing results, we present number of kits for each testing outcome (DNA, CODIS eligible, CODIS upload, CODIS hit) and both conditional and unconditional percentages. The unconditional percentages are based on the full sample of 1,287 of DNA and non-DNA cases. Conditional percentages show how the results change contingent on previous outcomes and are based on denominators from the immediate testing step prior. For example, a DNA profile will not be uploaded to CODIS if it is not CODIS-eligible, and therefore would not be included in the denominator when calculating percentage of

cases uploaded to CODIS. Cases with missing data are excluded from the denominators and cases with missing data at one stage, such as CODIS profile upload, are also missing data on subsequent stages, such as whether a CODIS hit was returned. For all other measures, we present number of cases, percentages based on all cases (i.e., including cases with missing data and items skipped due to skip patterns), and percentages based on valid cases only.

Next, Westat estimated bivariate relationships between key variables at the time of the original investigation for all DNA cases. We selected the following key variables for additional analyses: (1) whether a suspect (one or more) was interviewed, (2) whether the victim agreed to participate in the investigation, (3) whether the case was presented to a district attorney for charges/arrest warrant, and (4) whether an arrest was made. These variables were selected for closer examination because they represent significant aspects of investigations. For instance, victim participation has consistently been found to be associated with case progression. In addition, investigators conducting suspect interviews, presenting cases to a district attorney, and making arrests are all direct indicators of investigation progress. Westat assessed the association between each of these key variables and some combination of the following measures: whether the victim participated in the investigation, victim age (i.e., juvenile/adult), victim race (White/non-White), whether the offense was reported promptly to police (i.e., within 7 days), whether there was any documented victim credibility concerns, whether the victim reported additional injuries by the suspect during the offense, and whether the suspect was interviewed for the investigation. We examined these case characteristics because of their potential relationship to case progression. For example, case progression may be more likely when victim credibility concerns were absent, when the victim was injured, and when the offense was promptly reported. In addition, the analysis sought to explore relationships between victim demographic characteristics and case progression. We assessed bivariate relationships using chi-square statistics to test for significant differences. We present number of cases, row percents, chi-square statistics, and *p* values in the results tables. Cases with missing data were excluded from the analyses.

Westat then conducted univariate analyses on variables measured at the time of follow-up investigation on CODIS-hit cases including investigation activities, suspect characteristics, and case outcomes. These analyses serve to describe the follow-up investigation and prosecution activities in which sites engaged as of the time of data collection. Similar to univariate findings at the time of the

original investigation, for univariate follow-up investigation findings we present percentages based on all cases and percentages based on valid cases only.

It is important to note that at the time of data collection for this study component, sites had not completed SAK testing, follow-up investigation, or prosecution activities for all cases in the sample. Therefore, missing data on variables measured at the time of the follow-up investigation was expected. There was no follow-up investigation information yet available for about two-thirds of the CODIS-hit cases. All findings presented for the follow-up investigation time period are as of the time of data collection and should be interpreted with this in mind. Additional time would be necessary to capture complete data on follow-up investigation and prosecution activities.

Westat conducted bivariate analyses on key follow-up investigation measures for CODIS-hit cases, including whether a suspect was investigated during the follow-up investigation, whether a suspect was interviewed, whether the victim participated in the investigation, whether the case was presented to the district attorney for charges/arrest warrant, and whether an arrest was made. Most of these analyses consisted of too few cases to report results after cases with missing data were excluded from the analysis. However, we do present limited results based on the bivariate analyses for follow-up investigation measures. Detailed results are available upon request.

Case-Level Findings

Forensic Testing Results

Table 1 shows the forensic testing results of the kits included in this sample. As described in the methodology section, Westat used the SAK testing results to retroactively define the two main analytic samples: (1) DNA cases (n=576) and (2) cases with a CODIS hit (n=154), which are bolded in Table 1.

Table 1. Forensic Testing Results

Testing Status	N	Unconditional %	Conditional %
Number of kits screened (DNA + non DNA cases)	1,287[a]	100%	100%
Screened positive for biological evidence/DNA	**576**	44.8%	44.8%
Biological evidence/DNA CODIS eligible	410	31.9%	71.2%
CODIS Upload[b]	370	29.6%	99.7%
CODIS Hit[c]	**154**	12.7%	45.6%

[a]Ten kits from Site 2 with unknown DNA/biological evidence status were excluded from this count.
[b]Data were missing on CODIS upload status for 39 CODIS-eligible DNA cases, so the unconditional percent is based on 1,248 cases. Conditional percent is based on 371 CODIS-eligible DNA kits with valid data.
[c]Unconditional percent is based on 1,216 cases. At the time of data collection, CODIS hit status was missing for 71 DNA cases. Conditional percent is based on 338 CODIS-upload cases with valid data, which excludes the 71 cases with missing data and the one case with CODIS-eligible DNA that was not uploaded to CODIS. At the time of data collection, data were missing on CODIS hit status for 32 CODIS upload cases.

Of the 576 kits that screened positive for biological evidence/DNA, 410 (71.2%) contained a CODIS-eligible DNA profile. CODIS administrators uploaded 370 CODIS-eligible profiles (99.7% of 371 kits). About 46 percent of profiles uploaded to CODIS resulted in a CODIS hit (n=154 of 338), which is about 13 percent of the unconditional sample count (154 of 1,216 kits). Missing information on CODIS hit status is not unexpected given testing of SAKs was not completed at the time of data collection.

Univariate Analyses on DNA Cases at the Time of the Original Investigation

Victim Characteristics

As shown in Table 2, most cases involved adult victims (n=495 of 573 cases, 86.4%), with victims ranging in age from 2 to 82 years at the time of the offense (mean = 26.8 years for 573 cases). Nearly all cases involved female victims (n=553 of 576, 96.0%). About 71% of victims were White non-Hispanic, 15% of victims were Black non-Hispanic, and 14% were Latina/Chicana/Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Other Pacific Islander.

Table 2. Victim Characteristics

Variable	n (n=576)	Percent	Valid Percent
Victim age			
Juvenile	78	13.5	13.6
Adult	495	85.9	86.4
Missing	3	0.5	
Mean = 26.8 Med = 24 SD = 10.4			
Victim sex			
Male	23	4.0	4.0
Female	553	96.0	96.0
Victim race			
White non-Hispanic	394	68.4	70.6
Black non-Hispanic	86	14.9	15.4
Latina, Chicana, Hispanic	49	8.5	8.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	2.6	2.7
Asian, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander	14	2.4	2.5
Missing	18	3.1	

Case and Original Investigation Characteristics

Table 3 presents case characteristics and characteristics of the original investigation. The 576 DNA cases were associated with offenses that occurred between 1986 and 2019.[2] Of the 542 cases with data on date offense occurred and date sexual assault kit was collected, kits were collected on the

[2] Note, 18 of 576 cases (3.1%) had no data about the offense date.

same day of the offense in 340 cases (62.7%), within one week of the offense in 196 cases (36.1%), with the remaining kits collected more than 7 days from the date of the offense (n = 6, 1.2%). The mean number of days between the offense and kit collection date was 2.25 days. Of the 557 cases with information about the data of the offense and the date it was reported to police, 549 (98.6%) offenses were reported promptly to police (within 7 days), with a mean of 8.75 days. An investigator made contact with the victim during the original investigation in 107 of 123 cases (87%). The victim agreed to participate in the original investigation in 75 cases (63% of 119 cases). It is important to note that there was no data available on whether or not the victim participated in the investigation in 457 of 576 cases (79.3%).

At least one concern about the victim's credibility was present in 355 cases (86.6% of 410 cases). A suspect was interviewed during the original investigation in 198 cases (35.9% of 552 cases). There was documented evidence of a victim advocate being involved with the case during the original investigation in 172 cases (37.4% of 460 cases).

Table 3. Case Characteristics and Investigation Activities at the Time of the Original Investigation

Variable	n (n=576)	Percent	Valid Percent
Days between Offense and SAK Collected			
0 days	340	59.0	62.7
1 – 7 days	196	34.0	36.1
8-14 days	3	0.5	0.6
More than 14 days	3	0.5	0.6
Missing	34	5.9	
Mean = 2.25 Med = 0 SD = 24.26			
Days between Offense and Report to Police			
0 days	350	60.8	62.8
1 – 7 days	199	34.5	35.7
8-14 days	4	0.7	0.7
More than 14 days	4	0.7	0.7
Missing	19	3.3	
Mean = 8.75 Med = 0 SD = 156.54			
Prompt Report to Police (within 7 days of offense)			
Yes	549	95.3	98.6
No	8	1.4	1.4
Missing	19	3.3	

Number of Victims			
One victim	565	98.1	98.4
Multiple victims	9	1.6	1.6
Missing	2	0.3	
Contact Made with Victim			
Yes	107	18.6	87.0
No	16	2.8	13.0
Missing	453	78.6	
Victim Agreed to Participate in Investigation			
Yes	75	13.0	63.0
No	44	7.6	37.0
Missing	457	79.3	
Victim Credibility Concerns[a]			
Yes	355	61.6	86.6
No	55	9.5	13.4
Missing	166	28.8	
Victim Reported Additional Injuries by Suspect during Offense[b]			
Yes	178	30.9	31.8
No	382	66.3	68.2
Missing	16	2.8	
Victim Advocate Involved in the Case			
Yes	172	29.9	37.4
No	288	50.0	62.6
Missing	116	20.1	
Suspect Interviewed by Investigator			
Yes	198	34.2	35.9
No	354	61.5	64.1
Missing	24	4.2	
Number of Suspects Interviewed by Investigator			
0	354	61.5	64.1
1	195	33.9	35.3
2	3	0.5	0.5
Missing	24	4.2	

[a]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.
[b]Victim reported additional injuries by the suspect during the offense is measured if additional injuries were documented in the case file at any time.

Case Outcomes

Table 4 summarizes case outcomes of the original investigation, prior to SAK testing. First, Table 4 presents information about why law enforcement ended the original investigation in these cases. Victim participation was a notable barrier to case progression. About one quarter (n = 145, 25.8%) of investigation files with information on this variable indicated the original investigation ended

because the victim declined to participate and about 12 percent (n = 66, 11.8%) of investigation files indicated investigators were unable to contact the victim. About 14 percent (n = 79, 14.1%) of investigation files indicated there was insufficient evidence to continue.

During the initial investigation, investigators presented 168 cases (30.2% of valid cases) to a district attorney for charges/arrest warrant. This pattern suggests it was not uncommon for police investigators to determine they had sufficient evidence to support charges. It is also possible that investigators believed there was marginal evidence and sought input from prosecutors. Law enforcement arrested a suspect in 77 cases (13.7% of valid cases) at the time of the original investigation. Prosecution filed charges in 71 of the 77 cases with an arrest. About 30 percent of the cases with data on official case closure status (n=138, 30.2%) were not closed but inactivated prior to SAK testing. About two percent of cases with data on this item remained open and active prior to SAK testing (n=10, 2.2%).

Table 4. Case Outcomes at the Time of the Original Investigation

Variable	n (n=576)	Percent	Valid Percent
Law Enforcement Reason(s) for Ending Investigation[a]			
Unable to contact victim	66	11.5	11.8
Victim declined to cooperate	145	25.2	25.8
Unable to locate suspect	30	5.2	5.3
Insufficient evidence to continue	79	13.7	14.1
Arrested/charged	66	11.5	11.8
Wanted/charged	8	1.4	1.4
DA declined charges	54	9.4	9.6
Suspended/inactive, pending victim therapy	0	0	0
Suspended, pending forensic testing	2	0.3	0.4
Unfounded	49	8.5	8.7
Investigation not ended but inactive	3	0.5	0.5
Investigation open	1	0.2	0.2
Other	100	17.4	17.8
No data	15	2.6	
Case Presented to DA for Charges/Arrest Warrant			
Yes	168	29.2	30.2
No	388	67.4	69.8
Missing	20	3.5	

DA Accepted Charges			
Yes	71	12.3	42.5
No	96	16.7	57.5
Skip	388	67.4	
Missing	21	3.6	
Arrest Made in Case			
Yes	77	13.4	13.7
No	485	84.2	86.3
Missing	14	2.4	
Official Case Closure Status			
Open and active	10	1.7	2.2
Arrested and charged in this case	72	12.5	15.8
Arrested and charged in another case	0	0	0
Transferred to juvenile facility	0	0	0
Lack of prosecution by DA	81	14.1	17.7
Lack of prosecution by victim	2	0.3	0.4
Unfounded	58	10.1	12.7
Not closed but inactive	138	24.0	30.2
Cleared by investigation	0	0	0
Statute of limitations expired	5	0.9	1.1
Cleared by exceptional means	87	15.1	19.0
Suspect incarcerated	0	0	0
Suspect deceased	1	0.2	0.2
Victim deceased	2	0.3	0.4
Other	1	0.2	0.2
Missing	119	20.7	

[a]Law enforcement reason for ending original investigation is not mutually exclusive. Therefore, the sum of percentages exceeds 100%.

Bivariate Relationships for DNA Cases at the Time of the Original Investigation

The next set of analyses estimated bivariate relationships for several key variables at the time of the original investigation. Table 5 presents relationships between whether one or more suspects was interviewed during the original investigation and both victim and case characteristics. The relationship between whether a victim agreed to participate in the investigation and whether a suspect was interviewed during the original investigation is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 22.735$, $p<.001$), confirming the importance of victim participation that has been found in other studies. Investigators were more likely to interview a suspect when the victim agreed to participate in the investigation (52 of 72, 72.2%) than when the victim declined to participate (11 of 42, 26.2%).

Investigators were also more likely to interview a suspect in cases involving a non-White victim (66 of 156, 42.3%) compared to cases involving a White victim (126 of 379, 33.2%; $\chi^2 = 3.945$, $p<.05$).

The relationship between victim credibility concerns and whether one or more suspects was interviewed during the original investigation was also statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.258$, $p<.05$). It is important to note that in most cases with valid data on both of these variables, there were documented concerns about the victim's credibility in the case file (347 of 391, 88.7%). Investigators were more likely to interview a suspect when there were no victim credibility concerns documented in the case file (23 of 44, 52.3%) than when there were documented victim credibility concerns (115 of 347, 33.1%). Whether or not investigators interviewed a suspect during the original investigation was not significantly related to victim age, prompt reporting (offense reported to police within 7 days), whether a victim advocate was involved with the case, or whether the victim reported additional injuries during the incident.

Table 5. Bivariate Relationships for Suspect(s) Interviewed During Original Investigation

	Suspect(s) Interviewed		No Suspects Interviewed		χ^2
Victim agreed to participate in investigation					
Yes	52	72.2	20	27.8	22.735***
No	11	26.2	31	73.8	
Total	63	55.3	51	44.7	
Victim age					
Juvenile	26	33.8	51	66.2	0.205
Adult	172	36.4	300	63.6	
Total	198	36.1	351	63.9	
Victim Race[a]					
White	126	33.2	253	66.8	3.945*
Non-White	66	42.3	90	57.7	
Total	192	35.9	343	64.1	
Prompt Report to Police (within 7 days of offense)[b]					
Yes	193	36.6	335	63.4	0.190
No	2	28.6	5	71.4	
Total	195	36.4	340	63.6	
Victim Credibility Concerns[c]					
Yes	115	33.1	232	66.9	6.258*
No	23	52.3	21	47.7	
Total	138	35.3	253	64.7	

Victim Advocate Involved in the Case					
Yes	56	33.7	110	66.3	0.276
No	89	31.3	195	68.7	
Total	145	32.2	305	67.8	
Victim Reported Additional Injuries by Suspect during Offense[d]					3.091
Yes	53	31.2	117	68.8	
No	144	39.0	225	61.0	
Total	197	36.5	342	63.5	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05

[a]Note, the association between the disaggregated race variable and whether a suspect was interviewed during the original investigation was not statistically significant.
[b]Cases in which one or more suspects were interviewed during the original investigation and cases in which no suspects were interviewed had a median of 0 days between the date of offense and date offense was reported to police.
[c]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.
[d]Victim reported additional injuries by the suspect during the offense is measured if documented in the case file at any time.

Table 6 presents relationships between whether the victim agreed to participate in the original investigation and victim and case characteristics. The relationship between victim race and whether the victim agreed to participate in the original investigation is significant ($\chi^2 = 6.758$, $p<.01$). White victims were more likely to agree to participate in the original investigation (35 of 45, 77.8%) than non-White victims (40 of 74, 54.1%).

Table 6. Bivariate Relationships for Victim Participated in Original Investigation

	Victim Agreed to Participate in Investigation		Victim Declined to Participate in Investigation		χ^2
Victim age					
Juvenile	6	46.2	7	53.8	1.783
Adult	69	65.1	37	34.9	
Total	75	63.0	44	37.0	
Victim Race					
White	35	77.8	10	22.2	6.758**
Non-White	40	54.1	34	45.0	
Total	75	63.0	44	37.0	
Prompt Report to Police (within 7 days of offense)[a]					
Yes	72	62.6	43	37.4	0.021
No	2	66.7	1	33.3	
Total	74	62.7	44	37.3	

Victim Credibility Concerns[b]					
Yes	49	65.3	26	34.7	0.605
No	25	58.1	18	41.9	
Total	74	62.7	44	37.3	
Victim Advocate Involved in the Case					
Yes	10	58.8	7	41.2	2.471
No	4	100.0	0	0	
Total	14	66.7	7	33.3	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05

[a]Cases in which the victim agreed to participate in the original investigation and cases in which the victim did not agree to participate in the original investigation had a median of 0 days between the date of offense and date offense was reported to police.

[b]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.

Table 7 presents relationships between whether a case was presented to the district attorney for charges/arrest warrant at the time of the original investigation and victim and case characteristics. The relationship between whether the case was presented to the district attorney at the time of the original investigation and whether the victim agreed to participate in the original investigation is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 18.026$, $p<.001$). No cases were presented to the district attorney when the victim declined to participate. Conversely, approximately one-third of cases with a participating victim were presented to the district attorney (24 of 71, 33.8%).

The relationship between whether one or more suspects was interviewed at the time of the original investigation and whether a case was presented to the district attorney for charges/arrest warrant is also statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 102.99$, $p<.001$). Investigators were more likely to present a case to the district attorney when they interviewed a suspect during the original investigation (111 of 195, 56.9%) than when they did not interview a suspect (54 of 352, 15.3%). The remaining relationships presented in Table 7 are not statistically significant.

Table 7. Bivariate Relationships for Case Presented to District Attorney (DA) at the Time of the Original Investigation

	Case Presented to DA		Case Not Presented to DA		χ^2
Victim agreed to participate in investigation					
Yes	24	33.8	47	66.2	18.026***
No	0	0	42	100.0	
Total	24	21.2	89	78.8	
Victim age					
Juvenile	26	34.2	50	65.8	0.611
Adult	142	29.8	335	70.2	
Total	168	30.4	385	69.6	
Victim Race					
White	117	30.5	266	69.5	0.153
Non-White	45	28.8	111	71.2	
Total	162	30.1	377	69.9	
Prompt Report to Police (within 7 days of offense)[a]					
Yes	163	30.8	367	69.2	1.239
No	1	12.5	7	87.5	
Total	164	30.5	374	69.5	
Victim Credibility Concerns[b]					
Yes	86	24.6	263	75.4	1.263
No	14	32.6	29	67.4	
Total	100	25.5	292	74.5	
Victim Advocate Involved in the Case					
Yes	54	32.7	111	67.3	0.000
No	94	32.6	194	67.4	
Total	148	32.7	305	67.3	
Suspect interviewed					
Yes	111	56.9	84	43.1	102.99***
No	54	15.3	298	84.7	
Total	165	30.2	382	69.8	

***p<.001 **p<.01 p<.05*

[a]Cases presented to the DA at the time of the original investigation and cases not presented to the DA had a median of 0 days between the date of offense and date offense was reported to police.
[b]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.

Table 8 presents relationships between whether an arrest was made at the time of the original investigation and victim and case characteristics. The relationship between whether an arrest was made and whether the victim agreed to participate in the original investigation is statistically

significant (χ^2 = 11.767, p<.001). Investigators were more likely to make an arrest when the victim agreed to participate in the investigation (20 of 73, 27.4%) than when the victim declined to participate (1 of 43, 2.3%).

The relationship between victim age and whether an arrest was made at the time of the original investigation is also statistically significant (χ^2 = 8.934, p<.01). Investigators were more likely to make an arrest in cases involving juvenile victims (19 of 77, 24.7%) compared to cases involving adult victims (58 of 482, 12.0%). The relationship between victim race and whether an arrest was made at the time of the original investigation is also statistically significant (χ^2 = 8.991, p<.01). Investigators made an arrest at the time of the original investigation in a higher percentage of cases involving non-White victims (33 of 160, 20.6%) than cases involving White victims (42 of 385, 10.9%).

The relationship between victim credibility concerns and whether an arrest was made at the time of the original investigation was also statistically significant (χ^2 = 23.583, p<.001). It is important to note that in most cases with valid data on both of these variables, there were documented concerns about the victim's credibility in the case file. Investigators were more likely to make an arrest when there were no documented victim credibility concerns (15 of 47, 31.9%) than when there were documented victim credibility concerns (29 of 351, 8.3%).

Finally, the relationship between whether one or more suspects was interviewed at the time of the original investigation and whether an arrest was made is also statistically significant (χ^2 = 36.383, p<.001). Investigators were more likely to make an arrest during the original investigation if they interviewed a suspect (49 of 196, 25.0%) relative to cases in which no suspect was interviewed (24 of 354, 6.8%). The remaining relationships presented in Table 8 are not statistically significant.

Table 8. Bivariate Relationships for Arrest Made at the Time of the Original Investigation

	Arrest Made		Arrest Not Made		χ^2
Victim agreed to participate in investigation					
Yes	20	27.4	53	72.6	11.767***
No	1	2.3	43	97.7	
Total	21	17.9	96	82.1	
Victim age					
Juvenile	19	24.7	58	75.3	8.934**
Adult	58	12.0	424	88.0	
Total	77	13.8	482	86.2	

Victim Race					
White	42	10.9	343	89.1	8.991**
Non-White	33	20.6	127	79.4	
Total	75	13.8	470	86.2	
Prompt Report to Police (within 7 days of offense)[a]					
Yes	75	14.0	461	86.0	1.298
No	0	0	8	100.0	
Total	75	13.8	469	86.2	
Victim Credibility Concerns[b]					
Yes	29	8.3	322	91.7	23.583***
No	15	31.9	32	68.1	
Total	44	11.1	354	88.9	
Victim Advocate Involved in the Case					
Yes	20	11.9	148	88.1	0.159
No	38	13.2	250	86.8	
Total	58	12.7	398	87.3	
Suspect interviewed					
Yes	49	25.0	147	75.0	36.383***
No	24	6.8	330	93.2	
Total	73	13.3	477	86.7	

***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05

[a]Cases in which an arrest was made at the time of the original investigation and cases in which no arrest was made had a median of 0 days between the date of offense and date offense was reported to police.
[b]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.

Univariate Analyses on CODIS-Hit Cases at the Time of the Follow-up Investigation

This set of univariate analyses measured investigation characteristics and case outcomes among the 154 CODIS hit cases at the time of the follow-up investigation, *as of the time of data collection*. As described in the methodology section, follow-up investigation information was yet unavailable for about two-thirds of the CODIS-hit cases.

Case and Follow-Up Investigation Characteristics

Table 9 presents case and investigation characteristics. A follow-up investigation was conducted in about one-third of cases (n=51, 33.1% of the 154 CODIS-hit cases, 71.8% of 71 CODIS-hit cases with valid data on this item). Investigators made contact with the victim during the follow-up

investigation in 39 cases (25.3% of 154 cases and 83% of 47 cases with valid data). The victim participated in the follow-up investigation in 15 cases (9.7% of 154 cases, 39.5% of the 38 cases with valid data). Most of the case files associated with CODIS-hit cases contained documented victim credibility concerns (n=102, 66.2% of 154 cases, 86.4% of cases with valid data). A suspect was interviewed during the follow-up investigation in 8 cases (5.2% of 154 cases, 50% of 16 cases with valid data). No investigative files associated with CODIS-hit cases had documented evidence of a victim advocate being involved with the case during the follow-up investigation.

Table 9. Case and Investigation Characteristics at the Time of the Follow-up Investigation

Variable	n (n=154)	Percent	Valid Percent
Investigation Conducted after SAK Testing			
Yes	51	33.1	71.8
No	20	13.0	28.2
Missing	83	53.9	
Victim Located for Investigation			
Yes	43	27.9	93.5
No	3	1.9	6.5
Skip	20	13.0	
Missing	88	57.1	
Contact Made with Victim			
Yes	39	25.3	83.0
No	8	5.2	17.0
Skip	23	14.9	
Missing	84	54.5	
Victim Agreed to Participate in Investigation			
Yes	15	9.7	39.5
No	23	14.9	60.5
Skip	31	20.1	
Missing	85	55.2	
Victim Credibility Concerns[a]			
Yes	102	66.2	86.4
No	16	10.4	13.6
Missing	36	23.4	
Victim Reported Additional Injuries by Suspect during Offense[b]			
Yes	50	32.5	32.9
No	102	66.2	67.1
Missing	2	1.3	
Victim Advocate Involved in the Case			
Yes	0	0	0
No	6	3.9	100.0
Skip	101	65.6	

Missing	37	30.5	
Suspect Interviewed by Investigator after CODIS-hit			
Yes	8	5.2	50.0
No	8	5.2	50.0
Skip	101	65.6	
Missing	37	37	
Number of Suspects Interviewed by Investigator			
0	8	5.2	50.0
1	8	5.2	50.0
Skip	101	65.6	
Missing	37	37	

[a]Victim credibility concerns were measured if concerns were explicitly stated in the case file at any time.
[b]Victim reported additional injuries by the suspect during the offense is measured if documented in the case file at any time.

Primary Suspect Characteristics

Table 10 presents suspect characteristics for cases in which a primary suspect was investigated during the follow-up investigation (n=42, 27.3% of the 154 CODIS-hit cases, 31.8% of CODIS-hit cases with valid data). Primary suspects had a mean age of 30.1 years (based on data from 37 CODIS-hit cases) and were all male. About 40 percent of suspects were Black, non-Hispanic (n=15, 39.5%); about 32 percent were Latina, Chicana, Hispanic (n=12, 31.6%); and about 24 percent were White, non-Hispanic (n=9, 23.7%).

Table 10. Characteristics of Primary Suspects

Variable	n (n=154)	Percent	Valid Percent
Suspect was investigated during follow-up investigation			
Yes	42	27.3	31.8
No	90	58.4	68.2
Missing	22	14.3	
Suspect age (at time of offense)			
Juvenile	1	0.6	2.7
Adult	36	23.4	97.3
Skip	90	58.4	
Missing	27	17.5	
Mean = 30.08 Med = 29 SD = 9.5			
Suspect sex			
Male	42	27.3	100.0
Female	0	0	
Skip	90	58.4	

Missing	22	14.3	
Suspect race			
White non-Hispanic	9	5.8	23.7
Black non-Hispanic	15	9.7	39.5
Latina, Chicana, Hispanic	12	7.8	31.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.6	2.6
Asian, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander	1	0.6	2.6
Skip	90	58.4	
Missing	26	16.9	
Relationship between Suspect and Victim			
Stranger	23	14.9	62.2
Current Intimate Partner	4	2.6	10.8
Former Intimate Partner	1	0.6	2.7
Family Member	0	0	0
Friend	2	1.3	5.4
Acquaintance	7	4.5	18.9
Skip	90	58.4	
Missing	27	17.5	

Case Outcomes

Table 11 presents case outcomes for CODIS-hit cases at the time of the follow-up investigation. Investigators presented 14 cases (9.1% of the 154 CODIS-hit cases, 28.6% of 49 CODIS-hit cases with valid data) to a district attorney for charges or an arrest warrant. A suspect was arrested in 10 cases (6.5% of 154 cases, 20.0% of 50 cases with valid data), charges were filled in 8 of the 10 cases with an arrest, and a suspect was convicted in 3 of the 8 charged cases. Disposition information was unavailable for 4 of the 8 charged cases.

Table 11. Case Outcomes at the Time of the Follow-up Investigation

Variable	n (n=154)	Percent	Valid Percent
Case Presented to DA for Charges/Arrest Warrant			
Yes	14	9.1	28.6
No	35	22.7	71.4
Skip	101	65.6	
Missing	4	2.6	

DA Accepted Charges			
Yes	8	5.2	61.5
No	5	3.2	38.5
Skip	136	88.3	
Missing	5	3.2	
Arrest Made in Case			
Yes	10	6.5	20.0
No	40	26.0	80.0
Skip	101	65.6	
Missing	3	1.9	
Conviction			
Yes	3	1.9	75.0
No	1	0.6	25.0
Skip	120	77.9	
Missing	30	19.5	

Bivariate Relationships for CODIS-Hit Cases at the Time of the Follow-up Investigation

As described in the methodology section, Westat conducted analyses to examine bivariate relationships for several key variables measured at the time of the follow-up investigation for CODIS-hit cases. Because most analyses consisted of too few cases due to missing data, we summarize key findings here, with detailed results available upon request. Investigators were more likely to investigate a suspect during the follow-up investigation if the victim was White (33 of 85, 38.8%) than if the victim was non-White (8 of 41, 19.5%) ($\chi^2 = 4.699$, $p<.05$)[3]. Similarly, investigators were more likely to interview a suspect in cases involving White victims (7 of 9, 77.8%) compared to cases involving non-White victims (1 of 6, 14.3%) ($\chi^2 = 6.349$, $p<.05$)[4]. Victims were more likely to participate in the follow-up investigation in cases with no documented credibility concerns (4 of 4, 100%) than cases with documented credibility concerns (7 of 17, 29.3%) ($\chi^2 = 7.212$, $p<.01$).

We also found statistically significant relationships between whether a case was presented to the district attorney and the following measures: (1) whether the victim participated in the follow-up

[3] The association between the disaggregated race variable and whether a suspect was investigated during the follow-up investigation was not statistically significant.

[4] The association between the disaggregated race variable and whether a suspect was interviewed during the follow-up investigation was not statistically significant.

investigation (χ^2 = 18.745, p<.001), (2) victim age (χ^2 = 4.689, p<.05), and (3) whether a suspect was interviewed during the follow-up investigation (χ^2 = 10.500, p<.001). Cases in which the victim participated in the follow-up investigation were more likely to be presented to the district attorney (10 of 14, 71.4%) compared to cases in which the victim did not participate (1 of 22, 4.3%). Investigators were more likely to present cases to the district attorney if the victim was a juvenile (6 of 11, 54.5%) than if the victim was an adult (8 of 38, 21.1%) and when a suspect was interviewed as part of the investigation (6 of 6, 100%) compared to when a suspect was not interviewed (1 of 7, 12.5%).

We found three statistically significant relationships for whether a suspect was arrested at the time of the follow-up investigation. Investigators were more likely to make an arrest in cases in which the victim participated in the investigation (χ^2 = 13.157, p<.001), there were no documented victim credibility concerns in the case file (χ^2 = 6.428, p<.05), and when a suspect was interviewed as part of the investigation (χ^2 = 10.500, p<.001). Follow-up investigations were more likely to lead to an arrest when the victim participated (7 of 15, 46.7%) than when the victim did not participate (0 of 23, 0%). Investigators were more likely to make an arrest in cases without documented victim credibility concerns (4 of 8, 50.0%) than in cases with documented victim credibility concerns (3 of 26, 10.3%). Finally, investigators were likely to make an arrest when they interviewed a suspect as part of the follow-up investigation (7 of 7, 100.0%) than when they did not interview a suspect (1 of 6, 14.3%).

Feasibility and Utility of Collecting Case-Level Data for a SAKI Outcome Evaluation

We identified significant barriers to systematically collecting criminal case file data from several SAKI sites. It does not seem feasible to include criminal case file data collection and analysis in an outcome evaluation of the national SAKI program. Although case outcomes may be observable within individual sites, the team identified four significant barriers that limited feasibility of using casefile data as part of a program-level national evaluation: case file data access, grantee burdens, and limited variation in case outcomes.

Access: It can be difficult to access relevant data points from criminal case-level data because the most meaningful information is often not available in discrete fields in police electronic databases, such as victim participation, whether suspects were interviewed, and whether an arrest warrant was sought. For this reason, it is often necessary to read police investigation files and then extract and manually record information on paper or in an electronic database. In addition, we learned that police departments frequently do not have mechanisms in place to easily share criminal case files with researchers. For example, extracting electronic case files from case management systems, if the systems exist, can be a cumbersome process and securely sharing those files with research partners presents challenges. We also learned some jurisdictions are reluctant to grant access to investigation case files. In some jurisdictions the data sharing request required approval by multiple local organizations, including the police and city administrators (i.e., council). Finally, developing and finalizing data sharing agreements can require significant time and resources, for both researchers and participating sites.

Burden: Grantees will face significant burdens if asked to create and populate a database with information from investigation case files. It was uncommon for researcher partners in the jurisdictions we approached to maintain databases with relevant information about criminal cases and their progress through the justice system. As indicated above, it is uncommon for police agencies to maintain databases with variables relevant for answering important SAKI-related questions, such as the reasons for the lack of case progression to prosecution. It was more common for jurisdictions to maintain aggregate-level data for the purposes of meeting BJA's Performance

Measurement Tool (PMT) data reporting requirements. Thus, grantees would face the burden of extracting data from the investigation files.

In addition, to collect, combine, and analyze case-level data from multiple jurisdictions requires a data collection instrument that is reliable and relevant for those different jurisdictions. Developing such an instrument is challenging because it requires common sets of variable definitions that may not be applicable across jurisdictions. Legal definitions may be inconsistent, for example. In addition, recording data with the collection instrument presents challenges because coders need to be trained and the quality of data collection must be monitored for reliability. This work is more feasible if performed in a centralized location by a relatively small staff.

Limited Variation: Last, experience has shown that prosecution and conviction outcomes are uncommon in many SAKI jurisdictions. It takes substantial time for cases to proceed through investigation, prosecution, and court stages so measuring justice system outcomes requires time. Understanding the variables related to justice system outcomes will require data collection that occurs over multiple years and across several jurisdictions to ensure variation can be observed and explained through data analyses.

Summary and Recommendations

The SAKI program seeks to improve the investigation of sexual assault incidents through forensic analysis. Specifically, by analyzing samples in previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits police can be provided with new investigation leads they can pursue and hold offenders accountable. This work may also facilitate greater degrees of closure and healing for victims. In addition, and of importance to note, the SAKI program seeks to improve investigation and prosecution practices beyond the utilization of forensic testing results. SAKI encourages jurisdictions to improve interactions with victims and collaborations between organizations that include crime labs, police departments, victim advocacy organizations, and prosecutor offices. The SAKI program expects changes and outcomes to not only occur among the set of cases with previously unsubmitted kits, but also among current sexual assault cases that are reported to police.

Collecting and analyzing criminal case level information from cases with unsubmitted kits provides insights into the incidents, the investigations and case processing when the case was first reported, patterns of testing results, and case progression after kit testing is completed. Table 1 shows that 45% of kits generated a foreign DNA profile, 30% of kits produced a CODIS upload, and 13% produced a CODIS hit. In 30% of the CODIS hit cases, an investigator presented the case to a district attorney for an arrest warrant or charges at the time of the original investigation. This pattern suggests investigators felt there was sufficient evidence for the case to move forward before SAK testing. At the time of data collection, 10 of the 154 CODIS-hit cases resulted in a suspect's arrest.

Consistent with existing research, victim participation was closely associated with case progression at the time of the original investigation and after a CODIS hit was returned. This points to the need for focused attention on victim engagement. Victim race was associated with case progression at the time of the original investigation and following a CODIS hit, but the nature of the relationship was different across the time points. During the original investigation, suspects were more likely to be interviewed and arrests were more likely to be made when the victim was non-White. During the investigation after the CODIS hit, suspect interviews were more common when victims were White. All of the patterns of relationships should be viewed with a degree of caution because we did not estimate multivariate models that would better isolate the relationships between the independent and dependent variables while controlling for covariates.

There is value to be gained by including criminal case level data analyses in a SAKI outcome evaluation. These data would provide evidence about the extent to which SAKI led to improvements in specific investigative and prosecution practices *and* case outcomes. As described above, there are significant challenges to measuring investigation actions and other important aspects of the investigation (e.g., victim participation), and thus, including criminal case-level data in an outcome evaluation. Some options for incorporating case-level data collection and analysis in an outcome evaluation include the following:

- Provide specific encouragement, support, and resources to grantees to facilitate the collection and sharing of case-level data.
- Limit inclusion to grantees with active research who have time and resources available to dedicate to this effort.
- Limit participation to grantees that have conducted sufficient investigations and prosecutions to ensure variation in case-level outcome data, including arrest and charging outcomes.
- Establish a realistic timeline that recognizes collecting, sharing, and organizing criminal case-level data will take time.
- Due to the level of effort required to collect and share case-level data, focus on measuring key investigation and prosecution activities and outcomes that occurred after SAK testing and minimize collecting information about case-level activities that occurred at the time of the original investigation. Alternatively, build outcome measures that roughly capture the progress of a case by using information captured in case management systems' discrete fields. While these approaches may limit the range of case-level data collected, or the types of case outcomes that can be examined, these approaches could enhance feasibility.
- Consider relying on aggregate-level PMT data instead of case-level data. PMT data are valuable for understanding site-level activities and outcomes that could play an important part in an outcome evaluation. PMT data offer several advantages, including their availability and feasibility for analysis. PMT data are valuable for understanding testing outcomes across sites and criminal case outcomes, including arrests, charging decisions, and convictions. The aggregated-nature of PMT data also make them advantageous because the measures could be gathered from sets of non-SAKI comparison jurisdictions.
- Consider using lab information management system (LIMS) data. Although LIMS data were not collected as part of the study, our previous research suggests that LIMS data can provide valuable evidence about SAKI outcomes that are likely to be feasible for use in an outcome evaluation. LIMS data tend to be in electronic format and contain valuable data for understanding SAKI program outcomes, including kits received and

samples tested, turnaround times, CODIS profiles developed and uploaded, and CODIS hits. Similar to PMT data, LIMS data could be gathered from non-SAKI comparison jurisdictions.

References

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2015, March 9). *The Sexual Assault Kit Initiative: National Training and Technical Assistance FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement* (BJA-2015-4155, OMB No. 1121-0329) [Grant solicitation].

Appendices

APPENDIX A: SAKI Evaluation Case Analysis Data Collection Instrument Guide

The primary purpose of this data collection is to capture accurate details about each case, offense, the participants involved, the evidence collected, the investigative process, and dispositions of the offenses to support the *Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI)*.

Documenting data consistently, for cases within a site and cases across sites, is critical so that study conclusions are sound and the results are trusted and reliable. With that in mind, we have developed this data collection document as a guide to the information you submit for each case in the study. We ask that you carefully review and follow the instructions provided in each data item and in the section below to ensure that study information is recorded consistently.

Do not submit data to Westat until an MOA has been executed.

Instructions

- This data collection instrument collects information about cases that were part of your SAKI inventory and have been tested.
- This document lists all of the data collection items, instructions, and values to guide you in your data submission. Whether you plan to provide data extracted from your database, or will use the data entry file provided by Westat to submit your data, please provide responses to each item accurately.
- You may need to examine the case report in detail to find the information for items. If your data or case report does not have the information for an item, please record response -9 (**No data**).
- Throughout the instrument there is an option for recording **No data** responses. Do *not* use this response category as a "no" response to a question. This code should be used only when information to respond to the item is not available, unknown, or missing (see instructions for details on each item).
- ***Please do not leave any item blank; record a value for every item unless you are skipping items. Instructions for skip patterns are in the instructions in RED font.*** For those filling out the Westat data entry file, when you record a response that prompts you to skip the next item(s), the item you skip will be grayed-out. You do not need to record a value for a grayed-out item. For those extracting your data into a file to submit to Westat, please record a -9 (No data) for ALL skipped items.
- For items that allow you to record "all that apply," use commas with no spaces (e.g., 1,3,6,10) if you record more than one value.
- Many of the data items have instructions provided to clarify which value to record. Please read all instructions carefully before recording a response and to inform your data extraction.
- The items fall into three main sections: (1) Case/offense level information; (2) Victim information; and (3) Suspect (offender) information. Within these sections, there are

subsections that capture separately the information about the case and investigation at the time of the offense from case information after SAKI testing.

Case Analysis Data Collection Instructions, page 2

- There are five items shaded gray that are secondary items. Please provide the information if available and not overly burdensome; otherwise the item can be skipped.
- For items that offer an **Other** (**Specify) response option**, if you choose that option, please type all specified information in the space provided for that item number (e.g., A25).
- Enter each tested SAK as a separate case in the data. If there are two suspects accused of a crime in the case file and there are two SAKs, then they should be treated as separate cases.
- The term **OFFENSE** refers to the event, crime, assault.
- The term **VICTIM** refers to the crime victim for whom a SAK test was completed for this case. If a case includes multiple/different **VICTIMS** with SAK testing completed, EACH victim should be listed separately in the data file (i.e., as a separate case).
- The term **SUSPECT** refers to the alleged perpetrator of the offense. If a case has more than one suspect for the offense, complete information in Section C for the ***primary*** **SUSPECT that corresponds with the CODIS hit** in the case.
- When we refer to a **victim's report**, this may include the victim's statements to the responding officer, the sworn statement, and/or the responding officer's/ detective's narrative of the victim's statements and explanations.
    - If there are discrepancies between the victim reports (for instance, to a responding officer and later to an investigating officer), please record information based on what is in the victim's statement or the last information the victim provided (if the account changes or if additional details come to light later in the investigative process). Include information in notes if needed.
    - When there are discrepancies between the victim's report and reports by other people, including suspects and witnesses, record answers based on the victim's description of the event.
- Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). See instructions for details on each item.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT/GUIDE FOR DATA EXTRACTION

Item	Values	Labels	Recorded Value
Section A. Offense Information			
CASEID (CASE OR OFFENSE-LEVEL ID) [Instruction: This is a Westat generated ID. Please do not provide a response to this item.]	1-XXXX 2-XXXX	Case-level ID from Site 1 Case-level ID from Site 2	
SITEID (Site-level ID) This is a Westat generated ID to distinguish two sites that provide case-level data to Westat.	1 2	Site 1 Site 2	
A1. Date the offense occurred [Instruction: This should be date of the OFFENSE, not the date of the outcry or of the report to the police.]	09/09/9999 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Date	
A2. Date offense was reported to police [Instruction: This is distinct from the date of the offense; this is the date the offense was REPORTED to the police.]	09/09/9999 06/06/6666 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data No offense reported to police Date	
A3. Number of VICTIMS for offense [Instruction: While we've asked that each victim be reported as a separate case in the data file, please respond to this question if there was more than one victim involved for the offense. Do NOT count caregivers, parents, or outcry witnesses as victims.]	-9 0 1	No data One victim More than one victim (multiple victims)	

A4. Number of SUSPECTS involved in the offense [Instruction: In this item only, suspects refers to number of perpetrators involved in the offense as reported by the victim or stated in the police report.]	-9 1 2 3 4 5 6 17	No data 1 2 3 4 5 6 17	
A5. Offense location *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instruction: If you cannot provide this information record -9 (No data). If you can provide, please record either the offense address (street, city, state, and zip code) or the following GIS info: State FIPS = 2 digit state code County FIPS = 3 digit County Code Census Tract (6 digit Census tract). Code will total 11 characters.	-9 [###########]	No data Street, city, state, zip code; or 11 digit GIS location	

A6. Offense location category *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instructions: If you cannot provide this information record -9 (No data). If the victim did not know where the offense took place, record -9 (No data) for this item. *Victim home/apartment* refers to the victim's place of residence and may include a home or apartment listed under the suspect's name (e.g. victim is a wife accusing her husband of raping her in their home, which is listed under his name). *Hotel/motel* includes a place of residence through private exchange that is *not* an apartment or rented as a long term contract. If offense took place in a parking garage, use value 5.]	-9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	No data Victim home/apartment Suspect home/apartment Third party home/apartment Hotel/motel Outdoors or outside location (not in an enclosed building) Inside a commercial building, like a business, nightclub, or restaurant; includes a parking garage In or around a vehicle (including in a parking garage) Some other location (Specify)	
A6_O. Other specified offense location [Instructions: If A6 = 7, then A6_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A6 = 0 – 6, code A6_O as -7 (N/A). If A6 = -9, code A6_O as -9 (No data).	-9 -7 Text	No data N/A	

Items A7 – A20 include information about the investigation and outcomes of the case at the time of the offense			
A7. Number of suspects investigated for the offense [Instructions: Record the number of suspects who were investigated at the time of the offense. This refers to the number of suspects a patrol officer or investigator "checked into" as a suspect in the crime. This is not limited to conducting a formal interview; it can entail running a background check or simply talking to someone about their possible involvement in the assault. This information should be obtained by reviewing the report and all available supplements.]	-9 0 1 2 3 4 5	No data 0 1 2 3 4 5	
A8. Number of suspects interviewed by the investigator [Instructions: Record the number of suspects who were interviewed at the time of the offense. Suspects should be identified in the case file as such, not assumed based on interview of persons. An interview entails any personal communication between the suspect and the investigator, including telephone and face-to-face communication. Do not count electronic forms of communication, including messaging, texting, e-mail, and social media (i.e., Facebook).	-9 0 1 2 3 4 5	No data 0 1 2 3 4 5	
A9. Victim advocate involved with the case [Instructions: If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), code A10 and A10_O as specified per instructions below.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

A10. Organization that the victim advocate was affiliated with *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instructions: Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). Skip this item by recording -9 (No data) if it is overly burdensome. If A9 = 0 (No), then record 0 for this item. If A9 = -9 (No data), then record -9 for this item.]	-9 0 1 2 3 4	No data No advocate is involved System-based advocate Community-based advocate Both types of advocates Other (Specify)	
A10_O. Other specified organization that victim advocate was affiliated with [Instructions: If A10 = 4, then A10_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A10 = 0 – 3, code A10_O as -7 (N/A). If A10 = -9, code A10_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -7 Text	No data N/A	
A11. Date of the <u>first</u> investigative activity from the concerned division at the time of offense [Instructions: <u>This is not the date the case was assigned to an investigator</u>. Record the first date when the investigator began work on the case, including reading reports or running criminal history checks, and any initial attempts (whether successful or not) to contact any party involved in the incident, including victims, suspects, witnesses, etc.]	09/09/9999 06/06/6666 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data No investigative activity at the time of the offense Date	
A12. Date of <u>last</u> investigative activity, at the time of offense [Instructions: Record the date of the investigator's last activity; <u>do not count outstanding lab reports</u>.]	09/09/9999 06/06/6666 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data No investigative activity at the time of the offense Date	

A13. Law enforcement reason(s) for ending the investigation [Instructions: Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). If A11 and A12 = 06/06/6666 (No investigative activity at the time of the offense), code A13 as -8 (Skip).] Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). A13_0 through A13_11.	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	No data Skip Unable to contact victim Victim refuses to cooperate Unable to locate suspect Insufficient evidence to continue Arrested/charged Wanted/charged DA declined charges Suspended/inactive, pending victim therapy Suspended, pending forensic testing Other reason (Specify) Investigation not ended but inactive Investigation open Unfounded	
A13_O. Other specified reason for ending the investigation [Instructions: If A13 = 9, then A13_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A13 = 0 – 8, 10, or 11, code A13_O as -7 (N/A). If A13 = -9, code A13_O as -9 (No data). If A13 = -8 (Skip), code A13_O as -8 (Skip).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
A14. Case presented to a District Attorney for charges/arrest warrant [Instructions. This information is about the investigation at the time of the offense and not	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

post-SAKI work. If A14 = 0 or -9, code A15 – 17 per instructions as specified for each item below.]			
A15. If item A14 = 1 (Yes); date case presented to a District Attorney for charges/arrest warrant [Instructions: If A14 = 0 (No) then code this item as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A14 = -9 (No data), then code this item as 09/09/9999 (no data). If A14 = 1 and no date is provided for A15, code A15 as 09/09/9999.].	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	
A16. If item A14 = 1 (Yes); DA/magistrate accepted charges [Instructions: If A14 = 0 (No) then recode this item to -8 (Skip). If A14 = -9 (No data), then record this item to -9 (no data). If this item = 0 (No), code A17 per specified instructions below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
A17. If item A16 = 1 (Yes); record date DA/magistrate accepted charges [Instructions: If A14 = 0 (No) then recode this item to 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A14 = -9 (No data), then record this item to 09/09/9999 (No data). If A16 = 0, then code this item as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A16 = -9, then code this item as -9 (No data). If A16 = 1 and no date is available for this item, then code A17 = 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	
A18. Arrest made in the case	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

A19. The official case closure status [Instructions. This information is at the time of the offense and not post-SAKI work. If this item = 0 (Open and active), 7 (Not closed but inactive), or -9 (No data), code A20 per instructions as specified below. Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). This information is at the time of the offense and not post-SAKI work.] Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). A19_0 through A19_14.	-9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	No data Open and active Arrested and charged in this case Arrested and charged in another case Transferred to juvenile facility Lack of prosecution by DA Lack of prosecution by victim Unfounded Not closed but inactive Cleared by investigation Statute of limitations expired Cleared by exceptional means Suspect incarcerated Suspect deceased Victim deceased Other closure status (Specify)	
A19_O. Other specified official case closure status [Instructions: If A19 = 14, then A19_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A19 = 0 – 13, code A19_O as -7 (N/A). If A19 = -9, code A19_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -7 Text	No data N/A	
A20. Date of case closure [Instructions. If item A19 = 0 (Open and Active) or 7 (Not closed but inactive), then code A20 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A19 = -9 (No data), then record this item as 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	

Items A21- A35 include information about the investigation and outcomes of the case AFTER SAK testing			
A21. Case included a post-SAK testing investigation [Instructions: If this item = 0 or 1, Skip questions A22-A35 and code each item as specified below. If case was opened for investigation and encountered an obstacle, such as the offender was deceased or the statute of limitations had expired, record 2 or 3.]	-9 0 1 2 3	No data No. No CODIS hit, open not investigated yet or closed without investigation No. CODIS hit, but not investigated yet Yes. No CODIS hit, but reopened for investigation Yes. CODIS hit; investigation opened/reopened	
A22. Number of suspects investigated for the offense [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A22 as -8 (Skip). Record the number of suspects who were investigated in the post-SAK investigation. This is not limited to conducting a formal interview and can entail running a background check or simply talking to someone about their possible involvement in the assault. This information should be obtained by reviewing the report and all available supplements.]	-9 -8 0 -1 2 3 4 5	No data Skip 0 1 2 3 4 5	

A23. Number of suspects <u>interviewed</u> by the investigator [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A23 as -8 (Skip). Record the number of suspects who were <u>interviewed</u>. An interview entails any personal communication between the suspect and the investigator, including telephone and face-to-face communication. <u>Do not count electronic forms of communication,</u> including messaging, texting, e-mail, and social media (i.e., Facebook).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4 5	No data Skip 0 1 2 3 4 5	
A24. Victim advocate was involved with the case [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A24 as -8 (Skip). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), skip item A25 and code A25 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
A25. Organization that the victim advocate was affiliated with *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A25 as -8 (Skip). Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). Skip this item if overly burdensome to provide. If item A24 = 0 (No) then this item should = 0. If item A24 = -9 (No data) then this item should = -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3	No data Skip No advocate is involved System-based advocate Community-based advocate Some other organization type (Specify)	

A25_O. Specified organization that victim advocate was affiliated with [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A25_O as -8 (Skip). If A25 = 3, then A25_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A25 = 0 – 2, code A25_O as -7 (N/A). If A25 = -9, code A25_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
A26. Date of the first investigative activity from the concerned division [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A26 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). This is not the date the case was assigned to an investigator. Record the first date when the investigator worked on the case, including reading reports or running criminal history checks, and any initial attempts (whether successful or not) to contact any party involved in the incident, including victims, suspects, witnesses, etc.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Skip Date	
A27. Date of last investigative activity [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A27 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). This seeks to measure the investigator's last activity; do not count outstanding lab reports.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Skip Date	
A28. Law enforcement reason(s) for ending the investigation [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A28 as -8 (Skip). Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10).] Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). A28_0 through A28_11.	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4	No data Skip Unable to contact victim Victim refuses to cooperate Unable to locate suspect Insufficient evidence to continue Arrested/charged	

	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Wanted/charged DA declined charges Suspended/inactive pending victim therapy Suspended, pending forensic testing Other activity (Specify) Investigation not ended but inactive Investigation open	
A28_O. Specified reason for ending the investigation [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A28 = -8. If A28 = 9, then A28_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A28 = 0 – 8, 10, or 11, code A28_O as -7 (N/A). If A28 = -9, code A28_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
A29. Case presented to a DA for charges/arrest warrant [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A29 as -8 (Skip). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), skip item A30-A32 and code these items as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
A30. If item A29 = 1 (Yes); record date case presented to a DA for charges/arrest warrant [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A30 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A29 = 0 (No), code A30 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A29 = -9, code A30 as -9 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	

A31. If item A29 = 1 (Yes); DA accepted charges [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A31 as -8 (Skip). If A29 = 0 (No), code A31 as -8 (Skip). If A29 = -9 (No data), then record this item as -9 (No data). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), skip item A32.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
A32. If item A31 = 1 (Yes); report date DA accepted charges [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A32 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A29 = 0 (No), code A32 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A29 = -9, then record this item as 09/09/9999.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	
A33. Arrest made in the case [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A33 as -8 (Skip).]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
A34. The official case closure status [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A34 as -8 (Skip). Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). If this item = 0 (Open and active), 7 (Not closed but inactive), or -9 (No data), code A35 per instructions as specified below. Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). A34_0 through A34_14.	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	No data Skip Open and active Arrested and charged in this case Arrested and charged in another case Transferred to juvenile facility Lack of prosecution by DA Lack of prosecution by victim Unfounded Not closed but inactive	

	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Cleared by investigation Statute of limitations expired Cleared by exceptional means Suspect incarcerated Suspect deceased Victim deceased Other case closure status (Specify)	
A34_O. Other specified official case closure status [Instructions: If A21 = 0 or 1, code A34_O as -8. If A34 = 14, then A34_O should be completed. If not completed, code as -9 (no data). If A34 = 0 – 13, code A34_O as -7 (N/A). If A34= -9, code A34_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
A35. Date of case closure [Instructions. If A21 = 0 or 1, code A35 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If item A34 = 0 (Open and Active) or 7 (Not closed but inactive), then code A35 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If A34 = -9 (No data), then record this item as 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	

Item	Values	Labels	Recorded Value
B. VICTIM INFORMATION			
B1. VICTIM age at the time of offense	-9 0-100	No data Age in years	

B2. VICTIM sex	-9 0 1 2	No data Male Female Other	
B3. VICTIM race/ethnicity	-9 0 1 2 3 4	No data White/non-Hispanic Black/non-Hispanic Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Asian/Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	
Items B4-B9 include information about the investigation and outcomes of the case at the time of the offense			
B4. Number of attempts investigator made in contacting the VICTIM via any method (phone, visit, e-mail, or text) in pre-SAKI investigation [Instructions: If nothing is indicated in the report to suggest a contact attempt was made (via phone, site visit, letter, e-mail, or text) then assume a contact attempt was not made and item should = 0. This items establishes the effort made for initial contact with victim. Include all successful and unsuccessful contact attempts until the first contact is made. Once contact is made, stop counting attempts. In cases involving juveniles, contact attempts with a parent/guardian should be included	-9 0 1 2 3 4	No data None 1 2 3 4 or more	

in this question. Put in notes when this is the case (10/16/19). When vague language is used in the report, such as “few,” “many,” and “several,” take this to mean at least 4 attempts were made. Take “a couple” to mean 2 attempts.]			
B5. Contact was made with VICTIM	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
B6. VICTIM agreed to participate in the investigation [Instructions: This question should be based on the totality of the contents of the report. Passive refusal counts as "no" so if the victim agrees to participate initially but then does not participate in the investigation, record “no” for the item. For cases with no investigative information, use -9 (no data).]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
B7. Date VICTIM SAK was collected	09/09/9999 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Date	
B8. Testing of SAK requested by investigator at time of offense [Instructions: If this item = 0 (No) then code Item B9 as specified below.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
B9. If B8 = 1 (Yes), record the date of SAK testing request [Instruction: If B8 = 0 (No) then record 08/08/888 (Skip) for this item.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Skip Date of request	

Items B10 – B29 include information about the investigation and outcomes of the case AFTER SAK testing			
B10. Date of SAK submission for testing	09/09/9999 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Date of request	
B11. Results of SAK testing	-9 0 1 2	No data ~~Not tested~~/testing result not reported Negative for biological evidence Positive for biological evidence	
B12. Investigation was conducted after SAK testing [Instructions: Only contacting a victim post testing is not considered investigation; there should be additional information documented in the case file to indicate a suspect and/or outcomes were pursued regarding the case. If this item = 0 (No), skip and code B13-B19 as specified below but complete the remaining items in the B section.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
B13. VICTIM was located for investigation [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B13 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B13 as -9. If this item = 0 (No), skip and code items B14-B19 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	

B14. Number of attempts investigator made in contacting the VICTIM via any method (phone, visit, e-mail, or text) [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B14 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B14 as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B14 as -8 (Skip). This item is asking for information after SAKI testing. If nothing is indicated in the report to suggest a contact attempt was made (via phone, site visit, letter, e-mail, or text) then assume a contact attempt was not made then item should = 0. When vague language is used, such as "few," "many," and "several," take this to mean at least 4 attempts were made. "A couple" means 2 attempts were made.]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4	No data Skip None 1 2 3 4 or more	
B15. The mode VICTIM was contacted/notified *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instruction: If B12 = 0, code B15 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B15 as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B15 as -8 (Skip). Skip this item if overly burdensome to provide. Otherwise, record all items that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4 5	No data Skip Attempt was not made Letter in the mail Phone call In-person visit Text/e-mail Other mode (Specify)	

B15_O. Other specified mode VICTIM was contacted/notified *SECONDARY ITEM* [Instruction: If B12 = 0, code B15_O as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B15_O as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B15_O as -9 (Skip). If B15 = 5, B15_O should be completed; if not completed code B15_O as -9 (No data). If B15 = 0 – 4, code B15_O = -7 (N/A). If B15 = -9 (No data), code B15_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
B16. Contact made with VICTIM [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B16 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B16 as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B16 as -8 (Skip). This item should =1 (YES) only when the investigator made contact and the VICTIM responded to the contact. This item is asking for information after SAKI testing. [Instructions: If this item = 0 (No) then skip and code item B17 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
B17. If item B16 = 1 (Yes), the date VICTIM was contacted or notified [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B17 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B17 as 09/09/9999 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B17 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If item B16 = 0 (No), then code B17 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If B16 = -9 (No data) then code B17 as 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	

B18. Person who contacted/notified the VICTIM [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B18 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B18 as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B18 as -8 (Skip). If item B16 = 0, then code B18 as -8 (Skip). If item B16 = -9, then code B18 as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4	No data Skip Contact was not made Police officer/detective alone Victim advocate alone Police and victim advocate together Other person (Specify)	
B18_O. Other specified person who contacted/notified the VICTIM. [Instruction: If B12 = 0, code B18_O as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B18_O as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B18_O as -8 (Skip). If B16 = 0, code B18_O as -8 (Skip). If B18 = 4, B18_O should be completed; if not completed, code B18_O as -9 (No data). If B18 = 0 – 3, code B18_O = -7 (N/A). If B18 = -9 (No data), code B18_O as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
B19. VICTIM participated in the investigation [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B19 as -8 (Skip). If B12 = -9, code B19 as -9 (No data). If B13 = 0, code B19 as -8 (Skip). If B16 = 0, code B19 as -8 (Skip). If This item should be based on the totality of the contents of the report and what occurred after SAKI testing.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
B20. Profile uploaded into CODIS [Instruction: If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), skip B21-B24 and code these items as specified in the instructions below.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

B21. If B20 = 1 (Yes), provide the date of the CODIS upload [Instruction: If B20 = 0 (No) then record 08/08/8888 (Skip) for this item. If B20 = -9 (No data) then record 09/09/9999 (No data) for this item.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Skip Date	
B22. CODIS hit [Instruction: If B20 = 0 (No) then record -8 (Skip) for this item. If B20 = -9 (No data) then record -9 (No data) for this item. If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No) then skip items B23-B24 and code these items as specified in the instructions below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
B23. Date of CODIS hit [Instruction: If B20 = 0 (No) then record 08/08/8888 (Skip) for this item. If B20 = -9 (No data) then record 09/09/9999 (No data) for this item. If B22 = -9 (No data) then record 09/09/9999 (No data) for this item. If B22 = 0 (No), then record 08/08/8888 (Skip) for this item.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 (MM-DD-YYYY)	No data Skip Date	
B24. If B22 = 1 (Yes), record type of CODIS hit generated Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). B24_1 through B24_6. [Instructions: Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). If B20 = 0 (No) then record -8 (Skip) for this item. If B20 = -9 (No data) then record -9 (No data) for this item. If B22 = -9 (No data) then record	-9 -8 1 2 3 4 5 6	No Data Skip Case to case hit Case to offender hit Cold hit Warm hit Serial sex offender hit Non-sex offender hit	

-9 (No data) for this item. If B22 = 0 (No), then record -8 (Skip) for this item.] Definitions of terms: *Cold hit*: when the DNA hits to an offender who was not previously listed as a suspect/person of interest in the case. *Warm hit*: when the DNA hits to a known or listed suspect in the case. *Non-sex offender hit:* the hit was to an offender with no previous sexual offenses but the offender already had a profile in CODIS for a nonsexual offense. *Serial sex offender hit*: the hit was to a profile for an offender who had previously committed a sex offense.]			
B25. VICTIM reported having been the victim of a sexual assault to police prior to this event [Instructions: Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.).]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
B26. VICTIM reported additional injuries by SUSPECT during the offense [Instructions: Record only non-anal/non-genital injuries that did not result from the sexual attack, according to the VICTIM's report only.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

B27. Record concerns explicitly stated in the report about a VICTIM's credibility/vulnerability Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). B27_0 through B27_15. [Instructions: Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10).]	-9	No data	
	0	No credibility concerns explicitly indicated in the report	
	1	Inconsistent story by the victim	
	2	Arrest/convictions	
	3	Patrol officer/ investigator suspects victim /outcry witness has ulterior motives for reporting	
	4	Evidence contradicts victim story	
	5	Lack of witness corroboration	
	6	Victim unable to verbalize/articulate details	
	7	Patrol officer/ investigator believes victim / outcry witness is fabricating the event	
	8	Victim has a mental illness	
	9	Victim was acting as a prostitute at the time of the offense	
	10	Victim has a history of prostitution	
	11	Victim was engaged in risky behavior (e.g., drinking or drug use, buying or selling drugs) at the time of the offense	

	12 13 14 15	Victim did not attempt self-defense Emotional response is inconsistent for the event Parent/caregiver had alternative motives for reporting Other (Specify)	
B27_O. Other specified documented victim credibility/vulnerability concerns [Instructions: If B12 = 0, code B27_O as -8 (Skip). If B27 = -9, code B27_O as -9. If B27 = 0 – 14, code B27_O as -7 (N/A). If B27 = 15, B27_O should be completed; if not completed, code B27_O as -9.]	-9 -7 Text	No data N/A	
C. SUSPECT INFORMATION			
Item C1 pertains to information about the investigation and outcomes of the case at the time of the offense			
C1. A SUSPECT was investigated at the time of the offense	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	
Items C2-C28 pertain to information about the investigation and outcomes of the case AFTER SAK testing			
C2. A SUSPECT was investigated after SAK testing [Instructions: If this item = 0 (No) or -9, skip and code ALL remaining items in the C section as specified below.]	-9 0 1	No data No Yes	

C3. SUSPECT age at the time of the offense [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C3 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C3 as -9 (No data). Suspect information may only be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). When the case file provides no information, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0-100	No data Skip Record age in years	
C4. SUSPECT sex [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C4 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C4 as -9 (No data).Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). When the case file provides no information, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip Male Female	
C5. SUSPECT race/ethnicity [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C5 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C5 as -9 (No data).Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). When the case file provides no information, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4	No data Skip White/non-Hispanic Black/non-Hispanic Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Asian/Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	

C6. SUSPECT has history of mental illness [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C6 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C6 as -9 (No data).Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). When the case file provides no information to confirm a yes or no response, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
C7. SUSPECT has arrest record [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C7 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C7 as -9 (No data).If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), then code and skip items C8-C9 as specified below. Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, official criminal history information, investigator/patrol officer notes, etc.) that are included in this case; do not use information about the suspect from another case file. If the case file provides no information to confirm a yes or no response, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
C8. SUSPECT has previous convictions [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C8 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C8 as -9 (No data).If C7 = -9, code C8 as -9 (No data). If C7 = 0, code C8 as -8 (Skip). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), then code and skip item C9 as specified below. Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, official criminal history information, investigator/patrol officer notes, etc.). If the case file provides no information to confirm a yes or no response, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	

C9. Type of SUSPECT'S previous convictions Each response option is included as separate dichotomous variable in data file (1/0). C9_1 through C9_9. [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C9 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C9 as -9 (No data). If C7 = -9, code C9 as -9 (No data). If C7 = 0, code C9 as -8 (Skip). If C8 = -9, code C9 as -9 (No data). If C8 = 0, Code C9 as -8 (Skip). Record all that apply. If recording more than one value, use commas with no spaces (e.g., 3,6,10). If C8=1 and no values for this question apply (e.g., previous convictions were for other crimes) then record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	No data Skip Criminal homicide (violent) Forcible rape/Legacy rape (violent) Robbery (violent) Aggravated assault (violent) Domestic violence (violent) Burglary (non-violent) Larceny (non-violent) Motor vehicle theft (non-violent) Arson (non-violent)	
C10. SUSPECT has a history of being accused of committing sexual assaults [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C10 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C10 as -9 (No data).Do not count the current case. This item captures only "officially recorded" accusations. The response may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, official criminal history information, investigator/patrol officer notes, etc.). If the case file provides no information to confirm a yes or no response, record -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3	No data Skip No Yes, suspect in prior case(s) Yes, prior arrest(s) Yes, prior conviction(s)	

C11. The relationship between SUSPECT and VICTIM at the time the offense occurred [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C11 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C11 as -9 (No data).More than one category may apply but select only one response. If more than one applies, select the CLOSEST relational distance.]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3 4 5	No data Skip Stranger Current intimate partner Former intimate partner Family member Friend Acquaintance	
C12. VICTIM had a sexual relationship with SUSPECT prior to the offense [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C12 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C12 as -9 (No data).Item responses may be drawn from all documented materials in the case file (police report, medical report, etc.). Use responses 0 (No) and 1 (Yes) when information about a sexual relationship is EXPLICITLY mentioned in the case file. Use response -9 (No data) when there is no EXPLICIT mention of a sexual relationship in the report.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
C13. SUSPECT interviewed during the post-SAKI investigation [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C13 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C13 as -9 (No data). If this item = 1 (Yes), then code and skip item C14.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	

C14. If C13 = 0 (No), record the reason SUSPECT was not interviewed post-SAKI [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C14 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C14 as -9 (No data). If C13 = 0 (No), C14 should be completed; if not completed, code as -9 (No data). If item C13 = 1 (Yes), code this item as -8 (Skip). If C13 = -9 (No data), code this item as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 1 2 3 4 5 6	No data Skip Deceased Could not be located Incarcerated Victim preference – declined Lack of other evidence to proceed Other reason (Specify)	
C14_O. Other specified reason SUSPECT was not interviewed post-SAKI [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C14_O as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C14_O as -9 (No data). If C14 = -8, code C14_O as -8 (Skip). If C14 = -9, code C14_O as -9 (No data). If C14 = 1 through 5, code C14_O as -7. If C14 = 6, C14_O should be completed; if not completed, code C14_O as -9 (No data).	-9 -8 -7 Text	No data Skip N/A	
C15. SUSPECT's defense during the investigation [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C15 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C15 as -9 (No data). Reminder to answer this for investigation after SAK testing.]	-9 -8 0 1 2 3	No data Skip No contact Sexual contact was consensual No defense offered Other defense (Specify)	

C16. SUSPECT was arrested [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C16 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C16 as -9 (No data). Reminder that this item is for investigation after SAK testing. If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), then code and skip items C17-23 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	
C17. If C16 = 1 (Yes), record the arrest date for SUSPECT [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C17 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C2 = 0, code C17 as 09/09/9999.If C16 = 1, C17 should be completed; if not completed code C17 as 09/09/9999 (No data). If C16 = 0 (No), code C17 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C16 = -9 (No data) then record this item as 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	
C18. Charges were filed on SUSPECT [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C18 as -8 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C18 as -9 (No data). If C16 = 1, C18 should be completed; if not completed code C18 as -9. If C16 = 0 (No), code C18 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = -9 (No data) then record this item as -9 (No data). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No), then code and skip items C19-C23 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No Yes	

C19. If C18 = 1 (Yes), record the date that charges were filed on SUSPECT [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C19 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C2 = -9, code C19 as 09/09/9999. If C16 = 0, code C19 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C16 = -9 (No data), code C19 as 09/09/9999 (No data). If C18 = 1, C19 should be completed; if not completed code C19 as 09/09/9999 (No data). If C18 = 0 (No), code C19 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C18 = -9 (No data) then record this item as 09/09/9999 (No data).]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	
C20. Disposition of charges filed [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C20 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = 0, code C20 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = -9, code C20 as -9 (No data). If C18 = 0, code C20 as -8 (Skip). If C18 = -9, code C20 as -9 (No data). If this item = -9 (No data) or 0 (No) then code and skip items C21-C23 as specified below.]	-9 -8 0 1	No data Skip No conviction Convicted	
C21. If C20 = 1 (CONVICTED) provide date of conviction [Instructions: If C2 = 0, code C21 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C16 = 0, code C21 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C16 = -9 (No data), code C21 as 09/09/9999 (No data). If C18 = 0 (No), code C21 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C18 = -9 (No data) then record this item as 09/09/9999 (No data). If C20 = 1, C21 should be completed; if not completed code C20 as 09/09/9999.If C20 = 0, code C21 as 08/08/8888 (Skip). If C20 = -9, code C21 as 09/09/9999.]	09/09/9999 08/08/8888 [MM-DD-YYYY]	No data Skip Date	

C22. If C20 = 1 (CONVICTED) provide SUSPECT's sentence type [Instruction: If C2 = 0, code C22 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = 0, code C22 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = -9, code C22 as -9 (No data). If C18 = 0, code C22 as -8 (Skip). If C18 = -9, code C22 as -9 (No data). If C20 = 1, C22 should be completed; if not completed code C22 as -9. If C20 = 0, code C22 as -8 (Skip). If C20 = -9, code C22 as -9 (No data). If incarceration was completed by "time served," record 2.]	-9 -8 1 2	No data Skip Probation Incarceration	
C23. If C22 = 1 (PROBATION) or 2 (INCARCERATED) record length of SUSPECT's sentence, in months. [Instruction: If C2 = 0, code C23 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = 0, code C23 as -8 (Skip). If C16 = -9, code C23 as -9 (No data). If C18 = 0, code C23 as -8 (Skip). If C18 = -9, code C23 as -9 (No data). If C20 = 0, code C23 as -8 (Skip). If C20 = -9, code C23 as -9 (No data). If C22 = 1 or 2, C23 should be completed; if not completed code C23 as -9. If C22 = -9, code C23 as -9. If incarceration was completed by "time served," provide the number of months SUSPECT was in custody. If C22 = -9 (No data) then record this item as -9 (No data).]	-9 -8 0-240	No data Skip Number of months	