

## **DRAFT FOR COMMENT**

# STANDARD FOR THE REVIEW OF TESTIMONY OF FRICTION RIDGE EXAMINERS (LATENT/TENPRINT)

#### **Preamble**

Testimony review is a required component of a Quality Assurance Program.

#### 1 Scope

Testimony review evaluates the performance of the examiner in legal proceedings. Each examiner whose duties include providing testimony shall have their testimony reviewed at least annually.

#### 2 Testimony Review

- 2.1 The minimum criteria to be reviewed shall include whether the examiner effectively:
  - Prepared for trial.
  - Exhibited professional demeanor and appearance.
  - Described their qualifications, duties, and analysis.
  - Demonstrated verbal and non-verbal communication.
  - Testified within the limits of their expertise.
  - Conveyed scientific results to the court.
  - Presented testimony in an un-biased manner.
  - Presented demonstrative exhibits.
- **2.2** Testimony review mechanisms may consist of any of the following:
  - Use of a testimony evaluation form (sample form in Appendix A)
  - Communication with court officials
  - Review of written transcript, video, or audio recording of testimony
  - Personal observation of testimony
- **2.3** If testimony is not given during the year, that fact shall be documented.
- **2.4** The testimony review form will be discussed with the examiner.

Standard for the Review of Testimony of Friction Ridge Examiners

3/09/2012 ver. 1.0 Posted: 4/29/2012 **2.5** The testimony procedure should also prescribe the corrective action that is to be taken should the review be less than satisfactory.

### **APPENDIX A**

[AGENCY NAME]

## **Testimony Evaluation Form**

The evaluation of the testimony of our staff is an important part of our quality assurance program. Your cooperation is requested in completing this form and returning it to us.

Thank you for your assistance.

Analyst						Date Testin			
	ourt Location		Case #			Court Case			
	valuator		Gueen in	Title					
	valuatoi	(Please Print Nar	me/Sign)	1					
Agency				Phone					
D	efendant(s)			Subject Testimo					
					Excelle		Rating Averag	ıe	Poor
1.	Was the analyst well	orepared for trial?							
2.	Did the analyst have	a professional demeanor a	and appearance?						
3.	B. Did the analyst effectively describe their qualifications, duties, and analysis?								
4.	. Did the analyst demonstrate verbal and non-verbal communication								
5.	. Testify within the limits of their expertise?								
6.	. How well did the analyst convey scientific results to the court?								
7.	Did the analyst prese	nt evidence in an un-biase	ed manner?						
8.	If applicable, did the a	analyst present demonstra	ative exhibits effectively	?					
9. Were you satisfied with the overall testimony?									
Ple	ease comment on the te	estimony or ways we migh	nt improve our service:						
	Please return to: [/ [A[	AGENCY NAME] DDRESS]	OR FAX	TO:					

Standard for the Review of Testimony of Friction Ridge Examiners

3/09/2012 ver. 1.0 Posted: 4/29/2012

<b> </b>	Date Received by [AGENCY]					
GENC	Supervisor		Date			
[AG	Testifying Everyings	Signature	Dete			
	Testifying Examiner	Signature	Date			

Standard for the Review of Testimony of Friction Ridge Examiners 3/09/2012 ver. 1.0

3/09/2012 ver. 1.0 Posted: 4/29/2012