



FY 2014 PERFORMANCE PLAN

Department of Forensic Sciences

MISSION

The mission of the Department of Forensic Sciences (DFS) is to produce high quality, timely, accurate, and reliable forensic science with the use of the best available technology and practices, unbiased science, and transparency with the overall goal of enhancing public health and safety.

SUMMARY OF SERVICES

DFS provides independent analysis of evidence and samples submitted by agencies within the District of Columbia and its federal neighbors. The Forensic Science Laboratory Division analyzes evidence submitted from criminal cases, including DNA, fingerprints, firearms, materials, and digital evidence. The DFS also provides expert witness testimony in defense of their analytical reports in the District's courts of law. The Public Health Laboratory Division provides diagnostic and analytical testing for biological pathogens and chemical agents from clinical, environmental, or food sources and provides emergency response testing. The Crime Scene Sciences Division provides the collection, analysis, processing, and preservation of evidence found at crime scenes in the District. The DFS Directorate supports the work of the entire agency through strategic direction, training, quality assurance, research, recruitment and hiring of personnel, information technology, data management, fleet management, procurement, and other administrative support services.

PERFORMANCE PLAN DIVISIONS

- Forensic Science Laboratory Division
- Public Health Laboratory Division
- Crime Scene Sciences Division
- Directorate Operations & Agency Management



AGENCY WORKLOAD MEASURES

Measure	FY 2011 Actual ¹	FY 2012 Actual ¹	FY 2013 YTD ²
FSL Cases submitted ³	9266	8173	2533
Digital Evidence	N/A ⁴	N/A	N/A
DNA	293	330	271
Fingerprints	6707 ⁵	5726 ⁵	1113
Firearms ⁶	2266 ⁷	2117 ⁷	1149
Test fires ³	Unk*	Unk*	848
Materials Analysis	Unk*	N/A	N/A
FSL Pre-trial ⁸ (hrs)			
Digital Evidence	N/A	N/A	N/A
DNA	Unk*	Unk*	29
Fingerprints	Unk*	Unk*	3
Firearms	Unk*	Unk*	5
Materials Analysis	Unk*	Unk*	N/A
FSL testimony ⁹ (hrs)			
Digital Evidence	Unk*	Unk*	N/A
DNA	Unk*	Unk*	25
Fingerprints	Unk*	Unk*	15
Firearms	Unk*	Unk*	32
Materials Analysis	Unk*	Unk*	N/A
FSL waiting ¹⁰ (hrs)			
Digital Evidence	Unk*	Unk*	N/A
DNA	Unk*	Unk*	2
Fingerprints	Unk*	Unk*	0
Firearms	Unk*	Unk*	47
Materials Analysis	Unk*	Unk*	N/A
FSL Database entries			
DNA	Unk*	Unk*	46
Fingerprints	Unk*	Unk*	162
Firearms	Unk*	Unk*	914
FSL Database hits ¹¹			
DNA	Unk*	Unk*	0
Fingerprints	Unk*	Unk*	82
Firearms	Unk*	Unk*	51

¹ For FY11 and FY12, previous Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)-generated values were adjusted to meet FORESIGHT definitions and, therefore, are approximately comparable with FY13 values going forward. Components of the new DFS moved into the Consolidated Forensic Laboratory from October 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013 with associated decreased productivity.

² Through June 2013.

³ Physical evidence in criminal cases submitted to FSL by stakeholder.

⁴ For this table, "n/a" means that the service listed in the left-most column was not offered at the time.

⁵ The number of cases were not provided under the standard FORESIGHT rules, therefore this may be an over estimation.

⁶ Prior to FY13, test fires (operational examination of a firearm) were not separated from firearms casework measures and are assumed to be combined in FY11 and FY12.

⁷ The number of cases were not provided under the standard FORESIGHT rules, therefore this may be an over estimation.

⁸ Includes discussions prior to actual trial.

⁹ Time spent testifying on a case or providing testimony for a deposition.

¹⁰ Measured from arrival at court until taking the stand.

¹¹ Positive association to an entry in database.



PHL Samples submitted ¹²	Unk*	531	3630
PHL Tests conducted	Unk*	948	5598
Immunology	Unk*	Unk*	47
Measure	FY 2011 Actual¹³	FY 2012 Actual¹	FY 2013 YTD¹⁴
Clinical chemistry	Unk*	Unk*	23
Microbiology	N/A	370	2935
Molecular biology	N/A	361	1116
Virology	N/A	217	1111
Rabies	N/A	N/A	366
CSS ¹⁵ Scenes processed	N/A**	N/A**	N/A**
CSS Items processed	N/A**	N/A**	N/A**
CSS Hours in pre-trial	N/A**	N/A**	N/A**
CSS Hours in testimony	N/A**	N/A**	N/A**
CSS Hours waiting to testify	N/A**	N/A**	N/A**
Requests for information (FOIA)	N/A	0	1

* For this table, “Unk” means that the previous agency either did not collect this data or collected it in a way that conflicts with the FORESIGHT approach; the values for these entries are therefore unknown

** For this table, CSS was not operational yet and, therefore, could not provide the services listed. These are projected measures for out-years.

¹² Submitted by any stakeholder for public health

¹³ For FY11 and FY12, previous Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)-generated values were adjusted to meet FORESIGHT definitions and, therefore, are approximately comparable with FY13 values going forward. Components of the new DFS moved into the Consolidated Forensic Laboratory from October 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013 with associated decreased productivity.

¹⁴ Through June 2013.

¹⁵ Crime Scene Sciences Division will be established during the FY13 and FY14 timeframe, through the hiring of Crime Scene Scientists, developing training programs, training individuals, working with MPD’s Crime Scene Investigations Division to develop a transition plan for FY15, depending on full funding.



Forensic Sciences Laboratory Division

SUMMARY OF SERVICES

The Forensic Science Laboratory (FSL) Division provides independent scientific examinations and analysis to stakeholders submitting physical evidence in criminal cases, providing these services to District governmental agencies and neighboring Federal agencies. The FSL currently provides examinations for biological samples (DNA and fingerprinting), chemical and materials samples (coatings, glass, textiles, composites), and physical samples (firearms and digital evidence). The FSL works with public attorneys—prosecution and defense—as well as the courts and allied criminal justice agencies to serve and improve scientific information for public safety. This division contains the following activities:

- Forensic Biology Unit – provides analysis of blood and other tissue samples for identification
- Latent Fingerprint Unit – provides analysis of fingerprints for identification
- Firearms and Toolmarks Examination Unit – provides analysis of firearms and ammunition
- Digital Evidence Unit¹⁶ – will provide analysis of electronic devices and other sources of electronic information
- Materials Analysis Unit¹⁷ – will provide analysis of materials, such as coatings (paints), glass, textiles, and composites (like plastics and duct tape) for classification, comparison, and sourcing

Measures relating to the FSL are taken from the FORESIGHT Project¹⁸, a federally-funded process of measuring and comparing the effectiveness and efficiency of forensic laboratories worldwide. FORESIGHT has over 85 participating laboratories around the world and constitutes a *de facto* global standard for assessing forensic laboratories and their processes. Using direct quantitative measures and ratios, FORESIGHT provides robust key performance indicators

¹⁶ *This is a new service start-up for DFS' stakeholders and the District.* Digital evidence is becoming a commonplace type of analysis and key to criminal investigations and forensic analysis. The DFS is creating a Digital Evidence Unit (DEU) to process, analyze, and report on information and evidence from digital devices, such as cell phones, tablet computers, personal computers, and other digital computers or storage devices involved in criminal activity.

¹⁷ Formerly known as the “Trace Evidence Unit”, Materials Analysis Unit will be established in FY14. “Trace evidence” is a term of art used to describe a wide variety of evidence types that do not necessarily fall into one neat category. The term historically has described the analysis of any materials that, because of their size or texture, are readily transferred from one location to another; these transfers can indicate associations between people, places, and things involved in criminal activity. At the core of this type of analysis, the real unit of interest is the materials themselves and not merely their quantity (“trace” suggesting small or microscopic amounts). The 2009 National Academy of Sciences report on the forensic sciences was critical of trace analyses, indicating that little science was behind them. Therefore, DFS is shifting the focus from the historical concept of “trace evidence” to that of “materials analysis” and renaming the Trace Evidence Unit as the Materials Analysis Unit (MAU). The emphasis will be on those manufactured materials that have a significant industrial basis to them, such as coatings and paints, glass, textiles, and composite materials (plastics and duct tape, for example). This will provide DFS scientists with a foundation and support for the analysis of these materials, leveraging the forensic methods on the groundwork laid by the industry that made the goods being analyzed. This is a conceptual shift that has not been undertaken by any forensic laboratory elsewhere in the world and is in keeping with DFS’ intended leadership as a “science first” organization.

¹⁸ Houck, M., et al. 2009. “FORESIGHT: A business approach to improving forensic science services,” *Forensic Science Policy and Management* 1(2): 85-95.



(KPIs) for forensic laboratories¹⁹. Where comparisons are made, the FORESIGHT values are the mean (mathematical average value).

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve forensic laboratory services to stakeholders.

INITIATIVE 1.1: Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Division.

Effectiveness is the attainment of a desired outcome; efficiency is the time and effort used to produce that outcome. Several KPIs are calculated for each Unit within the FSL Division:

- Turnaround time (in days);
- Reports per FTE (full-time employee);
- Number of quality-based corrective action reports (QCARs);
- Number of preventative corrective action reports (PCARs).

These KPIs will be improved through reduction of waste (time, materials, effort, re-work), adjustments to processes to streamline steps taken to completion, and adoption of new methods, processes, or concepts to increase efficiency of forensic laboratory services. Effectiveness will be improved because, as waste is reduced, more cases, items, and samples can be processed and analyzed by the same number of staff using set resources. Target values are shown in the table below and, unless otherwise specified, are the average FORESIGHT values for that measure. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 1.2: Develop an automated workflow to process all known DNA samples.

In FY14, the agency will set-up and validate current instrumentation and equipment to allow for the unattended analysis of an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 known samples of DNA per year in casework. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

OBJECTIVE 2: Develop new forensic services to improve scientific information for public safety.

INITIATIVE 2.1: Conduct and complete a stakeholder needs assessment to determine what services are required (a business plan) for the Digital Evidence Unit.

Digital evidence analysis is a new forensic service for DFS' stakeholders and, therefore, a needs analysis is required to better understand the types of devices and kinds of analysis that will be desired. Surveys, interviews, discussions, and comparisons with scope and scale of services offered in similar jurisdictions will be conducted to develop a written business plan for the DEU. A phased approach to services is envisioned to better balance demand with supply. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

¹⁹ Speaker, P. J. 2009. "Key Performance Indicators and Managerial Analysis for Forensic Laboratories," *Forensic Science Policy & Management* 1(1): 32-42, and Speaker, P. J. 2009. "The Decomposition of Return on Investment for Forensic Laboratories," *Forensic Science Policy & Management* 1:2: 96-102.



INITIATIVE 2.2: Write standard operating procedures for the materials to be analyzed by the Digital Evidence Unit.

Once the scope and scale of services is understood, standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be written to cover the range of analyses and instrumentation needed. These procedures will then be validated on known samples and mock cases to demonstrate that the answers produced are accurate and precise. The SOPs will be vetted through the DFS quality system. Based on the outcome of this initiative, DFS can start the process of accepting new cases into the Digital Evidence Unit. Notification to DFS stakeholders that the Digital Evidence Unit is operational will commence once Initiative 2.2 is complete; once cases are submitted, the same measures for effectiveness and efficiency as the other Units will be applied. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 2.4: Develop standard operating procedures for the materials to be analyzed in Materials Analysis Unit.

In FY14, Standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be written to cover the range of analyses and instrumentation needed. These procedures will then be validated on known samples and mock cases to demonstrate that the answers produced are accurate and precise. The SOPs will be vetted through the DFS quality system. Based on the outcome of this initiative DFS can start the process of accepting new cases into the Material Analysis Unit. Notices will be sent to DFS stakeholders that the Materials Analysis Unit is operational. Once cases are submitted, the same measures for effectiveness and efficiency as the other Units will be applied. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: Forensic Sciences Laboratory Division

Measure ²⁰	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 YTD	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY2016 Projection
FSL Turnaround time²¹						
Digital Evidence ²²	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	36	32
DNA ²³	138	80	95	72	65	58
Fingerprints ²⁴	23	23	140	35	32	28
Firearms ²⁵	8	8	52	88	79	71
Test Fires	1	1	1	1	1	1
Materials Analysis ²⁶	N/A	N/A	N/A	55	49	44
FSL Reports per FTE						
Digital Evidence	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DNA ²⁷	Unk*	Unk*	9	70	63	57
Fingerprints ²⁸	449	269	64 ²⁹	242	218	196
Firearms ³⁰	50	170	3 ³¹	153	138	124
Test Fires	N/A	62	71	70	70	70
Materials Analysis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* For this table, "Unk" means that the previous agency either did not collect this data or collected it in a way that conflicts with the FORESIGHT approach; the values for these entries are therefore unknown

²⁰ All performance metrics use the definitions of the FORESIGHT method; see Appendix A.

²¹ In FORESIGHT terms, Turnaround time is measured as the time in days from receipt of evidence to the issuance of a report in a case.

²² FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 44

²³ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 80

²⁴ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 39

²⁵ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 98

²⁶ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 61

²⁷ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 78

²⁸ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 269

²⁹ The Fingerprint Analysis Unit lost two FTEs, one who stayed at MPD (and did not transfer) and another by attrition.

³⁰ FORESIGHT AVERAGE IS 170

³¹ Measures for the Firearms Examination Unit prior to FY13 included test fires.



Public Health Laboratory Division

SUMMARY OF SERVICES

The Public Health Laboratory (PHL) Division provides testing of biological and chemical samples that relate to public health and safety, such as infectious diseases, hazardous chemicals, or biological contamination, up to and including bio- or chemical terrorist attacks. The PHL routinely liaises with the Centers for Disease Control and the Association of Public Health Laboratories, representing the national capital region as the laboratory of record. This division provides the following activities:

- Microbiology Unit – provides analyses of microbial pathogens that are infectious to people, such as diseases or food-borne illnesses
- Chemistry Unit – provides analyses for the presence of toxins and heavy metals
- Molecular Biology Unit – provides the analysis of DNA to identify infectious organisms or biological threats (bio-terrorism)
- Virology Unit – tests for outbreaks of virus-based diseases, like West Nile and influenza.
- Accessioning Unit – Sample acceptance, accounting, and transfer.

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public health laboratory services.

INITIATIVE 1.1: Develop and apply FORESIGHT-like measures to the PHL.

Much of the testing done in PHL is similar to that done in FSL; therefore, the FORESIGHT process used for FSL should translate well to the PHL platform. In FY14, DFS will work with the Association of Public Health Laboratories (APHL) and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to establish FORESIGHT measures for PHL with the ultimate goal of establishing these as national standards for comparative metrics. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 1.2: Outreach to District hospitals for awareness of PHL services.

This initiative is a communication and marketing effort to expand awareness of the PHL testing and service capabilities available to District hospitals. Many, if not all, of the hospitals have slowly moved to private testing vendors outside the District; the PHL can replicate all necessary testing in the District, either at no fee or through a revenue-generating structure (to be determined). PHL is a central component to the health of the District's citizens and should be utilized routinely by our hospitals. The initiative will consist of informal meetings, formal presentations, distribution of information, social media, and other forums to educate hospital staff and leadership about PHL's capabilities. The goal is to estimate the amount of testing required by the hospitals and to capture at least 25% of it in PHL. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**



OBJECTIVE 2: Shift operational aspects to conform to agency-wide systems

INITIATIVE 2.1: Develop plan to shift from current laboratory information management system to agency-wide system.

The PHL currently uses a limited system for laboratory information management (LIMS) that only handles PHL's information and does not connect to any other system in DFS. In FY14, PHL will coordinate through the DFS Deputy Director for Information Technology (DD-IT) a transition plan from its current platform to the DFS agency-wide system; the eventual transition will need to occur in a way that does not impede PHL's current performance or information needs. Workflow diagrams, category definitions, process maps, and future needs will be clarified and communicated to the DD-IT and the other Division Directors to begin to integrate the PHL process into the larger DFS effort.

Completion date: September 30, 2014.

INITIATIVE 2.2: Integrate all PHL testing into DFS Quality program.

PHL and FSL seek accreditation through two different processes; the PHL work conforms to its own profession's quality standards. In FY14, PHL will continue to integrate all of its testing procedures into the DFS quality program by identifying common testing across divisions, simplifying paperwork and reporting, and aligning its practices to international quality standards (ISO 17025). **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 2.3: Integrate PHL accessioning (sample intake) into CSS evidence intake processes.

PHL currently accepts samples for testing ("accessioning" in public health laboratory parlance) through its own personnel and processes. As the DFS transitions to the responsibilities of crime scene response and evidence intake, PHL will work with the DFS Crime Scene Sciences Division (CSS) to integrate PHL's intake process and merge it with CSS', providing a single intake process and location for all material to be analyzed at DFS. This will assist with INITIATIVE 2.2 by simplifying paperwork, reducing the number of active forms, and enhancing the evidence handling ("chain of custody") procedures for the entire agency. Accessioning will occur at the Evidence Intake Unit (EIU) by the deadline. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: Public Health Laboratory Division

Measure	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 YTD	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY2016 Projection
PHL Tests per FTE ³²	N/A ³³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PHL Successful competency tests	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
PHL Hospital tests ³⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	75%	90%

³² FORESIGHT measure; FORESIGHT is a business benchmarking project of the National Institute of Justice and West Virginia University; see <http://www.be.wvu.edu/forensic/foresight.htm>.

³³ FORESIGHT metrics were created for forensic laboratory operations but are transferable to public health laboratory operations; this has yet to be done and is an on-going project with the Centers for Disease Control. Once developed and put in place for FY14, these values will be provided in FY15's Performance Plan.

³⁴ Any requests for clinical samples from a hospital. See Initiative 1.2.



Crime Scene Sciences Division

SUMMARY OF SERVICES

The Crime Scene Sciences (CSS) Division consists of highly trained civilian scientists who will transition responsibilities for crime scene response and evidence handling and processing in the District from the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). The goal is to provide additional science at the scene, to generate forensic intelligence—backed by science—early in the investigation, and to process and track evidence for immediate and future analysis. Transition of responsibilities from MPD and staffing this Division is on-going and dependent on funding. Beginning in FY14, the DFS will assume responsibility for the Central Evidence Unit, formerly known as Evidence and Documents Operation Center under MPD. This Division will include the following activities:

- Crime Scene Science Unit; and
- Central Evidence Unit.

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve evidence handling and processing at crime scenes and in the Consolidated Forensic Laboratory.

INITIATIVE 1.1: Simplify and unify intake of items for analysis.

This initiative involves the reduction of paperwork—both in terms of amount and repetitive or redundant forms—and simplification of workflow to take in items for analysis by the DFS. The emphasis will be on facilitating the intake experience for submitters with the goal of it being as easy or easier than a normal retail transaction, integrating documentation into the process for ease of completion, retention, and retrieval, and unification of processes so that the intake experience is the same regardless of agency, items, or other parameters. The process will be mapped, edited, and operationalized to provide seamless transfers and documentation.

Completion date: September 30, 2014.

INITIATIVE 1.2: Enhance evidence processing.

Develop and deploy an appropriate palette of evidence processing methods for the range of submitted items from crime scenes based on the testing done in FSL. These methods must be scientifically based, recognized standards, and validated using known materials. The number and types of methods will be determined by stakeholder needs, evidence types, and intended testing.

Completion date: September 30, 2014.



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: Crime Scene Sciences Division

Measure	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 YTD	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY2016 Projection
CSS Response time ³⁵	N/A ³⁶	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSS Turnaround time ³⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSS Reports per FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

³⁵ Response time for CSS is the time in minutes from when DFS is notified that services are requested by a stakeholder to arrival at the scene.

³⁶ For this table, CSS was not operational yet and, therefore, could not provide the services listed. These are projected measures for out-years.

³⁷ Turnaround time is the same as for FSL and is measured as the time in days from receipt of evidence (for CSS, collection at the scene) to the issuance of a report in a case (results of processing or analysis).



Directorate Operations & Agency Management

SUMMARY OF SERVICES

Directorate Operations and Agency Management – provides for administrative support and the required tools to achieve operational and programmatic results. This division is standard for all agencies using performance-based budgeting. This division also contains the following activities that support the entire agency:

- Quality – ensures that DFS produces products that are fit for purpose towards stakeholder and that fitness is maintained or improved, one of which includes achieving and maintaining ISO 17025 accreditation for the agency;
- Training & Development – provides training curriculum to DFS employees to ensure professional development, maintaining skillsets, meet standards of excellence, and high quality, accurate and reliable services;
- Information Technology – provides agency-wide support on information technology systems and to enhance DFS services through the most appropriate technology available.

OBJECTIVE 1: Achieve and Maintain Accreditation under International Standards of Operation (ISO) 17025³⁸.

INITIATIVE 1.1: Achieve accreditation by January 1, 2014 for the Forensic Science Laboratory.

This includes accreditation for the Forensic Biology Unit, Fingerprint Unit, and Firearms Unit. Accreditation is the external recognition that an organization meets specific minimum standards for performance; for forensic laboratories, this is compliance with standard ISO 17025 (General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories) with forensic amendments. External recognition is conducted by one or more ISO-approved vendors. **Completion date: January 1, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 1.2: Prepare Units and Divisions for accreditation as they become operational.

This includes identifying units and Divisions for accreditation, developing a timeline and plan for achieving accreditation. Accreditation is the external recognition that an organization meets specific minimum standards for performance; for forensic laboratories, this is compliance with standard ISO 17025 (General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories) with forensic amendments. For FSL, this will include the Digital Evidence Unit and the Materials Analysis Unit; under DFS, the CSS and PHL Divisions will both be brought under ISO 17025. External recognition is conducted by one or more ISO-approved vendors.

Completion date: September 30, 2014.

³⁸ Accreditation is an external recognition that an agency meets certain standards of quality and process. Accreditation is comprehensive, including the entirety of operations, from administration to documentation to policies to protocols to staff and even signage.



INITIATIVE 1.3: DFS Customer Service³⁹

In FY14, DFS will enhance the agency customer service by collecting feedback from stakeholders and customers and analyzing the information to improve the DFS management system, testing activities and customer service. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide positive workplace environment for employees.

INITIATIVE 2.1: Establish monthly public lecture series for DFS and neighboring agencies.

In FY14, DFS will establish monthly public lecture series for DFS and neighboring agencies. This includes bringing in external speakers and internal staff with expertise on a variety of topics that may enrich their understanding of the forensic, public health and legal community at large. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

INITIATIVE 2.2: Provides training curriculum to DFS employees to ensure professional development.

In FY14, DFS will establish beginning and master classes for basic skills, including communication, scientific writing, and management of science. This initiative will focus on developing employee skillsets to help foster a positive work environment. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

OBJECTIVE 3: Implementation of a laboratory information management system (LIMS) to provide seamless accountability and tracking of evidence from receipt to return for all DFS services.

INITIATIVE 3.1: Develop Agency LIMS Architecture and Concept of operations.

This includes developing evidence receiving and digital evidence lab requirements and process flow, review and refine agency lab requirements and process flows (DNA, trace, firearms, latent prints), deploy test environment for LIMS development, deploy evidence receiving module of LIMS, and develop beta DNA LIMS capability. **Completion date: September 30, 2014.**

³⁹ ISO/IEC 17025 Section 4.7.2



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: Directorate Operations & Agency Management

Measure	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 YTD	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY2016 Projection
DFS Quality corrective action reports	N/A ⁴⁰	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DFS Quality preventative action reports	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DFS Number of complaints	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

⁴⁰ DFS was created on 1 OCT 2012 and, therefore, has no historical data to provide and no baseline against which to forecast; data will be provided starting in FY15.



Appendix A: FORESIGHT Measure Definitions (abridged)

FORESIGHT Terminology	Glossary of Definitions
backlog	Open cases that are older than 30
case -	A request from a crime lab "customer" that includes forensic investigations in one or more investigative areas.
casework	All laboratory activities involved in examination of cases.
casework time	Total FTE's for operational personnel in an investigation area (in hours) subtracted by the hours of R&D and, E&T and support and service given to external partners.
crime	perceived violation of the law that initiates a case investigation.
full-time equivalent (FTE)	The work input of a full-time employee working for one full year.
investigation area	Area limited by item type and methods as they are listed in the "definitions of investigative areas tab.
item	A single object for examination submitted to the laboratory. Note: one item may be investigated and counted in several investigation areas.
report	A formal statement of the results of an investigation, or of any matter on which definite information is required, made by some person or body instructed or required to do so.
representation expense	The costs for hosting guests: lunches, dinners, coffees offered by the lab, and giveaway to guests or during visits abroad, etc.
sample	An item of evidence or a portion of an item of evidence that generates a reportable result.
test	An analytical process, including but not limited to visual examination, instrumental analysis, presumptive evaluations, enhancement techniques, extractions, quantifications, microscopic techniques, and comparative examinations. This does not include technical or administrative reviews.
Turn-around time	The number of days from a request for examination in an investigative area until issuance of a report. (Note that an area case may have multiple requests and each new request has a separate turn-around time.)
workload	Total time spent on all work related to job, including overtime.