



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: The Evaluation of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Sexual Assault Kit Initiative: Evaluation Plan

Author(s): Debra Rog, Susan Chibnall, William Wells

Document Number: 300098

Date Received: February 2021

Award Number: 2016-AK-BX-K020

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

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

Evaluation Plan

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 EVALUATION PLAN
(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 numerous Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) site coordinators, law enforcement officers, victim advocates, laboratory staff, prosecutors, site research partners, and other multi-disciplinary team members 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 17 participating SAKI sites.



Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction	1
Overview of the National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) Program and Evaluation Project.....	1
Summary of Key Implications for the Outcome Evaluation.....	2
Focus on Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit Case Reduction and System Reform as Key Outcomes.....	2
Assess Victim Engagement and Perspectives.....	3
Include Both State and Local Level Outcomes	3
Compare Outcomes of SAKI Grantees to Outcomes of Non- SAKI Sites (and within group)	4
Examine the Spread of SAKI Influence	4
Research Questions.....	5
Study Design.....	7
Cross-Site Comparative Study	11
In-Depth Case Study.....	17
National Study.....	20
Summary of Analysis.....	22
Anticipated Challenges.....	23
References	26

<u>Figures</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Research Questions Answered by Evaluation Study Components.....	8
2	Matrix of Critical Stage-Level Indicators of Success.....	37
 <u>Appendices</u>		
A	Timeline	28
B	Task Plan Summary.....	29
C	Staffing	30
D	Domains of SAKI Evaluation	35
E	Cross-site Comparative Study Component Materials	40
F	Victim Surveys	66
G	In-depth Case Study Component Materials.....	92
H	Cost Analysis Study Component Materials.....	96
I	National Landscape Study Component Materials	99

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 outcome evaluation plan details a summary of the key implications as determined from the completion of the initial evaluation activities, and the proposed methods, data collection timelines, staffing plans, and sample instruments to guide the execution of an evaluation of the national SAKI program.

Summary of Key Implications for the Outcome Evaluation

Westat conducted an initial evaluation of the SAKI program including evaluability assessments and a process evaluation and system reform assessment of 17 FY 2015 sites, as well as a case-level analysis and feasibility assessment. As described below, findings from the three study components¹ were synthesized to construct key implications for the conceptualization of the national SAKI outcome evaluation with respect to the types of outcomes and levels of measurement that would be required in a program evaluation.

Focus on Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit Case Reduction and System Reform as Key Outcomes

The evaluability assessment of FY 2015 SAKI sites determined two types of outcomes are evaluable given sites' current implementation and could be included in an outcome evaluation of the SAKI program: (1) unsubmitted SAK reduction and associated case resolution outcomes (e.g., convictions and case closures), and (2) sexual assault system reforms to improve current case processing (e.g., training and legislation).

Unsubmitted case reduction and resolution efforts are plausible to achieve given the resources and effort placed on them and can be measured using existing Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) data. System reforms also were in progress in a number of sites and, given sufficient time, should be able to be implemented across sites. The in-depth process evaluation informed our understanding of the range of these types of reforms and how uniform measurement could be used to assess their existence as well as their comprehensiveness, quality, and robustness within and across sites.

The prevention of a current caseload backlog, however, is not yet plausible to expect as a program-level outcome. System reforms are nascent in a number of sites and they are likely to take a number of years to affect the caseloads. Changes in investigation and prosecution, for example, are likely to take several years to materialize, given the long-term nature of many of these cases. Moreover, sites tend to focus their efforts on reforming case reduction and submission activities, though some

¹ The Final Report summarizes key findings from each of the three study components.

implemented more expansive efforts across multiple case processing stages. Therefore, Westat recommends measuring the extent to which sites have implemented system reforms across the case processing continuum (and any plausible associated current case outcomes) to assess the program’s interim achievements in effecting case-level backlog prevention outcomes. We further propose that to have ample time to make systems changes, the evaluation should focus on sites with at least 3 years of programming post-funding.

Assess Victim Engagement and Perspectives

The study of FY 2015 SAKI sites underscored the importance of improving sexual assault victims’ experiences with the criminal justice system to reduce trauma for victims as well to maintain and increase their engagement for the benefit of case outcomes. Victim-centered programming is a particularly salient part of SAKI’s framework, and sites’ emphasis on engaging with victims and implementing trauma-informed reforms indicate that it is plausible that victim experiences may be improved as a function of SAKI program participation.

Most sites do not have structures in place for collecting and analyzing data about victims’ experiences, but cross-site strategies are possible for seeking that information as part of the outcome evaluation. The evaluation plan, therefore, includes a study component focused on measuring victims’ engagement and satisfaction with their system contact experiences.

Include Both State and Local Level Outcomes

SAKI grants are awarded at two levels of jurisdiction,—at the state level or at the local level (i.e., city, county, or multi-county jurisdiction). Program outcomes are observable at each level and at times occur based upon the interaction between the two levels. For example, case-level SAKI reduction outcomes are apparent at the local level and can sometimes be predicated by statewide reforms, while system reform outcomes can be observed across a state or within a local jurisdiction, with a local jurisdiction’s efforts even spurring broader state-level reforms. In some states, there are multiple SAKI grantees, with some having state-level efforts funded in addition to local-level grantees. Both to capture the change at all levels and their interaction as well as provide consistency in measurement across the sites, we propose that the evaluation use the state-local lens in all sites, with acknowledgment of the level at which the site was funded when examining outcomes.

Compare Outcomes of SAKI Grantees to Outcomes of Non-SAKI Sites (and within group)

Having a basis of comparison with comparable sites that have not been funded by SAKI should sharpen the ability to see patterns in outcomes among SAKI grantees, even taking into account site variation, demonstrating if SAKI has made a difference in fostering reduction of unsubmitted SAKs, and implementing system reforms. Matching comparison sites to SAKI sites on key characteristics should help to increase understanding of the role that SAKI might play in contributing to desirable outcomes.

Among grantees, understanding the role of other factors in sites' achievements is another fundamental aim. The variation among sites in the agency and level funded, the size and complexity of the site, and numerous other factors provides a laboratory for determining if there are patterns of outcomes among these sites that suggest where SAKI may be more or less effective in helping sites achieve outcomes.

Examine the Spread of SAKI Influence

BJA's vision of the SAKI program is that the program and the work of individual sites contribute to the development of national standards in sexual assault case processing. In order to determine whether SAKI programming has influences beyond its grantee jurisdictions, we propose identifying changes in existing accumulations of unsubmitted SAK reduction in local sites and states nationally as well state-level changes (e.g., legislation) that foster reform in processing SAKs. Measuring whether and how SAKI programming influences these changes can provide insights into the program's contribution to national systems change.

Research Questions

The main research questions for the outcome evaluation include the following:

- 1. To what extent does participation in BJA’s SAKI program reduce existing accumulations of unsubmitted SAKs and aid in the resolution of associated cases?**
 - a. What portion of SAKI sites’ existing accumulation of unsubmitted SAKs have been processed at each stage along the case processing continuum? What portion of cases associated with the SAKs achieve desirable case outcomes, such as convictions or pleas bargains?
 - b. Are reductions in these existing accumulations of unsubmitted SAKs for communities with SAKI grants greater than non-SAKI/newly funded sites?
 - c. What site characteristics, local and state-level activities, and system changes influence the reductions in existing backlogs? What patterns can explain why some sites have more improvement in this outcome than others?
 - d. What are the range of costs associated with processing unsubmitted SAKs and implementing system reforms among sites that are especially successful in achieving program outcomes?

- 2. To what extent does participation in BJA’s SAKI program result in system reform aimed at improving processing of sexual assault cases and preventing new backlogs?**
 - a. What is the nature of system reforms that SAKI sites have implemented to improve case processing and prevent the recurrence of a case backlog? To what extent do sites with system reforms prevent backlogs of current cases across the case processing continuum?
 - b. Is progress in system reform among SAKI grantees greater than non-SAKI/newly funded sites?
 - c. What reforms are made in victim engagement? What is the victim’s perception of the system response? Are some victim engagement efforts associated with better case outcomes, or better victim experiences? How do victims’ experiences at SAKI grantee sites compare with victims’ experiences in non-SAKI/newly funded sites?
 - d. What site characteristics, local and state-level activities, and systems changes influence the introduction of system reform efforts?

3. **To what extent does the SAKI program have broader impact on sexual assault case processing?**
 - a. To what extent have sites nationally reduced backlogs and implemented key system changes (e.g., legislation)?
 - b. What has been SAKI's influence in fostering system reform and backlog reductions? How has SAKI had influence?

Study Design

The proposed evaluation design is comprised of three study components that address the research questions:

1. a **cross-site comparative study**,
2. **in-depth case studies of a sample of sites that have achieved outcomes**, and
3. a **national study** of unsubmitted SAK reduction and system reforms that assess the role of SAKI in influencing these outcomes beyond jurisdictions that are funded by the grants.

The evaluation will be executed in a phased approach, over 3.5 years, with the national study component informing site selection for the cross-site comparative study, and the findings from the cross-site comparative component informing the refinement of data collection tools and analysis questions for the case studies. The evaluation will begin with a period of organization and planning to align with NIJ and BJA needs and to complete critical groundwork for the subsequent tasks. During this period, the evaluation team will obtain IRB approval, determine whether OMB review is needed and if so, prepare the package for submission (see Appendix A for a timeline of key study tasks, Appendix B for a summary of task planning, and Appendix C for projected staffing). The next sections describe the site selection, data sources, and methods for each of the evaluation's components.

Figure 1 summarizes the data sources that will be used in each component to answer the evaluation questions.

Figure 1. Research Questions Answered by Evaluation Study Components

STUDY COMPONENT	CROSS-SITE COMPARATIVE STUDY*						CASE STUDIES			NATIONAL STUDY
<i>Data Source</i>	Documents, legislation, & policy databases	PMT/ unsubmitted SAK case management data	Site leadership interview	Local stakeholders interviews	State-level stakeholders interviews	Victim experience web survey	In-depth program implementers interviews	Current case management data	Grantee cost reporting/ financial data	Web survey/ interview of expert stakeholders
RQ1. To what extent does participation in BJA’s SAKI program reduce existing accumulations of unsubmitted SAKs and aid in the resolution of associated cases?										
a. What portion of SAKI sites’ existing accumulation of unsubmitted SAKs have been processed at each stage along the case processing continuum? What portion of cases associated with the SAKs achieve desirable case outcomes, such as convictions or plea bargains?		●								
b. Are reductions in these existing accumulations of unsubmitted SAKs for communities with SAKI grants greater than non-SAKI/newly funded sites?		●								
c. What site characteristics, local- and state-level activities, and systems changes influence the reductions in existing backlogs? What patterns can explain why some sites have more improvement in this outcome than others?	●		●	●	●		●			
d. What are the range of costs associated with processing unsubmitted SAKs and implementing system reforms among sites that are especially successful in achieving program outcomes?							●		●	
● = data source will address the research question										
*data collected as part of the cross-site system study component may be used in analyses conducted for the other study components										

Figure 1. Research Questions Answered by Evaluation Study Components (Continued)

STUDY COMPONENT	CROSS-SITE COMPARATIVE STUDY*						CASE STUDIES			NATIONAL STUDY
	Documents, legislation, & policy databases	PMT/ unsubmitted SAK case management data	Site leadership interview	Local stakeholders interviews	State-level stakeholders interviews	Victim experience web survey	In-depth program implementers interviews	Current case management data	Grantee cost reporting/ financial data	Web survey/ interview of expert stakeholders
RQ2: To what extent does participation in BJA’s SAKI program result in system reform aimed at improving processing of sexual assault cases and preventing new backlogs?										
a. What is the nature of system reforms that SAKI sites have implemented to improve case processing and prevent the recurrence of a case backlog? To what extent do sites with system reforms prevent backlogs of current cases across the case processing continuum?		●		●	●			●		
b. Is progress in system reform among SAKI grantees greater than non-SAKI funded/newly funded sites?				●	●					
c. What reforms are made in victim engagement? What is the victim’s perception of the system response? Are some victim engagement efforts associated with better case outcomes, or better victim experiences? How do victims’ experiences at SAKI grantee sites compare with victims’ experiences in non-SAKI/newly funded sites?				●	●	●				
d. What site characteristics, local- and state-level activities, and systems changes influence the introduction of system reform efforts?	●		●	●	●		●	●		
● = data source will address the research question										
*data collected as part of the cross-site study component may be used in analyses conducted for the other study components										

Figure 1. Research Questions Answered by Evaluation Study Components (Continued)

STUDY COMPONENT	CROSS-SITE COMPARATIVE STUDY*						CASE STUDIES			NATIONAL STUDY
<i>Data Source</i>	Documents, legislation, & policy databases	PMT/ unsubmitted SAK case management data	Site leadership interview	Local stakeholders interviews	State-level stakeholders interviews	Victim experience web survey	In-depth program implementers interviews	Current case management data	Grantee cost reporting/ financial data	Web survey/ interview of expert stakeholders
RQ3. To what extent does the SAKI program have broader impact on sexual assault case processing?										
a. To what extent have sites nationally reduced backlogs and implemented key changes (e.g., legislation)?	●									●
b. What has been SAKI's influence in fostering system reform and backlog reductions? How has SAKI had influence?	●									●
●= data source will address the research question *data collected as part of the cross-site system study component may be used in analyses conducted for the other study components										

Cross-Site Comparative Study

The cross-site comparative study is the core component of the evaluation, aimed at assessing the extent to which SAKI funded sites, representing the national program, realize backlog reduction and system reform outcomes compared to comparable non-SAKI sites, and the role that other factors play in facilitating or inhibiting the outcomes.

Site Selection

Two groups of sites will be selected for the first study component.

SAKI Grantees: The group of sites representing the national SAKI program will include all SAKI grantee sites with sufficient time (3+ years) to achieve the unsubmitted and system reform progress outcomes. The pool of sites would consist of **42 grantee sites** from the FY 2015, FY 2016, and FY 2017 funding cycles. The sites represent a mix of both state- and local-level funded sites and comprise nearly two-thirds of the 64 grantee sites that have been funded with SAKI grants to-date. As noted, a site would be a funded local community or a funded state, but the inquiry in all sites would include both the state- and local-level changes. For states funded at the state level, a local jurisdiction will be identified to include in the evaluation as part of the site recruitment process. Similarly, when local jurisdictions are funded, a state-level partner(s) will be identified to participate in identifying state factors in the local site's programming. Evaluators will reach out to site coordinators at the start of evaluation activities to help build relationships and promote site participation in advance of site recruitment for data collection.

Comparison Sites: The comparison site group would include approximately **eight to 10 sites** matched to one or more of the SAKI grantee sites based on local-level characteristics that could influence the outcomes, such as geographic size of jurisdiction, the size of the unsubmitted SAKI inventory that the site is managing, and the agency type where responsibility for backlog reduction and system reform effort rests, among others. The comparison sites may be selected from a combined pool of SAKI applicant sites that were unfunded in FY 2015-2017 and/or funded by SAKI in later years (i.e., FY 2018-2020), or sites who have reported existing backlogs but do not have SAKI program involvement (i.e., one of the 19 states or localities therein, that do not have

SAKI funding). Including more newly funded SAKI sites as well as the range of unfunded applicant sites provides a pool of sites that may be more feasibly recruited for participation in the study, and yet, still offer a sufficient range of sites that together can inform whether and to what degree SAKI program participation can be associated with grantees' achievement of different outcomes. Though newly funded sites may potentially show less contrast with more mature SAKI grantees than non-funded sites and may be on a trajectory of change due to their SAKI participation, the limited time they have participated in SAKI reduces the likelihood that SAKI participation has yet had impact on system reforms or the backlog. Comparison sites will be matched to the SAKI sites on local community characteristics, but as with the SAKI sites, comparison sites will be assessed at both the state and local levels.

Data Sources & Methods

Document and Legislation Review

Document and legislation review will be fundamental in characterizing grantee sites' contexts, identifying comparison sites, and measuring backlog reduction and system reform outcomes and as part of the cross-site study component of the evaluation. Documents such as program narratives for grantee sites, site documentation about backlog reduction and sexual assault system reform efforts (e.g., protocols, trainings, and websites), and pertinent jurisdictional legislation affecting sites' case processing (e.g., laws mandating SAK submission or statutes of limitation) will serve as rich sources of data about site characteristics, context, and implementation processes.

These documents may be acquired via BJA, publicly available websites and databases, and/or the sites themselves during site recruitment, and will be reviewed for all participating SAKI grantee sites at the start of the evaluation. Document contents will be thematically coded into a site characteristic database in order to provide an understanding of the scope and nature of the sites included in the evaluation.

Documents also will be used to identify comparison sites, matched to the degree possible to SAKI grantees on key characteristics (i.e., jurisdiction-level, unsubmitted SAK inventory size, jurisdiction's statute of limitations for sexual assault crimes, etc.). Upon their engagement in the study,

comparison sites' documents and legislation will be reviewed and coded in similar manner to those of the SAKI grantee sites, with site characteristics documented in the same database.

Throughout the evaluation, documents will be sought for all sites participating in the cross-site study component to substantiate and triangulate system reform outcomes identified in interviews with key stakeholders. These will include protocols, trainings, and legislation and regulations.

PMT and Backlogged Case Management Data Analysis

Backlog reduction will be operationalized as the proportion of sites' unsubmitted SAK inventories at the local-level jurisdiction that progress along the case processing continuum over a 5-year period (or as much of that period as there exists data within the site). For SAKI sites, the measures will be based on the most recent cumulative counts reported in the grantee PMT data, at each case processing stage (i.e., "number of SAKs inventoried," "number of SAKs determined to need DNA testing," "number of SAKs tested to completion," etc.). For each site, two key types of calculations will be generated:

- the percent of all inventoried cases that are processed to achieve a final case outcome (i.e., result in a conviction, plea bargain, acquittal, mistrial or are dismissed), with variations highlighting some outcomes (e.g., those resulting in a conviction) considered more desirable outcomes than others (e.g., those being dismissed)
- the percent of cases that are processed from one stage to the next (i.e., the percent of SAKs determined to need testing that are tested to completion, or the percent of cases with SAKs tested [and not tested, per sites' policies] that were forwarded for prosecution, etc.).

Sites where the highest proportion of cases result in final case outcomes, in more desirable case outcomes, and/or in stage-specific case outcomes will be considered especially successful in backlog reduction and associated case resolution outcomes. For comparison sites, case-level data on documented SAK backlogs at these sites will be collected from law enforcement, lab, and/or prosecutorial case management systems to make analogous calculations about backlog reduction and case resolution outcomes for each site's inventoried cohort of unsubmitted SAKs. In the selection of comparison sites, access to and feasibility of collecting these data will be an eligibility criterion to provide for a comparable backlog reduction analysis.

Interviews

Leadership Interviews: Following all grantee and comparison sites' recruitment for participation in the cross-site study component, researchers will conduct interviews with site coordinators or equivalent leadership in each site. For SAKI sites, the grantee leadership (at either the state or local level) will be conducted. For comparison sites, the leadership contact(s) identified during recruitment will be interviewed. The aim of initial leadership interviews will be to understand the structure of agencies and organizations at the state and local jurisdictions responsible for the physical processing sexual assault cases, and its administration. The interviews will seek to identify key state- and local-level stakeholders to include in the evaluation, documents to review, data that are available, and verify key findings from initial reviews of documents and data received about the site from BJA, where applicable. Data from these interviews will help develop site profiles for analysis, as well as aid in structuring subsequent interviews and gathering additional data.

Local Stakeholder Interviews: Interviews will be conducted with a range leaders and members of site's multidisciplinary (or equivalent strategy) team members who are responsible for implementing unsubmitted SAK reduction and system reform efforts at local sites (including investigators, prosecutors, Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANEs), laboratory managers, and other local leadership such as community-based Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) members at non-funded comparison sites). The designated individuals will be invited to participate in group or individual interviews focused on identifying and measuring backlog reduction and system reform programming that has occurred at the local site level.

Local stakeholder interviews will be tailored to sites' organizational structures and context based on data collected through documents and other sources. An interview preparation guide that outlines key case processing stages will be shared with interviewees in advance of the interview so that respondents have opportunity to gather information about the range of program elements as needed.

The interview will include qualitative, categorical, and ordinal measures of each type of SAK reduction strategy and system reform constructed based on the findings from Westat's study of FY 2015 sites. The measure will not only capture what change is introduced to the case processing system by the implementation of any reform, but the extent to which a reform affects all cases, the stages of processing that the reform touches, whether it is consistently implemented (e.g., if protocol

implementation is monitored, etc.), how robust the reform is (e.g., if there sufficient staffing to execute the reform), and whether the reform is fully institutionalized (either through internal policies, regulations, etc.).

Interview questions will also assess the facilitators and challenges sites face in processing SAKs at the local level, including the role of SAKI (if applicable) and other funding, the role of the state, and other contextual factors.

State Stakeholder Interviews: Stakeholders at the state level who are responsible for orchestrating state-level backlog reduction and system reform efforts will be interviewed at all sites. Interviewees likely will include representatives of state-level agencies (e.g., the state’s Department of Public Safety, Department of Justice, State Police, Attorney General’s Office, or relevant state Commission). Interviews will be conducted in a manner similar to those conducted at the local level (using an advanced tool to structure and streamline each interview). The focus will be on identifying and measuring state-level system reforms that affect the local site’s unsubmitted and current case processing efforts, and the facilitators and challenges faced at sites that have affected them.

Evaluators will examine data from the leadership, local, and state stakeholder interviews to determine whether and how sites are implementing best practices across their case processing systems. These best practices, informed by Westat’s study of FY 2015 SAKI sites, will serve as indicators of overall program success for the outcome evaluation. Indicators of success are organized across four key domains used to evaluate sites’ sexual assault case processing systems, measuring the systematization of stage-level processes and the degree of cross-agency coordination, data tracking and monitoring, and overall sustainability of sites’ programming. More details about these domains and their role in the evaluation are provided in Appendix D. The Cross-site Comparative Study Component Materials are provided in Appendix E.

Victim Experience Survey

Given the prominence and importance of victim engagement in SAKI, the outcome evaluation plan includes a focused look at the extent to which victims are engaged in the case process, and the nature of that engagement. In the study of FY 2015 SAKI sites, Westat documented a number of mechanisms aimed at improving the system engagement experiences of victims’ of sexual assault, for example, via the delivery of victim-centeredness trainings to law enforcement, policies integrating

victim advocates into interview processes, and the implementation of victim-accessible kit tracking systems. In addition to measuring the system reform in this area, we propose assessing victims' perspectives on their experiences as an additional program outcome by using an anonymized, confidential, voluntary survey developed in partnership with a trusted, national advocacy organization (such as the Joyful Heart Foundation).

This brief survey will be developed in partnership with victim services experts. The evaluation team will collaborate with the national victim advocacy partner, as well as with the victim advocates at a selection of SAKI sites, to develop the survey protocol and instrument items so that the tool is secure, confidential, sensitive to victims' experiences, and encourages participation with as little burden as possible. Pilot tests limited to a subset of volunteer sites will identify any potential recruitment or instrument issues, and will help retool the survey for dissemination across SAKI and comparison sites. The survey will be made available to victims of both current cases and those associated with unsubmitted SAKs in all sites via secure, jurisdiction-specific web links that allow researchers to tie victims' responses to a specific evaluation site for analysis. The web links will be disseminated directly to victims of unsubmitted SAK and current sexual assault cases by the victim advocates and community service providers at each study site as part of their routine victim engagement practices, or as part of follow-up engagement. By engaging the victims' advocates in the recruitment process, researchers can maintain distance from the victims in an assurance of anonymity. Recognizing that recruitment for this important study component may be challenging, researchers will work to implement the survey across sites as early as possible to allow ample time for responses.

Items included on the brief survey will aim to describe and measure victims' system experiences during the processing of their cases. The survey will also ask the approximate date of the offense (e.g., prior to or after the site's inventory's range), so that responses can be associated with either the sites' unsubmitted SAKs or their current caseload. Victims' experiences will be measured as a function of the type and nature of contact they had, the timing of their contact(s) along the case process, their perceived sense of agency in decision making about their case, and their overall satisfaction with their engagement process.

Victims' self-reported experiences at grantee sites will be compared with the experiences of victims at comparison sites, and examined in relation to the sites' victim engagement programming efforts.

In addition to assessing the role of SAKI program involvement in developing victim-centered sexual assault case processing approaches, analysis will determine the relative impact of specific victim engagement strategies and system reforms (including access to case tracking services or variations in victim engagement protocols) on victims' system experiences.

The Victim Surveys are provided in Appendix F.

In-Depth Case Study

In-depth case studies will be conducted with a small sample **(six to eight) of SAKI** and **(three to four) comparison sites** that were especially successful in achieving backlog reduction and/or system reform program outcomes. The case studies will provide more detailed understanding of the strategies used to reach these outcomes, validating sites' reform efforts through an assessment of current case processing progress, as well as assessing the costs associated with these outcomes.

Site Selection

Analysis of unsubmitted SAK reduction and system reform outcomes measured in the cross-site system component study will identify SAKI grantee and comparison sites that are especially effective (relative to their peers) in achieving backlog reduction and/or system reform outcomes.

Approximately six to eight especially effective SAKI sites will be recruited for participation in the in-depth case studies component of the evaluation, as will three to four effective comparison sites. The final selection of sites will be determined by sites' willingness and ability to participate in further interviews, and the existence and accessibility of current case-level data within the site. Because of the extra time and effort that will be required from case study sites to participate in case study data collection tasks, sites selected for the case study will be compensated with the payment of overtime funds.

Data Sources & Methods

In-Depth Interviews

In-depth interviews with key stakeholders involved with implementing the site's fundamental unsubmitted SAK reduction and system reform programing elements, as identified in the cross-site

study component interviews, will be individually interviewed to understand the stage-specific implementation reform strategies and drivers of change within those efforts in more detail. These interviews will emphasize the perspectives of local stage-specific stakeholders across all stages of case processing within case study sites, as well as the stakeholders responsible for developing and executing activities associated with state-level reforms. Potential interview participants include unsubmitted SAK and current case investigators, prosecutors, victims' advocates, lab staff, evidence technicians, training moderators, and legislation committee members. Virtual interviews with these stakeholders will focus on describing in more detail the stage-specific implementation of backlog reduction and system reform efforts documented in the cross-site study component. These interviews will aim to qualitatively measure the program components, stakeholder involvement, and decisions-making process at these sites, in order to learn more about how they contribute to sites' outcome achievement.

The In-depth Case Study Component Materials are provided in Appendix G.

Current Case Management Data

Data from several sources will be triangulated to assess and validate the existence of the system reform efforts among case study sites. Current case-level data from a cohort of recent sexual assault cases will be analyzed across the case study sites to validate the sites' system changes aimed at preventing a new case backlog by determining how effective sites have been at reducing the cohort of current cases. Evaluators will work with the local law enforcement agency associated with each case study site to identify all cases forwarded for investigation to the agency's sex crimes unit during a specified time period (e.g., a 6-month period, such as January 1, 2019 to May 31, 2019).

Compensated administrators at the site will examine each case's associated records, to-date, to measure the case's progress across the case processing stages over time. When case outcomes over this period are examined cumulatively within each site, analyses will demonstrate how effective sites have been at reducing current caseloads and obtaining final case outcomes.

Data recorded from these case files will be limited to elements commonly captured in the discrete fields of a single agency's case management software to avoid some of the challenges experienced in Westat's prior case analysis study. For example, details to be recorded for each case might include the date of the alleged crime, the date the crime was reported, whether and when a SAK was

collected, whether and when a SAK was submitted for testing, whether and when the results of the SAK were returned to the investigative agency, whether a case was investigated (as determined through the documentation of victim and/or suspect interviews), and whether and when arrests were made and/or charges filed. Information from these fields will allow researchers to determine the average turnaround time of cases between processing stages (e.g., the length of time between a crime's report and the submission of any associated SAKs for testing or the time from submission to receipt of results for that test), as well as the proportion of the cohort of cases that progress across processing stages over time (i.e., what percent of the identified cases have been submitted for testing? what percent of the identified cases have had testing results returned? what percent of the identified cases have had victim and/or suspects interviewed?).

Measures of SAKI sites' current case outcomes will be examined along with data from other sources, measuring sites' system reform efforts for their validation (e.g., cases at sites that have mandated submission timelines should meet those criteria within the cohort, and sites with high levels of victim engagement programming may see higher percentages of cases with victim interviews).

Cost Analysis

Case studies will include a feasibility assessment based on the available financial data at grantee and comparison sites, to determine whether these sites can support participation in a cost-analysis study. A cost study may help understand how spend patterns at these highly effective sites are associated with their program implementation efforts. Where available, sites' expenditures in implementing unsubmitted SAK reduction and/or system reform efforts will be examined to understand the range of costs associated with different programming components. For SAKI grantee sites, one potential source of financial data includes the grantee cost reporting data reported quarterly to BJA. These data include information about the amount of funds spent in a preceding quarter on different aspects of sites' unsubmitted case reduction and system reform efforts. Coupled with the sites' PMT data, these cost reports can be used to determine the average amount of resources spent by sites relative to the number of cases that progressed from one stage to the next during each reporting quarter. Furthermore, patterns in how money was spent (i.e., for testing, staffing, equipment) relative to the overall proportion of cases that achieve different outcomes can provide valuable insights as to when and how certain funded activities may best influence sites' overall backlog reduction efforts.

For all sites, and particularly comparison sites, multiple funding streams likely finance their programming. Efforts will be made to take into account all key sources amounts of funds and how they are applied.

The Cost Analysis Study Component Materials are provided in Appendix H.

National Study

Overview

The third study component of the evaluation, a national study of SAKI impact, aims to understand whether sexual assault case processing reforms are happening more broadly beyond the funded SAKI grantee jurisdictions and to what degree SAKI has contributed to the adoption or development of improved case processing standards at jurisdictions across the country. The national study component will include a landscape assessment of sites across all **(fifty) states in the U.S.**, followed by a national web survey of and follow-up interviews with expert stakeholders representing a range of state- and local-level reform efforts across the U.S.

Site Selection, Data Collection, and Methods

An initial landscape assessment will entail gathering information about the current status of reform efforts (particularly legislative reforms) among SAKI sites as well as unfunded jurisdictions performing relevant work across the U.S. The landscape assessment will be conducted using the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)'s public policy database and the End the Backlog State Response database. Content analysis of these databases will provide a full understanding of the state legislative and other relevant sexual assault reforms occurring in jurisdictions across the United States, including SAKI grantee sites. Examples of legislation or reforms to be documented in the landscape assessment include legislation requiring a regular inventory of untested SAKs, mandatory testing of backlogged SAKs and/or newly collected kits, the mandated implementation of SAK tracking systems, victims' right to notice laws, adjustment of sex crimes definitions and associated penalties, expanded statutes of limitation, refined consent laws, mandated collection of lawfully owed DNA, and state budget appropriation bills that fund SAK testing or other components of sexual assault case processing. Evaluators will document these

reforms in a database along with information about key site characteristics (such as jurisdiction type, geography and population characteristics, key agencies or organizations leading the reforms, and number of previously SAKs associated with the jurisdiction where known). The information populated in the database will be used to create site profiles, select comparison sites, and construct a frame for analyses (comparing sites based on characteristics and approaches).

Following this landscape assessment, the evaluators will conduct a national web survey of experts in sexual assault case processing across the U.S. to understand more about the origin of reforms identified, as well as identify additional reforms that are not legislatively mandated or otherwise captured in the policy databases. This survey will include questions about the scope of accumulations of unsubmitted SAKs within the experts' own jurisdictions or others that they are aware of, the status of efforts to process those unsubmitted kit cases (legislatively mandated or otherwise), and whether and how they perceive SAKI to have influenced these reform efforts. Additionally, the survey will prompt respondents to identify the key organizations or individuals responsible for the jurisdiction's legislation and reform development, to provide the research team with points of contact for potentially additional in-depth interviews. Examples of experts to be surveyed include members of the state associations of chiefs of police, and representatives from advocacy organizations that are members of state coalitions against sexual assault.

The National Landscape Study Component Materials are provided in Appendix I.

For each piece of legislation or reform observed within a site, the date at which the reforms were enacted (i.e., before or after 2015) will determine whether there is some plausibility that SAKI might have contributed to their implementation. Researchers will disseminate a web survey to police chiefs, sexual assault coalition organizations, and other expert groups across the U.S. asking about their awareness of SAKI, whether and how SAKI was an influential factor in the development of the legislation or in the implementation of reform efforts within their or other jurisdictions, and who within those sites drove the reforms' development. Responses about efforts occurring within SAKI-funded jurisdictions will enrich the findings about reforms occurring at SAKI sites. Special attention will be paid to responses by experts in states where recent legislation or reform efforts exist but there were no state-level SAKI grants awarded. Responses from experts at these sites will determine whether and how awareness of SAKI has contributed to SAKI-relevant efforts and identify key contacts who can speak to the development and implementation of those reforms. The evaluation

team will conduct virtual interviews of the individuals identified as driving reform development to understand what factors served as catalysts for the reforms, how long they took to implement, what challenges were faced in their implementation, and the ways that SAKI might have been influential in the reforms' development (e.g., referencing SAKI reform activities, using SAKI training and technical assistance (TTA) materials, or consulting with SAKI-funded sites).

Survey and interview responses will document the status of unsubmitted SAK reduction and system reform efforts in unfunded states and communities that have participated in reforms that align with SAKI objectives, as well as demonstrate the range of knowledge about SAKI possessed by associated stakeholders, and provide additional depth in the understanding of how SAKI may have contributed to reforms of unfunded sites' sexual assault case processing standards.

Summary of Analysis

Analyses will be conducted within each study component, informed by one another, and synthesized into the main findings. Analyses of the cross-site data from the first component will be aimed at examining outcome patterns between the SAKI and comparison sites at both the state and local levels to identify any differences between the two groups of sites, as well as examine within group differences to understand the role that other factors play in facilitating or inhibiting outcomes.

A special focus of the analysis will be placed on determining if victim engagement is fostered to a greater degree in SAKI than in comparison sites, and the extent to which these reforms relate to victims' perceptions of being engaged and involved in decision making.

The in-depth studies will build on the cross-site findings and highlight lessons learned in the specific mechanisms that facilitate change at different stages in case processing at the local level and the range of costs incurred in bringing these changes about.

Finally, the national component will provide a descriptive analysis of the work occurring across the states and in selected communities without SAKI funding. The work will provide a detailed understanding of the state reforms, how they are similar and different, and whether there are areas of change that are more or less possible to make given the experiences thus far. In addition to the landscape analysis, qualitative analyses will be conducted to understand if and how SAKI has had influence on these changes, especially in states that are not funded by SAKI.

Anticipated Challenges

Several challenges anticipated in the execution of the evaluation plan, with proposed solutions, are described below.

- The first expected challenge pertains to the recruitment of participant sites. There is likely to be variation in sites' willingness to participate in an evaluation of SAKI. Reluctance may be tied to challenges with resources and time constraints, more limited investment in the program's success (especially for non-grantee sites and those no longer funded by SAKI), and political concerns, among others. Although site-level burden for the cross-site systems study is expected to be low (approximately 5 total hours of virtual interviews across site leaders), participation in the case studies component will require additional participation from a wider range of stakeholders, particularly for the reporting of current case data for the study of backlog prevention and current case processing.

The evaluation plan includes recommendations to incentivize and compensate sites' participation in various study elements, including funding victims' advocates follow-up of SAKI victims for the victim experience survey, as well as the overtime payments to support data reporting activities involved for comparison and case study sites, in order to offset associated staffing costs. Furthermore, efforts will be made to streamline all sites' involvement by leveraging existing data where available. Finally, if some grantee sites do decline to participate in the streamlined tool-assisted interviews component of the study, data from their PMT, program narratives, relevant legislation, and other documents can still be included in the cross-site analysis.

- Identifying data sources for comparison sites that are comparable to SAKI-specific program elements (such as the PMT data) is another expected challenge of SAK program evaluation. In order to measure the reduction of unsubmitted SAK inventories at comparison sites, the site must have identified a comparable inventory of unsubmitted kits, and subsequently tracked their processing progress over time. Findings from Westat's evaluability assessment of the FY 2015 sites about case tracking and data management systems will inform the participation criteria that will be used to select comparison sites so that backlog reduction outcomes can be measured. Recognizing that data tracking systems at comparison sites may not reflect the exact case-level criteria recorded as part of the PMT, evaluators will work closely with site administrators to produce comparable reports for analysis from which meaningful comparisons can be made.
- Victim response rates for the victim experience survey are an additional concern. Partnering with victim advocates and community victim service organizations at each

site to disseminate the survey link streamlines the survey into sites' existing victim engagement protocols; however, if a site does not have a strong victim engagement component it may be difficult to obtain victims' involvement. Survey results will be examined in consideration of this sampling bias, though there are several alternative design approaches to consider.

One strategy is to limit the victim survey for distribution among SAKI sites or within the in-depth case study sites only, where victim services are expected to be stronger. Although this would limit the ability to make inferences in the evaluation about SAKI programming's relative effectiveness in fostering victim-centered communities, summarizing victims' feedback would still yield valuable program information. Alternate dissemination strategies may be considered as well, including the posting of a publicly accessible version of the confidential survey on national advocacy providers' websites, supplementing the site-specific dissemination by victim advocates. Determinations about the best approach can be made following a pilot test of the victim survey among a small subset of sites.

- Access to quality data may present challenges for certain components of the evaluation, even among sites that are especially effective in achieving program outcomes. Sites with more comprehensive and accessible current case data management systems will be prioritized for inclusion in the case studies. Accessing financial data from case study sites will likely be more challenging. Although grantees supply BJA with financial reports about how they use SAKI funds, many sites supplement their efforts with other local, state, federal, or private funding sources that may not be comparably tracked. This will limit evaluators' ability to measure and link sites' overall programming costs to specific activities or outcomes, and make it difficult to isolate the specific contributions of SAKI funds in sites' efforts. Likewise, comparison sites may not have any comparably tracked funding sources.

In light of the challenges expected in accessing comprehensive financial data, Westat proposes conducting an initial cost-analysis feasibility study among the sites that are selected for case study participation. If access to comparison sites' financial data proves too challenging, a cost-analysis may be limited to studying the grantee sites' financial reporting data, qualitatively factoring in the presence of other data sources.

- The national study component involves the survey and interview of stakeholders at sites unaffiliated with SAKI, potentially posing some challenges to their recruitment. It is possible that selection biases may influence the results of this component, as jurisdictions familiar with SAKI may be more likely to participate. If recruitment is a concern, however, evaluators may instead take a more in-depth look at how reforms develop at these sites and consider interviewing multiple stakeholders across the jurisdiction to ascertain if SAKI is more commonly recognized and/or referenced

among certain stakeholder types (e.g., representatives from victim services organizations, law enforcement, or prosecutorial agencies).

In addition, the national study relies on publicly available information to determine whether reforms are occurring in non-SAKI jurisdictions; the most visible reform efforts will be observed via enacted state legislation. As such, the national study may focus largely on unfunded state-level sites, and underrepresent reforms occurring at unfunded local sites. If the landscape assessment does not capture a range of local jurisdictions' efforts within the publicly available documentation, evaluators may consider asking expert state-level stakeholders to identify local jurisdictions from within their sites that could be included in the study.

- The comparative study design proposed in the evaluation will be unlikely to determine SAKI as a uniquely causative, lone contributor to sites' outcomes. Sites efforts often reflect a patchwork of funding streams, with some sites having started similar efforts prior to SAKI program enrollment. However, by using a combination of within-grantee and SAKI vs. comparison site analyses, especially looking for patterns of outcome and patterns of influence, it will be possible to draw inferences about SAKI program contributions in sites' backlog reduction and system implementation efforts relative to comparable efforts by unfunded sites, as well as the effectiveness of certain program implementation approaches or site factors in achieving program goals.
- COVID-19 response efforts will likely impact sites' implementation efforts, though the exact manner and nature of these response effects are still uncertain. Some of the case processes identified in Westat's study of FY 2015 sites may see significant delays due to COVID management protocols; for example, sites with in-person victim notifications may have stalled their efforts. There may be delays at evidence testing facilities where labs are prioritizing machinery for viral testing, and court dates may be postponed as in-person gatherings remained barred in some areas. Prior to performing an evaluation, BJA might consider performing a COVID impact study among a small sample of sites that helps determine the range of effects to be expected and potentially delay the evaluation until a normal pace of activities is resumed. As part of the evaluation plan, researchers may also consider integrating measures in interviews to understand how each sites' initiative is affected, for another level of analysis. Regardless, as planned within all elements of the proposed evaluation, researchers should prepare for data collection activities to be conducted virtually.

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. Timeline

	Year 1												Year 2												Year 3												Year 4												
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	
Project Management																																																	
Submit semi-annual progress reports																																																	
Develop quarterly and final financial reports																																																	
Client meetings (kick-off and periodic conference calls)																																																	
Study Design																																																	
Initial IRB approval and amendments																																																	
Refine sampling plans																																																	
Refine and finalize data collection protocols and analysis plans																																																	
Prepare OMB package and obtain approval																																																	
Develop and test national landscape and victim experience web surveys																																																	
Select national landscape non-SAKI experts and cross-site comparative study sites																																																	
Select in-depth case and cost study sites/participants																																																	
Prepare data disclosure and archiving plan																																																	
Develop MOU/data sharing agreements																																																	
Data Collection																																																	
Prepare for national landscape and cross-site comparative study data collections																																																	
Prepare for case and cost study data collections																																																	
Create national landscape database and site profiles																																																	
Conduct national landscape study web survey and interviews																																																	
Conduct cross-site comparative study interviews and obtain Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) data																																																	
Conduct case study interviews and obtain aggregate current case data																																																	
Conduct cost study feasibility assessment and collect financial data																																																	
Conduct victim experience web survey																																																	
Analysis and Reporting																																																	
National study analysis for informing site selection and populating database																																																	
National study report																																																	
Cross-site comparative study report																																																	
Case study report																																																	
Cost study feasibility analysis, financial data analysis, and report																																																	
Victim experience study report																																																	
Develop peer-reviewed article(s) (one per study component)																																																	
Develop practitioner oriented article(s) (two total)																																																	
Present at research and practitioner oriented conference(s)																																																	
Develop client-ready data sets																																																	
Deliver data sets and documentation																																																	
Develop draft and final reports																																																	
Deliver draft and final reports to NIJ																																																	

Appendix B. Task Plan Summary

Study Component	Task Team	Timeframe
National study	Task lead, one programmer, one mid-level staff member and (initially) two junior level staff.	Months 1 – 15: Refine survey, finalize materials for submission to OMB/IRB, develop national study database, develop web survey, populate database, create site profiles, and prepare for data collection. Months 15 – 24: Conduct web survey, virtual interviews, data preparation, coding, analysis and summary.
Cross-site, in-depth case, and cost studies	Year 1: Task lead, cost subject matter expert, and one mid-level staff member. Years 2 & 3: Three two-person teams of a Senior and Junior staff member, plus one full-time junior scheduler (during data collection) and mid-level analyst.	All 3 studies: Months 1 – 15: Refine survey, finalize materials for submission to OMB/IRB, and prepare for data collection. Cross-site: Months 15 – 32: Conduct virtual interviews, obtain data from sites, data preparation, coding, analysis and summary. Case & cost studies: Months 30 – 37: Conduct virtual interviews, obtain data from sites, data preparation, coding, analysis and summary.
Victim experience study	Task lead, one programmer, one mid-level staff, and a junior staff member (to field survey questions or technical issues via email).	Months 1 – 14: Refine survey, finalize materials for submission to OMB/IRB, develop and conduct user testing of web survey (including translation), and prepare for data collection. Months 15 – 23: Administer survey, provide technical support, and conduct data preparation, coding, analysis and summary.

Appendix C. Staffing

Role	Job Description	Minimum Qualifications	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	Hours
Principal Investigator	Responsible for the preparation, conduct, and administration of the evaluation project. Provides direction on all stages of the study based on his/her expertise in program evaluation and justice research.	Senior level methodologist with a minimum of 15 years of experience designing and conducting cross-site justice system evaluation studies.	15%	15%	15%	7%	1,092
Cost Study Subject Matter Expert	Provides cost analysis subject matter expertise to inform the design, collection and analysis of financial data.	Senior level cost analyst with a minimum of 10 years of experience designing and conducting cost studies.	2%	0%	1%	2%	115
Project Director	Manages all aspects of project operations to ensure deliverables are completed on time and on budget. Develops, monitors, and updates staffing plans, overall project schedule, and budget. Serves as client point of contact and ensures compliance with all client-related reporting requirements. Manages development of OMB and IRB materials. Works closely with task leads to monitor staff progress, completion of tasks, and quality control. Serves in a dual role as a senior research analyst, conducting interviews and analysis, and	A senior level justice system and sexual victimization researcher with a minimum of 7 years of experience leading studies.	50%	78%	77%	40%	5,096

Role	Job Description	Minimum Qualifications	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	Hours
	contributing to the development of reports, peer-reviewed articles, presentational materials and the final report.						
Task Lead: Cross-site Comparative Study Case Study and Cost Study Victim Experience Survey	Manages the cross-site comparative study, case study and cost study components. Responsible for collaborating on the study design and managing the data collection, analysis, and data archiving tasks. Serves in a dual role as an interviewer and analyst, contributing to the development of reports, peer-reviewed articles, presentational materials and the final report. Collaborates with the management team to complete and manage the victim experience component's study design, data collection, and analysis tasks. Oversees testing of the survey, manages data collection, and contributes to the development of reports, presentational materials and the final report. Oversees and contributes to the development of client-ready data sets.	A senior level justice system and sexual victimization researcher with a minimum of 5 years of experience leading data collection and analysis tasks.	50%	72%	72%	30%	4,659

Role	Job Description	Minimum Qualifications	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	Hours
<p>Task Lead: National Study Task Lead</p> <p>Senior Researcher: All other study components</p>	<p>Collaborates with the management team to complete and manage the national study component study design, data collection, and analysis tasks. Oversees beta testing of the survey, manages data collection, and contributes to the development of reports, presentational materials and the final report. Oversees and contributes to the development of the report, the final report and client-ready data sets. Also serves as a senior analyst on the cross-site comparative, case, and cost study components, conducting interviews and analyses, writing reports and publications, and presenting materials.</p>	<p>A senior level justice system and sexual victimization researcher with a minimum of 3 years of experience leading data collection and analysis tasks.</p>	50%	50%	50%	20%	3,536
Programmer	<p>Designs, develops, and leads testing of web survey and database. Develops programming specifications for the PMT and current case data received as part of the cross-site comparative study, case studies and cost components (including those for deriving variables), conducts diagnostic and quality assurance checks on the data, prepares analysis-ready files, runs analyses,</p>	<p>A senior level systems developer with a minimum of 5 years of experience in web survey and data base development, data management, and data archiving.</p>	12%	4%	4%	3%	460

Role	Job Description	Minimum Qualifications	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	Hours
	develops and populates table shells, and prepares data for archiving.						
Senior Researcher	Contributes to tasks such as developing IRB/OMB materials, developing the data collection protocols, testing the web surveys, cleaning, preparing, and analyzing the PMT, current case level, and cost data, and summarizing findings. This staff also will support reporting and dissemination activities by contributing to the cross-site comparative study, case study, and cost study reports, data archival tasks, and presentations and publications.	A mid-level analyst with a minimum of 3 years of experience conducting data collection and analyses.	75%	75%	75%	38%	5,460
Graphics, word processing, editorial, translation	Provides technical support in the production of reports, presentations, publications, and the final report. Provides translation support for the victim survey (Spanish.)	A mid-level support staff with a minimum of 2 years of experience in creating graphics, and preparing or editing documents.	4%	5%	5%	7%	433
Research Associate	Provides technical support to task leads including administrative data retrieval and review, coordinating interview logistics, conducting web-based survey testing, conducting interviews, and analyzing data.	Junior level staff	100%	100%	100%	50%	7,280

Role	Job Description	Minimum Qualifications	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	Hours
Research Assistant	Provides technical support to task leads including conducting online searches and populating the national landscape database, coordinating MOUs, coordinating retrieval of site documentation and reviewing materials, testing the web-based surveys (national and victim experience), providing technical support to web survey users, coordinating transcription of interview notes, coding and analyzing data, and data archival.	Junior level staff	120%	120%	75%	35%	7,280
TOTAL HOURS							35,411

Appendix D. Domains of SAKI Evaluation

Overview

Westat’s evaluation plan for the SAKI program organizes grantee and comparison sites based on their level of success in reducing backlogs of previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs) and implementing mechanisms for effectively processing sexual assault cases with victim-centered approaches. These outcomes are visible at the local level, where the direct processing of sexual assault cases occurs. As state-level outcomes are comprised of mechanisms for change that make local systems change possible, sites’ overall ability to achieve program outcomes should be focused on local-level outcomes, with consideration of the state-level mechanisms and contexts that contribute to their outcome potential.

In addition to the degree to which sites reduce and resolve unsubmitted caseloads (which will be determined from the analysis of sites’ PMT and comparable case outcome data as part of the cross-site study component), sites’ outcomes on the evaluation will be determined based on the review of site documentation and stakeholders’ interview descriptions of sites’ case processing systems. Evaluators will review these data to determine whether sites are implementing case processing systems that are indicative of successful case processing reforms, as documented in Westat’s study of the FY 2015 SAKI sites.

The indicators of success for sites in achieving program outcomes can be organized across four key domains:

- 1) The **level of systemization** applied within and across sexual assault case processing stages at each site.
 - Systematization of processes will be measured through several best practices that indicate program success. A first set of key indicators are the protocols, policies, and legislation that limit individual-level decision making along the case processing trajectory through the specification of process steps, personnel and agencies responsible for implementing stage activities, timelines for the execution of stage activities, and victim involvement within each case processing stage. A second set of systematization indicators is the range of cases affected by processes at each stage (i.e., previously unsubmitted SAK and/or current cases), as well as the exclusion criteria and alternate processing steps for cases that do not progress along all stages of the case process. A final series of indicators includes the training of personnel to ensure that all key staff involved in executing stage processes are trained in stage-specific best practices and methods of performing their role in a victim-centered manner.
- 2) The **degree of cross-agency coordination** among stakeholder agencies and personnel involved in processing sexual assault cases.

- With a focus on the shared understanding of definitions and processes across stage-involved stakeholders and personnel, cross-agency coordination additionally is measured through the diverse staffing of collaborative workgroups that address all aspects of case processing, the regular consultation of victim’s advocates in case processes, and the attention to all stages of case processes as part of multidisciplinary review meetings.
- 3) The **degree to which data are tracked and monitored** within and across stages of sexual assault case processing.
- Indicators of effective data tracking and monitoring include the presence of SAK tracking and electronic case management systems for both previously unsubmitted SAK and current cases, and the active monitoring and enforcement of case processing policies across stages through the incentivization of process adherence and/or the remediation of processes that do not meet the stage’s processing expectations.
- 4) The **sustainability of sites’ programming** for eliminating sexual assault case backlogs and reforming overall sexual assault case processing systems in the long-term.
- Sustainability of sites’ program efforts will be measured as a function of how permanent sites reform mechanisms are across stages (i.e., whether policies or victim-centered practices are embedded in legislation), the acknowledgement of stage activities in sites’ plans to eliminate case backlogs and indefinitely maintain momentum in current case processing efforts, and the sufficiency of resources (including funding, staffing, and equipment) across stages to fully process all previously unsubmitted SAKs and new sexual assault cases in a timely manner.

Westat’s study of FY 2015 sites determined that some indicators of success are more critical at certain stages of case processing than others. A matrix documenting which indicators of best practice that will guide the outcome evaluation is outlined below. When considering sites’ success in achieving program outcomes, evaluators will focus attention on documenting and characterizing the critical domains within each case processing stage at each site, in addition to assessing the degree to which sites implement best practices that indicate program success across their local case processing systems. Evaluators will further consider sites’ context constraints and justifications for case processing approaches that allow them to effectively achieve program outcomes through other mechanisms.

Figure 2. Matrix of Critical Stage-Level Indicators of Success

		Stages of Sexual Assault Case Processing															
Best Practices		Reporting of sexual assaults	SANE/Evidence Collection	Transfer of SAKs to/from Law Enforcement	SAK and Case Evidence Storage	Inventory of SAKs	Submission of SAKs for Testing	Victim Notification	Testing of SAKs	Uploading to CODIS Disseminating Results	Collecting Lawfully owed DNA	Investigating Cases	Uploading Case Details to VICAP	Prosecuting Cases	Providing Victim Support and Engagement Services		
Systematization of Process	Policies, protocols, legislation	Defined and delineated process steps for stage	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
		Required victim involvement in stage processes	•	•					•				•		•	•	•
		Specified agencies and positions responsible for executing stage					•	•	•			•		•			
		Mandated turnaround times and/or specified time points for stage execution		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•						
	Case range	All current cases processed at stage	•	•	•	•	•					•					•
		All previously unsubmitted cases processed at stage					•										•
		Defined subset of cases processed at stage						•	•	•	•		•	•	•		
		Defined exclusion criteria & alternate processing policies at stage						•	•	•	•		•	•	•		

• = "Best practice" is a critical indicator of site program success for the processing stage.

Figure 2. Matrix of Critical Stage-Level Indicators of Success (continued)

		Stages of Sexual Assault Case Processing															
Best Practice		Reporting of sexual assaults	SANE/Evidence Collection	Transfer of SAKs to/from Law Enforcement	SAAs and Case Evidence Storage	Inventory of SAKs	Submission of SAKs for Testing	Victim Notification	Testing of SAKs	Uploading to CODIS Disseminating Results	Collecting Lawfully owed DNA	Investigating Cases	Uploading Case Details to VICAP	Prosecuting Cases	Providing Victim Support and Engagement Services		
Systematization of Process	Trainings	Trainings required of all stage-specific personnel	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
		Victim-centeredness including neurobiology of trauma, forensic interview techniques, and	●	●				●				●		●	●	●	
Cross-Agency Coordination		Shared understanding of policies and definitions across stakeholders	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
		Stage-critical staff on MDT/workgroup		●		●		●	●			●		●	●	●	
		Workgroup addresses stage activities	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Victim advocate involvement in stages	●	●				●				●		●	●	●	●
		Cross-agency mechanisms for data sharing			●				●	●		●		●	●	●	●

● = "Best practice" is a critical indicator of site program success for the processing stage.

Figure 2. Matrix of Critical Stage-Level Indicators of Success (continued)

		Stages of Sexual Assault Case Processing													
Best Practice		Reporting of sexual assaults	SANE/Evidence Collection	Transfer of SAKs to/from Law Enforcement	SAK and Case Evidence Storage	Inventory of SAKs	Submission of SAKs for Testing	Victim Notification	Testing of SAKs	Uploading to CODIS Disseminating Results	Collecting Lawfully owed DNA	Investigating Cases	Uploading Case Details to VICAP	Prosecuting Cases	Providing Victim Support and Engagement Services
Data Tracking & Monitoring	Data Systems	SAK tracking system		●	●	●		●							
		Electronic data/case management system	●	●	●	●	●		●			●		●	●
	Data monitoring	Regular process auditing and/or monitoring	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Process adherence incentives/deviation consequences	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Sustainability		Legislation development/revision addressing stage		●	●	●	●		●		●				●
		Current case personnel involvement in backlog reduction efforts				●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●
		Plans (including staffing and projected timeframes) address stage processes	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Sufficient resources available to complete backlog reduction				●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

● = "Best practice" is a critical indicator of site program success for the processing stage.

Appendix E. Cross-site Comparative Study Component Materials

Overview

The cross-site comparative study component aims to assess the extent to which the national SAKI program contributes to the reduction and resolution of previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits and associated cases, as well as to the reform of sexual assault case processing systems within its grantee jurisdictions.

SAKI sites who were awarded funds during FY 2015-2017 will represent the national SAKI program. Their ability to achieve backlog reduction and system reform outcomes will be compared to that of unfunded sites that match the characteristics of one or more of the funded SAKI sites, in respect to geography, jurisdiction size, key agency involvement, and known backlog volume. Comparison sites will be identified as part of preliminary analyses from the national landscape assessment.

In addition to the analysis of PMT and equivalent case data from previously unsubmitted SAKs and a victim experience survey, the cross-site comparative study component involves four key interviews for each site. All interviews will be conducted virtually. Following project kickoff, evaluators will begin outreach to all SAKI site coordinators via email to introduce the evaluation study, outline participation expectations, and obtain consent for site participation in these interviews.

The interviews involved in the cross-site study component include:

- 1) A **preliminary site coordinator interview** that provides an overview of site structure and identifies key agencies, organizations, and individuals on the local- and state-levels that contribute to backlog reduction, current sexual assault case processing, and relevant system reform efforts. These contacts will be candidates for subsequent interviews. For non-SAKI comparison sites, site representatives who can serve as coordinator equivalents will be identified through correspondence with site contacts established during the national study component of the evaluation. This interview is expected to take approximately one-half hour.
- 2) A **follow-up site coordinator interview** that collects fundamental information about the nature of coordination between different agencies and organizations involved in backlog reduction and system reform. This interview is expected to take approximately one-half hour.
- 3) An **interview with local-level site SAKI stakeholders** that focuses on the range of processes and strategies employed at the local level to process previously unsubmitted and current sexual assault cases. Interview candidates who are involved in executing

and/or leading case processing on the local-level will be identified from the site coordinator interviews and approached for participation in a group interview via email. Local stakeholders will be interviewed at all sites, regardless of grantee level. In advance of this interview, participants will receive a tool to help prepare them for the range of topics and style of questions to be covered. This interview is expected to take approximately one-and-a-half hours.

- 4) An **interview with state-level site SAKI stakeholders** that focuses on the range of mechanisms organized at the state level to reform the sexual assault case processing system and/or assist local sites in achieving backlog reduction and system reform outcomes. Interview candidates who are involved in developing and/or implementing state-level reform efforts will be identified from the site coordinator interviews and approached for participation in a group interview via email. State stakeholders will be interviewed at all sites, regardless of grantee level. In advance of this interview, participants will receive a tool to help prepare them for the range of topics and style of questions to be covered. This interview is expected to take approximately one-and-a-half hours.

Protocols for each of these interviews (and preparation tools for each of the local- and state-level interviews) are outlined below.

Local Site Coordinator Preliminary Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Preliminary Interview Protocol for Local Site Coordinators

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction *[points to cover conversationally]*

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).
- The purpose of this interview is to learn about your site's structure and identify key stakeholder contacts. We plan to have another conversation with you in the coming weeks to learn more about your site's history in engaging in backlog reduction and sexual assault case processing reform efforts.
- We are conducting these interviews with Site Coordinators from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17, and a selection of key representatives from sites that did not receive SAKI funding for comparison.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than a half hour of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be alright with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Background

First we'd like to talk about your organization's efforts to address previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits and your role in the effort.

1. What is the history of your site's efforts in reducing the backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits and related reforms in case processing?
 - When were backlog reduction efforts initiated and why?

- What activities has your site engaged in to reduce the backlog? How far along is your site in completing each of these activities?
 - Has your site made changes to improve how current cases are processed? If so, what types of changes? How far along is your site in making these changes?
2. Tell us about your role within your organization/agency.
 - Tell us about your role in the effort to reduce the backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits.
 - *[For SAKI grantees]*, tell us about your role in the SAKI effort.
 - How long have you been involved in these efforts?

Site Structure

Now we're going to talk about the agencies involved in processing previously unsubmitted kits.

3. *[Confirm the site's jurisdiction and lead agency]*. What role does this agency play in the site's efforts to reduce the backlog of unsubmitted cases? What role does this agency play in related system reform efforts?
4. What agencies and organizations are involved in processing the previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits at your site? *[Review the stages of sexual assault case processing to ensure all SAKI-specific stages are covered.]*
5. What agencies and organizations are involved in addressing current sexual assault cases at your site? Are the same people within those agencies/organizations involved in processing current cases? *[Review the stages of sexual assault case processing to ensure all current sexual assault processing stages are covered.]*

State Involvement & Other Champions

Now we're going to talk about your site's involvement with state agencies and individuals who lead the effort for sexual assault case reform at the state *[or local]* levels.

6. What state-level agencies or organizations are involved in backlog reduction and sexual assault case processing reform efforts in your state?
7. Who are champions or individuals leading the effort to reduce the backlog reduction and/or reform the system at your site?
 - Are there local-level champions within your jurisdiction?
 - Are there state-level champions?
8. Who is responsible for financial tracking and reporting for grants at your site?
 - Could we follow-up with you for their contact information? *[for the cost-study feasibility assessment]*

Conclusion

- Thank you again for your time.
- Our next step involves a follow-up interview with you where we will review details about how the different stakeholders we discussed today coordinate to reduce backlog and implement system reforms.
- We will follow up with you in the coming weeks to schedule this interview. No preparation will be required.
- Please let us know if you have any questions in the meantime.

Local Site Coordinator Follow-up Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Follow-Up Interview Protocol for Local Site Coordinators

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction [*points to cover conversationally*]

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).
- The purpose of this interview is to learn about the nature of coordination and clarify any questions that have come up for us about your site's structure since we last spoke.
- Like with our last interview, we are conducting these interviews with Site Coordinators from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17, and a selection of key representatives from sites that did not receive SAKI funding for comparison.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than a half hour of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be alright with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Interagency Coordination

1. We previously discussed that *[agencies/organizations]* are involved in processing backlogged sexual assault cases at your site. How do the agencies and organizations involved at various stages coordinate with one another – within stage, and across the stages of case processing?
 - Is there any sharing of data, colocation, co-funding of efforts, or other examples of collaboration?
2. We previously discussed that *[agencies/organizations]* are involved in processing current sexual assault cases at your site. How do the agencies and organizations involved at various stages coordinate with one another – within stage, and across the stages of case processing?
 - Is there any sharing of data, colocation, co-funding of efforts, or other examples of collaboration?
3. Does your site have any multidisciplinary team(s) that focuses on how to carry out efforts to reduce backlog and reform sexual assault case processing?
 - What is the group(s) purpose? What has it achieved?
 - What agencies and organizations participate? Are any state representatives involved?
 - How frequently does it meet? Where?
 - How has the group function and/or composition changed over time?

Local & State Coordination

4. We previously discussed *[agencies/organizations]* at your site. Can you describe the nature of the relationship between the state and your local site in respect to backlog reduction and sexual assault case processing reform?
 - Does your site or other local partners work with any state-level partners to craft legislation or reform practice guidelines? Who, and how?
 - How has state-level reform work changed how your site processes previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits? Or how your site processes current cases?
 - Has your site received funding from the State or other sources to reduce the unsubmitted kit backlog or conduct reform efforts? Has your site been involved in partnerships or collaborations with state agencies for either of these activities?
5. Has your site contributed to any state efforts to reform sexual assault case processing?
 - Is your site the first within the state to engage in backlog reduction and/or sexual assault case processing reform efforts? If not, what jurisdictions had already engaged in efforts, and did their efforts influence your site's efforts in any way?
 - Are any representatives from your local site involved system reforms at the state-level? This may include helping to craft state legislation, lobbying policymakers,

developing improved case tracking systems, creating or providing training.

Data Tracking

6. How are case data tracked at your site?
 - What case management system does law enforcement in your jurisdiction use to track current sexual assault cases? *[for SAKI sites, if lead agency is not law enforcement]* Is this system different from what the lead agency uses? Does the lead agency have access to this system, or can they request data from this system?
 - Are previously unsubmitted cases tracked in the same system(s), or in a different way?
 - Who could we follow up with about law enforcements' case management data at your site? Can we follow-up with you for their contact information *[for current case management data, and for comparison sites, previously unsubmitted case management data]*?

7. How are SAK inventory data collected, tracked, and reported at your site?
 - Who is responsible for conducting inventories? How are they conducted -- by whom and how frequently?
 - Are inventories reported to the state? How? Is this legislatively mandated *[and if so, as of when]*?
 - Are submission data also tracked/reported? How?

8. Is there a statewide SAK tracking system at your site?
 - Please describe how the tracking system works. What agencies/roles update the SAK system, and at what processing points?
 - When was this system implemented?
 - Is this system legislatively mandated *[and if so, as of when]*?
 - Do victims have access to this system? How? When do they receive access to the system? What information do they see about their case, and when is it updated?
 - Are previously unsubmitted SAKs included in this tracking system, or only SAKs from new cases?
 - Who manages the system? Who could we follow up with for more details about this system? Can we follow-up with you for their contact information *[for current case management data, and for comparison sites, previously unsubmitted case management data]*?

Tool for Local Cross-Site Evaluation Interview

SAKI EVALUATION Interview Preparation Sheet for Local Level Key Informants

Background

During our virtual interview, we will cover a range of topics relevant to sexual assault case processing, for both the previously unsubmitted sexual assault cases in your jurisdiction, as well as current sexual assault cases.

The virtual interview is expected to last approximately 1.5 hours. You are welcome to include as many site representatives in the interview as you think would be helpful to address the full range of topics, listed below.

Topics of Interest

For each of these topics, we are interested in learning about how previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases and/or current sexual assault cases are handled at your site:

Case Processing Stages

- I. Reporting of Sexual Assaults
- II. SANE/Evidence Collection
- III. Transfer of sexual assault kits (SAKs) to Law Enforcement
- IV. Storage of SAKs
- V. Inventory of SAKs
- VI. Submission of SAKs for Testing
- VII. Victim Notification
- VIII. Testing of SAKs
- IX. Collecting lawfully-owed DNA
- X. Uploading Genetic Profiles to CODIS and Disseminating Results to Law Enforcement
- XI. Investigating Cases
- XII. Uploading Case Details to ViCAP
- XIII. Prosecuting Cases
- XIV. Providing Victim Support Services

Other Relevant Activities

- XV. Multidisciplinary teams and local partnerships affecting sexual assault case processing
- XVI. Research efforts
- XVII. Role of the media
- XVIII. Role of COVID-19

Core Question Examples

We will ask a few key questions about each of these topics related to previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases and current sexual assault cases, summarized below:

1. For each stage of case processing or relevant activity, what work is in progress or has been completed within your site's jurisdiction?
 - Please describe any protocols, legislation/mandates, trainings, cross-agency collaborative efforts, data tracking, and/or monitoring efforts that are in place that affect case processing at this stage.
2. Are there any ways in which the victim's perspective or experience is integrated into *[case processing stage]*?
3. What recent *changes or new efforts* have been made to sexual assault kit processing for *[case processing stage]*?
 - These may include but are not limited to the implementation of protocols, legislation, trainings, data tracking and/or monitoring systems, research efforts, resource adjustments, organizational restructuring, or other efforts.

Sharing Documentation

During this interview, we will be asking about protocols, trainings, and other relevant documentation (such as case outcome tracking reports and grant expenditures) for both previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases and current sexual assault cases at your site. We would appreciate you sharing copies of these files with us to help us better understand your site's sexual assault case processing systems.

In advance of our conversation, you can upload any such files to a private folder in a secure SharePoint site, accessible here: [\[link\]](#)

Any documents shared with us will be retained on a confidential server, will not be shared with anyone outside our project, and will be destroyed at the end of our study.

Contact Info

Thank you for reviewing this sheet in advance of our call, we look forward to speaking with you.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions at: _____

Local Cross-Site Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Interview Protocol for Local Level Key Informants

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction [*points to cover conversationally*]

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with BJA.
- The purpose of this virtual interview call is to learn about sexual assault case processing practices in your jurisdiction, especially with respect to changes that have been made to the process since you became involved in the SAKI program [*for non-SAKI sites: since 2015**].
- We are interested in how cases are processed for both previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit (SAK) cases [*tailor for each interview to identify how they refer to their kits/the date range*] as well as current sexual assault cases.
- We will be using the interview information sheet we sent out as a guide for our conversation. We would like to cover the range of topics listed on that sheet in order to understand how specific elements of case processing occur at each site.
- We are conducting these interviews with key representatives from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17 and a selection of key representatives from sites that did not receive SAKI funding.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than an hour and a half of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be alright with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have. This really is meant to be a conversation to get your input.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Overview of Interview Structure

[To be covered conversationally]

1. Please introduce yourselves (names and affiliations).
2. Begin by referring to the different topics listed on the Interview Preparation Sheet we circulated. Explain that each of the sexual assault case processing stages may apply to previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit (SAK) cases, current cases, or both cases, and it is possible the site is not engaging in all stages of case processing.
3. Walk through each of the stages listed, and ask:
 - a. Is *[stage of case processing]* part of previously unsubmitted SAK and/or current sexual assault case processing in your jurisdiction?

If yes:

- i. What does this stage of case processing currently look like for *previously unsubmitted* SAK cases within your site's jurisdiction?
- ii. If this was a change from how *[case processing stage]* was done before, what was the reason for this change?
 - Was anything being done before? How was it different?
 - Was SAKI a driver of this change? How? (*funding activities/staff, connecting with other sites, technical assistance, materials from RTI, etc.*)
 - Was the state involved in this change? How? (*appropriations, legislation, oversight/guidance, monitoring, trainings, etc.*)
 - Were there any other drivers of change?
- iii. Please describe any of the following mechanisms/efforts that are in place that apply to this case processing stage:
 - Policies or protocols
 - Legislation/mandates
 - Trainings
 - Data-tracking and/or monitoring efforts
 - Cross-agency collaborative efforts

Probe to determine:

- When was *[mechanism/effort]* implemented?
 - Before or after receipt of SAKI grant/2015?
- Is there documentation about *[mechanism/effort]* you can share with us, or direct us to?
 - *[Note for follow-up]*

- What agencies, organizations, and staff are involved with or affected by *[mechanism]*?
 - Are the same staff involved with current cases?
 - What individuals/what agencies oversee *[mechanism]*?
 - What SAKs/cases are affected by *[mechanism]*? Which cases are excluded? Which cases are prioritized?
 - E.g.: partially submitted SAKs, anonymous SAKs, cases still prosecutable/no longer prosecutable by SOL, no-DNA cases, cases with CODIS hits, cases with known/unknown offenders, cases with serial offenders, based on victim criteria, etc.
 - Is there protocol in place to determine which cases are included at this stage? What/who does it involve?
 - Is there protocol in place to determine which cases are prioritized at this stage? What/who does it involve?
 - How is progress for *[case processing stage]* monitored?
 - Are there timelines associated with *[mechanism]* at this stage?
 - How is protocol adherence at this stage monitored? What happens if protocols are not being adhered to?
 - How is success defined for this stage of case processing?
 - How are data about progress at this stage tracked? By whom/what agencies, and shared with whom?
- iv. Are there any ways in which the victim’s perspective or experience is integrated into *[case processing stage]*?

Probe to determine:

- Are victim advocates/victim representatives involved in the planning and/or execution of this stage?
 - Are there protocols governing victim involvement at this stage?
 - Are choices offered to victims at this stage?
- b. Have there been any other *changes or new efforts [since becoming a SAKI site / since FY 2015]* that we haven’t discussed that affect how element *[case processing stage]* is conducted for previously unsubmitted SAK cases?

Changes may include but are not limited to the implementation of protocols, legislation, trainings, data tracking and monitoring, research efforts, resource adjustments, organizational restructuring, or other efforts.

If yes proceed, repeat questions “iii” from series “3-a” above.

4. Repeat section 3, asking about current sexual assault cases.

Stage-Specific Probes

5. Refer the following domain-specific probes when discussing each sexual assault case processing stage to ensure they are covered in the discussion:
 - a. Reporting of sexual assaults [*current cases only*]
 - Are the number of reported cases tracked? By whom?
 - Has there been a change in reporting trends since the site began its system SAK reform efforts/since FY 2015?
 - b. SANE/evidence collection [*current cases only*]
 - Do cross-agency collaborative efforts (like MDTs) include SANE?
 - c. Transfer of SAKs to law enforcement
 - For current cases, is there legislation or a policy that defines the process and timeline for transferring SAKs to law enforcement?
 - d. Storage of SAKs
 - Have storage facilities been updated? How? With what funds?
 - e. Inventory of SAKs
 - How many SAKs were inventoried as part of the unsubmitted SAK backlog?
 - What (if any) cases were excluded from the inventory?
 - Are there regular inventories of SAKs?
 - f. Submission of SAKs for testing
 - Was a forklift, prioritization, or some combination of approaches employed to submit previously unsubmitted SAKs?
 - Do protocols specify who is responsible for completing paperwork for submitting SAKs for testing?
 - Are all current case SAKs submitted for testing? Which are not?
 - g. Victim notification [*previously unsubmitted cases only*]
 - For which case types are victims of previously unsubmitted cases notified? (*all previously unsubmitted SAKs, those still within SOL, those with CODIS hits, etc.*)
 - When are victims notified about testing results?
 - Is there a SAK tracking system accessible by victims associated with previously unsubmitted SAKs?

- h. Testing of SAKs
 - Where are previously unsubmitted SAKs tested?
 - Have local labs obtained any new equipment for testing?
- i. Collecting lawfully-owed DNA
 - Did your site receive SAKI funding for this activity/stage?
- j. Uploading genetic profiles to CODIS and disseminating results to law enforcement
 - Are all eligible cases routinely uploaded to ViCAP?
- k. Investigating cases
 - Are cases without biological evidence investigated (*for both previously unsubmitted SAK and current cases*)?
- l. Uploading case details to ViCAP
 - Did your site receive SAKI funding for this activity/stage?
 - Are all eligible cases routinely uploaded to ViCAP?
- m. Prosecuting cases
- n. Providing victim support services
 - How frequently/at what points of processing are victims updated about their case progress? By whom, and how?
 - Do victims have access to SAK tracking systems? (*for previously unsubmitted and current cases*)
- o. Other Relevant Activities
 - Multidisciplinary teams and local partnerships affecting sexual assault case processing
 - Research efforts
 - Role of the media
 - Role of COVID-19
 - How has COVID affected the processing of sexual assault cases at this site?

State Site Coordinator Preliminary Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Preliminary Interview Protocol for State Site Coordinators

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction *[points to cover conversationally]*

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with BJA.
- The purpose of this interview is to learn about your site's background and structure, and to help tailor a subsequent interview with key stakeholders at your site about how previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases and current sexual assault cases are processed.
- We are conducting these interviews with Site Coordinators from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17, and a selection of key representatives from non-SAKI comparison sites.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than an hour of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be all right with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Background

1. Tell us about your organization/agency and your role within your organization/agency.
 - Tell us about your role in the SAKI effort.
 - How long have you been involved in the SAKI effort?
2. How would you describe the visibility of sexual assault case reform in your state?
 - What served as the impetus for the state's reform efforts? *[was there negative media coverage, discovery of the issue following another state's experience, lobbying from an individual/organization,*
 - Are there champions of backlog reduction and/or system reform at the state-level?

3. What is the history of your state's efforts in reducing the backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits and related reforms in case processing?
 - Where is your site in its implementation [*e.g. fully completed or in early stages of implementation*]?
 - What major milestones has your site achieved? [*# of kits tested, investigated/closed, convictions, serial offenders identified, tracking or case management systems implemented, partnerships engaged, protocols or legislation developed, etc.*]
 - When were backlog reduction efforts initiated?
 - What cases are included in the backlog of unsubmitted cases? [*date range, partially tested cases, anonymous cases*]

Site Structure

4. [*Confirm the site's jurisdiction and lead agency*]. What role does this agency/the state have in supporting local sites' backlog reduction and case reform efforts?
 - Do they support via: administration of trainings, development of regulations and legislation, providing guidance, financial support, overseeing monitoring and accountability, development of statewide case management or tracking systems?

Local-Level Insights

5. Within the state, are there specific counties/cities where the state's backlog reduction and case reform efforts are more heavily focused?
 - What community-level agencies are responsible for the efforts at these sites?
 - Does your site have any kind of relationship with local-level agencies at these sites?
 - How has local-level work about sexual assault case reform impacted (*and/or served as the impetus for*) your local site's efforts to process previously unsubmitted kits?
 - Have you received any grants or appropriations from the State, or been involved in partnerships or collaborations with state agencies?
6. Who is responsible for financial reporting for grants at your site?
 - Could we follow-up for their contact information? [*for the cost-study evaluability assessment*]

Conclusion

- Thank you again for your time.
- Our next step involves a virtual interview where we will review details about how your site engages in different aspects of sexual assault case processing.
- In order to prepare for that interview, we will be sending you an Interview Preparation Sheet. The sheet will give you an idea of the topics and kinds of questions we would like to cover during that call.
- Please review the sheet and coordinate with key stakeholders within your site to determine who should participate on that call.
- We will follow up with you in the coming weeks to identify who is critical to include in that

call, and get their contact information. We will then reach out and schedule a time to talk with those contacts. We expect this next interview to take about 1.5 hours.

- Please let us know if you have any questions in the meantime.

State Site Coordinator Follow-Up Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Follow-Up Interview Protocol for State Site Coordinators

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction [*points to cover conversationally*]

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).
- The purpose of this interview is to learn about the nature of coordination and clarify any questions that have come up for us about your site's structure since we last spoke.
- Like with our last interview, we are conducting these interviews with Site Coordinators from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17, and a selection of key representatives from sites that did not receive SAKI funding for comparison.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than a half hour of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be alright with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Interagency Coordination

1. We previously discussed that *[agencies/organizations]* are involved in coordinating backlog reduction and sexual assault processing case reforms at your site. How do the agencies and organizations coordinate with one another?
 - Is there any sharing of data, colocation, co-funding of efforts, or other examples of collaboration?
2. Does your site have any multidisciplinary team(s) that focuses on how to carry out efforts to reduce backlog and reform sexual assault case processing in the state?
 - What agencies and organizations participate? How frequently does it meet? Where?
 - How/why did the group(s) form? Because of SAKI or something else?
 - What is the group(s) purpose(s)?
 - What has it achieved? *[do they develop trainings, legislation, a tracking system, oversee all relevant programming, etc.]*
 - How has the group function and/or composition changed over time?
 - Is there any sharing of data, colocation, co-funding of efforts, or other examples of collaboration?

Local & State Coordination

3. We previously discussed *[local jurisdictions]* that are working to resolve backlogs and implement reforms your site. Can you describe the nature of the relationship between the state and the local agencies/organizations in these jurisdictions in respect to backlog reduction and sexual assault case processing reform?
 - Does your site or other state partners work with any local-level partners to craft legislation or reform practice guidelines? Who, and how?
 - How has state-level reform work changed how your site processes previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits? Or how your site processes current cases?
 - Has the state provided funding or other sources to reduce the unsubmitted kit backlog or conduct reform efforts at the local level? Has your site been involved in partnerships or collaborations with local agencies for either of these activities?
4. Have local partners contributed to any state efforts to reform sexual assault case processing?
 - At what local jurisdictions did backlog reduction and reform efforts start, and when? Did their efforts influence the state's reform efforts in any way?
 - Are any representatives from local sites involved system reforms at the state-level? This may include helping to craft state legislation, lobbying policymakers, developing improved case tracking systems, creating or providing training?

Data Tracking

5. How are SAK inventory data collected, tracked, and reported at your site?

- Who is responsible for conducting inventories? How are they conducted -- by whom and how frequently?
 - Are inventories reported to the state? How? Is this legislatively mandated *[and if so, as of when]*?
 - Are submission data also tracked/reported? How?
6. Is there a statewide SAK tracking system at your site?
- Please describe how the tracking system works. What agencies/roles update the SAK system, and at what processing points?
 - When was this system implemented?
 - Is this system legislatively mandated *[and if so, as of when]*?
 - Do victims have access to this system? How? When do they receive access to the system? What information do they see about their case, and when is it updated?
 - Are previously unsubmitted SAKs included in this tracking system, or only SAKs from new cases?
 - Who manages the system? Who could we follow up with for more details about this system? Can we follow-up with you for their contact information *[for current case management data, and for comparison sites, previously unsubmitted case management data]*?

Tool for State-Site Evaluation Interview

SAKI EVALUATION Interview Preparation Sheet for State Level Key Informants

Background

During our virtual interview, we will cover a range of topics relevant to sexual assault case processing reform, as it applies to previously unsubmitted sexual assault cases in your state, as well as to current sexual assault cases.

The virtual interview is expected to last approximately 1.5 hours. You are welcome to include as many site representatives in the interview as you think would be helpful to address the full range of topics, listed below.

Topics of Interest

We are interested in learning about how your state has managed sexual assault case reform for previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases and/or current sexual assault cases within the state.

Types of Initiatives

- I. Resource adjustment
- II. Organizational restructuring
- III. Legislation development
- IV. Policy/protocol development
- V. Development/administration of trainings
- VI. Implementation of case management, kit tracking and other data systems
- VII. Community and victim engagement efforts
- VIII. Research efforts
- IX. Other types of initiatives

Other Relevant Activities

- I. Multidisciplinary teams
- II. Role of the media
- III. Role of COVID-19

Core Question Examples

We will ask a few key questions about each of these topics, summarized below:

1. Has the state engaged in any initiatives or efforts of this type? What does the initiative entail, and what types of cases and aspects of case processing are affected?
2. How is victim-centeredness addressed in this effort?
3. What was the impetus for this reform? Did SAKI program participation contribute, and how?

Sharing Documentation

During this interview, we will be asking about protocols, trainings, and other relevant documentation (such as case outcome tracking reports and grant expenditures) for both previously unsubmitted and current sexual assault cases at your site. We would appreciate you sharing copies of these files with us to help us better understand your site's sexual assault case processing systems.

In advance of our conversation, you can upload any such files to a private folder in a secure SharePoint site, accessible here: *[link]*

Any documents shared with us will be retained on a confidential server, will not be shared with anyone outside our project, and will be destroyed at the end of our study.

Contact Info

Thank you for reviewing this sheet in advance of our call, we look forward to speaking with you.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions at: _____

State-Level Cross-Site Evaluation Interview Protocol

SAKI EVALUATION Interview Protocol for State Level Key Informants

Interviewers:

Interviewee(s):

Date of Interview:

Introduction [*points to cover conversationally*]

- Thank you for taking the time to talk with us about your work.
- We're with Westat, a research organization working with BJA.
- The purpose of this virtual interview call is to learn about sexual assault case processing practices in your jurisdiction, especially with respect to changes to have been made to the process since you became involved in the SAKI program [*for non-SAKI sites: since 2015**].
- We are interested in how cases are processed for both previously unsubmitted SAK cases [*tailor for each interview to identify how they refer to their kits/the date range*] as well as current sexual assault cases.
- We are conducting these interviews with key representatives from all SAKI awardee sites from FY15-FY17 and a selection of non-SAKI comparison sites.
- I will do my best to keep the interview brief. The interview should take no more than an hour and a half of your time.
- Your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. There is no known risk to participating or not participating.
- With your permission, we would like to record our conversation. We will also take notes and the recording will be used as a backup in case we miss something in our notes. The audiotapes and notes will be reviewed only by our team and destroyed at the end of the project. Would it be all right with you if we recorded the conversation for note-taking purposes?
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin? Throughout the interview please feel free to ask any questions that you have. This really is meant to be a conversation to get your input.
- If you have any questions after our conversation, please feel free to contact me or the project director. Our contact information is in the email that we sent to you to schedule this interview.

Overview of Interview Structure

[To be covered conversationally]

1. Please introduce yourselves (names and affiliations).
2. Begin by referring to the different topics listed on the Interview Preparation Sheet we circulated. Explain that each of these efforts of sexual assault cases processing may apply to previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases, current cases, or both cases, and it is possible the site is not engaging in all types of efforts.
3. Walk through each of these efforts listed, and ask:
 - a. Has the state engaged in any initiatives or efforts of this type? What does the initiative entail, and what types of cases and aspects of case processing are affected?

For each initiative identified, probe to determine:

- i. When was *[mechanism]* implemented?
 - Before or after receipt of SAKI grant/2015?
 - Was anything being done before? How was it different?
 - ii. Is there documentation about *[mechanism]* you can share with us, or direct us to?
 - *[Note for follow-up]*
 - iii. What agencies, organizations, and staff are involved with or affected by *[mechanism]*?
 - What individuals/what agencies oversee *[mechanism]*?
 - iv. What SAKs/cases are affected by *[mechanism]*? Which cases are excluded? Which case are prioritized?
 - For example: partially submitted SAKs, anonymous SAKs, cases still prosecutable/no longer prosecutable by SOL, no-DNA cases, cases with CODIS hits, cases with known/unknown offenders, cases with serial offenders, based on victim criteria, etc.
 - v. How is progress at this element monitored?
 - Are there timelines associated with *[mechanism]*?
 - How is protocol adherence at this element monitored? What happens if protocols are not being adhered to?
 - How is success defined for this element of case processing?
 - How are data about progress at this element tracked? By whom/what agencies, and shared with whom?
- b. How is victim-centeredness addressed in this effort?

Probe to determine:

 - i. Are victim advocates/victim representative organizations involved in the planning and/or execution of this case element?

- c. What was the impetus for this reform?
 - i. Did the state lead this effort? How did it contribute? *[appropriations, legislation, oversight/guidance, monitoring, trainings, etc.]*
 - ii. Was SAKI a driver of this change? How? *(funding activities/staff, connecting with other sites, technical assistance, materials from SAKI TTA, etc.)*
 - iii. Were there any other drivers of change?

Appendix F. Victim Surveys

SAKI EVALUATION

Draft Victim Survey – Previously Unsubmitted Kit Case Victims

Survey will be collected from victims associated with backlog cases/previously unsubmitted kits – sexual assaults that occurred more than two years ago (or within site’s SAKI inventory window.)

Study ID: _____

Site ID: _____

Section A: Screening Questions

1. Have you been a victim of sexual assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 2**

No **END SURVEY**

2. What month and year did your sexual assault for which you are **currently seeking services occur**?

Month: _____ Year: _____

Section B: Victim Notification of Unsubmitted Kit

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about the medical services you received related to the sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

3. Did you have a sexual assault kit completed around the time of your sexual assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 4**

No **END SURVEY**

4. Have you been notified that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits (that is, your kit had not previously been submitted to a crime laboratory for testing)?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 5**

No **END SURVEY**

5. How were you notified that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits?

Check all that apply.

a. In-person

b. By phone

c. Email message

d. Letter in the mail

e. Other

6. Who notified you that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits?

Check all that apply.

a. Law enforcement officer

b. Victim advocate/counselor

c. Prosecutor/attorney

d. Other

7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experience being notified about your sexual assault kit.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed about my kit being part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits.					

b. I was treated with respect when being notified that my kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits.					
c. I received the support I needed when being notified that my kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits.					
d. I was involved in making decisions about how my case would proceed after being notified that my kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with the notification process.					

Section C: Law Enforcement/Investigation

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

8. Since you received notification about your sexual assault kit, did you have an **initial interview or meeting** with law enforcement officers/investigators to discuss your case?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 9**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 10**

9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your **initial interview or meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators** about your sexual assault case, after you received notification about your kit. **Please do not answer these questions about any initial interview or meeting you had prior to receiving notification about your kit.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my initial					

interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
b. I was treated with respect during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about how my case would proceed during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					

10. Since you received notification about your sexual assault kit, have you had **ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators** about your case (i.e., after an initial interview or meeting)?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 11**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 12**

11. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your **ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators** about your sexual assault case, after you received notification about your kit. **Please do not answer these questions about any interactions you had with law enforcement prior to receiving notification about your kit.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case (such as updates on the investigation, notification of an arrest, notification that a suspect is in custody).					
b. I was treated with respect during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about my case during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					

12. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, to the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been arrested in your case?

Yes

No

Section D: Sexual Assault Kit Testing and Tracking

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your sexual assault kit that is part of a backlog of unsubmitted kits and associated with your sexual assault indicated in Question 2.

13. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted kits, have you had access to or received any information about the forensic testing status of your sexual assault kit?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 14**

No **SKIP TO SECTION E**

14. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted kits, have you had access to or received any information about the testing status of your sexual assault kit through the following sources?

Check all that apply.

a. Sexual assault kit tracking system

b. Website

c. Hotline

d. Case representatives (law enforcement officers/investigators, victim advocates, prosecutors)

e. Other

15. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted kits, have you been notified that your kit has been submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 16**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 17**

16. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your experience with being notified that your sexual assault kit has been submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
b. I was treated with respect when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
c. I received the support I needed when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about submitting my sexual assault kit to a crime laboratory for testing.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with the notification I received that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for testing.					

17. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted kits, have you been notified regarding whether the forensic testing of your kit has resulted in the identification of a suspect or perpetrator of your assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 18**

No **SKIP TO SECTION E**

18. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your experience with being notified about whether the forensic testing of your kit has resulted in the identification of a suspect or perpetrator of your assault.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
b. I was treated with respect when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
c. I received the support I needed when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about how my case would proceed after being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with the notification I received about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					

Section E: Prosecution Activities

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about prosecution activities related to your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

19. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, have you had an **initial interview or meeting** with prosecutors about your case?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 20**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 21**

20. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your initial interview or meeting with prosecutors about your sexual assault case after you received notification about your sexual assault kit. **Please do not answer these questions about any initial interview or meeting you had prior to receiving notification about your kit.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case (options moving forward such as potential plea agreements and prosecution decisions, what to expect from the prosecution process).					
b. I was treated with respect during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved in making decisions about how my case would proceed during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					

21. Since you received notification about your sexual assault kit, have you had **ongoing interactions with prosecutors** about your case (i.e., after an initial interview or meeting)?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 22**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 23**

22. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your ongoing interactions with prosecutors about your sexual assault case, after you received notification about your kit. **Please do not answer these questions about any interactions you had with prosecutors prior to receiving notification about your kit.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case (such as updates on the prosecution, potential plea agreements).					
b. I was treated with respect during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about my case during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					

23. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, to the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been charged by prosecutors in your case?

Yes

No

I don't know

24. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, to the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been convicted in your case?

Yes

No

I don't know

Section F: Victim Advocate

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your experiences with a victim advocate/counselor regarding your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

25. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, have you met with a victim advocate or counselor?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 26**

No **SKIP TO SECTION G**

26. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about interactions with a victim advocate/counselor regarding your sexual assault case, since you received notification about your kit. **Please do not answer these questions about any interactions you had with a victim advocate/counselor around the time of your assault.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed from a victim advocate/counselor (what to expect from the criminal justice system, information on services available for victims).					
b. I was treated with respect by a victim advocate/counselor.					

c. I received the support I needed from a victim advocate/counselor (emotional support, interview accompaniment, assistance with completing paperwork).					
d. I was involved in making decisions about my sexual assault case and/or support services when interacting with a victim advocate/counselor.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my interactions with a victim advocate/counselor.					

Section G: Services

27. Since you received notification that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits, have you been referred to any victim support services?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 28**

No **SKIP TO SECTION H**

28. Please indicate to which services you have been referred and/or received since you were notified that your sexual assault kit is part of a backlog.

Services	Referred	Received
a. Medical services		
b. Counseling services		
c. Substance abuse services		
d. Children’s services		
e. Immigration services		
f. Legal services		
g. Financial assistance		
h. Employment services		
i. Housing assistance		
j. Transportation assistance		
k. Travel assistance		

29. Overall, how satisfied are you with the services you received after being notified about your unsubmitted sexual assault kit?

Very Satisfied

Satisfied

Unsatisfied

Very unsatisfied

Section H: Closing

30. Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience after receiving notification about your unsubmitted sexual assault kit?

31. Is there anything you would change or modify about your experience after receiving notification about your unsubmitted sexual assault kit?

SAKI EVALUATION
Draft Victim Survey – Current Case Victims

Survey will be collected from victims associated with “current” cases – sexual assaults that occurred within the past two years (or after site’s SAKI inventory window.)

Study ID: _____

Site ID: _____

Section A: Screening Questions

1. Have you been a victim of sexual assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 2**

No **END SURVEY**

2. What month and year did your sexual assault for which you are **currently seeking services occur**?

Month: _____ Year: _____

Section B: Medical Services

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about the medical services you received related to the sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

3. After your sexual assault, did you receive medical services or meet with a nurse or other medical professional?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 4**

No **SKIP TO SECTION C**

4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the medical services you received after your sexual assault.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed about my medical concerns after my sexual assault.					
b. I received the information I needed about receiving a medical exam after my sexual assault.					
c. I received the information I needed about reporting my sexual assault to law enforcement.					
d. I was treated with respect when receiving medical services after my sexual assault.					
e. I received the support I needed when receiving medical services after my sexual assault.					
f. I was involved in making decisions about the medical care I received after my sexual assault.					
g. Overall, I am satisfied with the medical care I received after my sexual assault.					

Section C: Law Enforcement/Investigation

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your initial interview/meeting and ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators related to the sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

5. Did you report your sexual assault to law enforcement?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 6**

No **SKIP TO SECTION D**

6. After your sexual assault, did you have an **initial interview or meeting** with law enforcement officers/investigators to discuss your case?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 7**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 8**

7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your initial interview or meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators after your sexual assault.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
b. I was treated with respect during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about how my case would proceed during my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my initial interview/meeting with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					

8. After your sexual assault, have you had ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about your case (i.e., after an initial interview or meeting)?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 9**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 10**

9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about your sexual assault case.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case (such as updates on the investigation, notification of an arrest, notification that a suspect is in custody).					
b. I was treated with respect during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about my case during my ongoing interactions with law enforcement officers/investigators.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my ongoing interactions with law enforcement					

officers/investigators about my sexual assault case.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

10. To the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been arrested in your case?

Yes

No

I don't know

Section D: Sexual Assault Kit Testing and Tracking

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your sexual kit associated you're your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

11. Did you have a sexual assault kit completed after your sexual assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 12**

No **SKIP TO SECTION E**

12. Since your sexual assault, have you had access to or received any information about the forensic testing status of your sexual assault kit?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 13**

No **SKIP TO SECTION E**

13. Since your sexual assault, have you had access to or received any information about the testing status of your sexual assault kit through the following sources?

Check all that apply.

a. Sexual assault kit tracking system

b. Website

c. Hotline

d. Case representatives (law enforcement officers/investigators, victim advocates, prosecutors)

e. Other (Specify: _____)

14. Since your sexual assault, have you been notified that your kit has been submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 15**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 16**

15. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your experience with being notified that your sexual assault kit has been submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
b. I was treated with respect when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
c. I received the support I needed when being notified that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for forensic testing.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about submitting my sexual assault kit to a crime laboratory for testing.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with the notification I received					

that my sexual assault kit was submitted to a crime laboratory for testing.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

16. Since your sexual assault, have you been notified regarding whether the forensic testing of your kit has resulted in the identification of a suspect or perpetrator of your assault?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 17**

No **SKIP TO SECTION E**

17. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your experience with being notified about whether the forensic testing of your kit has resulted in the identification of a suspect or perpetrator of your assault.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
b. I was treated with respect when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
c. I received the support I needed when being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about how my case would proceed after being notified about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with the notification I received about the forensic testing results of my sexual assault kit.					

18. Have you been notified that your sexual assault kit has recently been submitted to a crime laboratory for testing?

Yes

No

19. Have you been notified regarding whether the testing of your sexual assault kit has resulted in the identification of a suspected perpetrator of your assault?

Yes

No

20. Did you have access to information about the status of your sexual assault kit such as through an online kit tracking system or website?

Yes

No

Section E: Prosecution Activities

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about prosecution activities related to your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

21. Since your sexual assault, have you had an **initial interview or meeting with prosecutors** about your case?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 22**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 25**

22. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your **initial interview or meeting with prosecutors** about your sexual assault case.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my initial interview/meeting with					

prosecutors about my sexual assault case (options moving forward such as potential plea agreements and prosecution decisions, what to expect from the prosecution process).					
b. I was treated with respect during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					
d. I was involved in making decisions about how my case would proceed during my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my initial interview/meeting with prosecutors about my sexual assault case.					

23. Since your sexual assault, have you had **ongoing interactions with prosecutors** about your case (i.e., after an initial interview or meeting)?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 24**

No **SKIP TO QUESTION 25**

24. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your ongoing interactions with prosecutors about your sexual assault case.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed during my ongoing interactions prosecutors about my case (such as					

updates on the prosecution, potential plea agreements).					
b. I was treated with respect during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					
c. I received the support I needed during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					
d. I was involved with making decisions about my case during my ongoing interactions with prosecutors.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my ongoing interactions with prosecutors about my case.					

25. To the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been charged by a prosecutor in your case?

Yes

No

I don't know

26. To the best of your knowledge, has a suspect been convicted in your case?

Yes

No

I don't know

Section F: Victim Advocate

Respondent Instructions: Please answer these questions about your experiences with a victim advocate/counselor regarding your sexual assault for which you are currently seeking services, as indicated in Question 2.

27. Since your sexual assault, have you met with a victim advocate or counselor about your sexual assault case?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 28**

No **SKIP TO SECTION G**

28. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your interactions with a victim advocate/counselor regarding your sexual assault case.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. I received the information I needed from a victim advocate/counselor (what to expect from the criminal justice system, information on services available for victims).					
b. I was treated with respect by a victim advocate/counselor.					
c. I received the support I needed from a victim advocate/counselor (emotional support during the exam/at the hospital, interview accompaniment, assistance with completing paperwork).					
d. I was involved in making decisions about my sexual assault case and/or support services when interacting with a victim advocate/counselor.					
e. Overall, I am satisfied with my interactions with a victim advocate/counselor.					

Section G: Services

29. Following your sexual assault, have you been referred to any victim support services?

Yes **CONTINUE TO QUESTION 30**

No **SKIP TO SECTION H**

30. Please indicate to which services you have been referred and/or received since your sexual assault.

Services	Referred	Received
a. Medical services		
b. Counseling services		
c. Substance abuse services		
d. Children's services		
e. Immigration services		
f. Legal services		
g. Financial assistance		
h. Employment services		
i. Housing assistance		
j. Transportation assistance		
k. Travel assistance		

31. Overall, how satisfied are you with the services you received since your sexual assault?

Very Satisfied

Satisfied

Unsatisfied

Very unsatisfied

Section H: Closing

32. Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience after your sexual assault?

33. Is there anything you would change or modify about your experience after your sexual assault?

Appendix G. In-depth Case Study Component Materials

Overview

The case study component aims to provide supplementary data about key stage-level efforts that sites have implemented to reduce backlogs and initiate system reforms, in order to inform the replication and refinement of SAKI program efforts across grantee sites, and to provide a nuanced understanding of how SAKI program participation can be especially impactful in effecting systems change. A small set of sites will be selected for case studies that have implemented systems change in one or more stages of case processing and that emerged as especially successful in reducing existing backlogs of unsubmitted SAKs and associated cases within those stages, and/or in preventing the resurgence of new backlogs and reforming case processing systems in respect to those stages. The final selection of key stakeholders participating in the in-depth interviews will vary by site as a function of the aspects of case processing each case study site is selected to represent and based upon the information learned about that aspect of case processing at each site as part of the cross-site study. Interviews with key stakeholders involved in these changes will provide more in-depth understanding of how those changes were made and how they might inform other sites' efforts.

A secondary purpose of the case study component is to determine the feasibility of collecting financial data to conduct a cost study; more details on this aspect of the case studies can be found in Appendix H. Evaluators will approach site coordinators and leadership from the final sites via email to determine if key site stakeholders are willing and able to participate in additional in-depth cost interviews.

Interviews with key stakeholders will focus on:

- **the history of how current processes at the stage were developed**, including the state of stage-level processes prior to reform efforts, any iterations of change to the stage processes that occurred and why, the agencies, organizations, and individuals who contributed to the changes on the local and state-levels, and plans for sustaining and/or modifying the stage's case processes moving forward;
- **the strategies stakeholders considered critical in meeting stage-specific goals and why**, for example, multidisciplinary planning processes, triage and case conferencing systems, partnerships with other agencies and community organizations, or personnel trainings, as well as stage-specific strategies like case prioritization or the exclusion of specific case types from processing, or the involvement of victim advocates in stage activities;

- **the nature of coordination within and across roles and agencies/organizations involved in implementing the successful processes**, including the mechanisms for data sharing, within- and cross-agency workgroups, and local and/or state partnerships;
- **the challenges that have been encountered in optimizing these processes and how they have been overcome**, such as resource gaps, stakeholder buy-in, media coverage, and community trust; and,
- **the factors that facilitated the processes' implementation at the sites and how**, including SAKI networking, funds, technical assistance, or other initiative resources, non-SAKI funds or technical assistance, and site-specific leaders and champions.

Interview responses will be examined to qualitatively measure the program components, stakeholder involvement, and decision-making process at these sites, in order to learn more about how they contribute to sites' outcome achievement. The in-depth interviews are expected to take approximately one hour and will be conducted virtually. Because the focus and participants of each interview will be unique to the aspect(s) of case processing that the evaluation team determines the site to be especially successful in implementing, each interview protocol will be tailored to the participant's role and known information about the aspect of stage processing in which they are involved. Core interviewing questions that will serve as the framework for these individualized protocol are outlined below.

Participant Selection

Eligibility for participation in this component will be determined based on preliminary analysis of the cross-site study data. A total of six to eight SAKI grantee sites and three to four comparison sites are expected to participate in the case study component of the evaluation.

Interviews will capture the perspectives of local stage-specific stakeholders across the case processing continuum within case study sites, as well as the stakeholders responsible for developing and executing activities associated with state-level reforms. For example, at a site that is considered especially successful in performing victim notifications for previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit cases with in-person teams, evaluators may approach the victim advocates, prosecuting attorneys, and/or investigators who are responsible for conducting these notifications, as well as any additional community or state-level leadership involved in developing associated policies and protocols at the site. At a site where evaluators determine that submission and testing of all sexual assault kits is especially successful, evaluators may approach lab staff and leadership, evidence technicians, and champions identified in the local and state cross-site interviews that are critical to the site's submission and testing processes. Evaluators will aim to cover different aspects of case processing across the final selection of case study sites, ensuring that the case studies focus on sites' success(es) at various stages of case processing, for both previously unsubmitted SAK cases and current sexual assault cases. A template for tailoring in-depth interview protocols with stage- and site-specific details learned from the cross-site study is included below.

In-Depth Case Study Interview Protocol Template

1. Please describe your role in processing sexual assault cases (those associated with previously unsubmitted SAKs, and/or current sexual assault cases). What are the key responsibilities of your role in respect to addressing *[successful stage(s) of interest]*?
 - How long have you been in this role?
 - Are you the only one with this role or are there others? How are their roles similar or different?
 - Are you involved in the direct processing of cases at this stage/these stages? Have you been involved in any planning and/or revision of how this stage is completed?
2. What do you consider to be key strategies for how you and/or your site approached *[stage]*, and why? How were these strategies developed and/or decided upon?
 - Are these strategies implemented across stakeholders? Are they integrated into protocols?
 - Who was involved in developing/deciding on these strategies?
3. Please describe the history of *[stage(s) of interest]* at this site. What changes have occurred in how *[stage]* has been addressed?
 - When did these changes occur?
 - What inspired these changes, and who was responsible for implementing the changes?
4. Please describe the ways in which your role in addressing *[stage]* involves coordinating with staff in your agency and staff in other roles, agencies, and organizations.
 - What kinds of data sharing, planning meetings, or decision-making processes do you engage in?
 - How has this changed over time? Why?
5. What challenges have you/your site encountered in implementing *[stage]*, and why? How have these challenges been addressed?
 - What remains challenging in implementing *[stage]*?
 - Are there ways that SAKI program involvement could be more helpful in addressing these challenges?

6. What has helped you/your site in successfully implementing *[stage]*, and why?

- What has been the most helpful, and why?
- How has *[for SAKI sites] SAKI program/[for non-funded sites] SAKI program awareness, other agency or coalition involvement been helpful? (e.g., funding of staffing/equipment/activities, collaborating with other sites, developing relationships with other agencies/organizations, coordination in a multidisciplinary team (MDT), TTA guidance, protocol or other templates from other sites/the TTA website, etc.)*

Appendix H. Cost Analysis Study Component Materials

Overview

The cost study aims to understand how sites fund their efforts to submit and resolve previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits and associated cases. Findings from this component can help the evaluation team develop expectations for the range of costs of processing a previously unsubmitted sexual assault kit case at various stages, as well as inform decisions about how grant efforts can be optimized to best serve sites in their program development and implementation. Evaluators will conduct a feasibility assessment among SAKI-funded and comparison study site candidates to determine data availability, assess sites' ability to participate in the study component, and refine plausible study questions that can be answered with available data.

Through the case study interviews, site coordinators will identify individuals who can speak to expenditure tracking at each site's local level, where site's unsubmitted SAK reduction and case resolution processing occur. A list of feasibility questions will guide a brief phone interview (approximately one-half hour) with these stakeholders. These interviews will focus on the format and availability of expenditure data across processing stages. Evaluators will review expenditure data that sites have available and are willing to share via a secure SharePoint site, and assess contents and quality of these data for their utility in answering potential cost study research questions (described below).

In their review, evaluators will pay special attention to patterns in the availability of expenditure data at different processing stages across sites, and to the types of funding and support sources that sites use to address their backlog reduction efforts across different processing stages. Noted patterns will drive evaluators approach to refining research questions.

Feasibility Questions for Cost Analysis

As part of our evaluation, we are interested in learning about the different ways that sites have funded any efforts to reduce the backlog of previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits and resolve their associated cases [including and in addition to SAKI grant funds].

For example, we would like to learn about how staffing, equipment, facilities, activities, victim support services and any other aspects of your site's backlog reduction efforts were funded across stages of case processing, including inventory, submission, testing, investigation, and prosecution.

We have a few questions for you about the kinds of related expenditure records your site might keep that could help us better understand patterns in funding needs and usage across sites.

1. How are data on expenditures related to backlog reduction efforts tracked at your site, across all stages of case processing (e.g., inventory, submission, testing, investigation, prosecution, and victim support/engagement)? *Expenditure examples include staffing costs, activity costs like SAK submission and testing, trainings, equipment, facility costs, victim engagement services, etc.*
 - Are data tracked by source, agency, stage of processing, and/or some other way? Are different types of costs tracked differently?
 - What do these records include? Do they include staffing costs/role counts, activity costs (e.g., submission shipment costs, testing fees), facility costs (e.g. office, direct/indirect costs, etc.)? Do they include funding source, amount, and years of funding?
 - In what format are these records kept? (In spreadsheets, a financial tracking software system, grant reporting forms, etc.)
 - Who is responsible for inputting these data? How frequently are these data updated?
 - Could we have access to those records?
 - Are there aspects of funding and/or resource support for your site’s backlog reduction efforts are not included in these records?

2. Has your site engaged in any cost-analysis studies related to backlog reduction efforts? (e.g. cost-benefit analyses for specific submission or testing approaches, or for a community’s entire backlog reduction and case resolution efforts) *[If yes:]*
 - What was the purpose of these analyses? What aspects of case processing did they cover?
 - How was this conducted, and by whom?
 - What kinds of findings were reported, and to whom/how?
 - Could we have access to these reports and/or any associated records?

Potential Questions for Cost-Study

- How do sites that have reduced their previously unsubmitted case backlogs and resolved associated cases fund/support these efforts? With what range of sources, and with a focus on what expenditures?

- Given the number of previously unsubmitted SAKs and associated cases processed at each of the case sites, what is the range of costs per SAK associated with processing a previously unsubmitted SAK case to closure? What ranges of costs can be expected at

each and across processing stages? How do these costs differ as a function of sites' different programming choices and approaches?

- Over the course of the sites' previously unsubmitted case reduction efforts, how do expenditures shift?
- In consideration of a site's full range of resources and backlog-reduction related expenditures, for what aspects of programming are SAKI funds especially critical?
- Among sites that report performing any cost-analysis of their backlog reduction efforts, what are common findings about case processing expenditures or the cost-benefit of different backlog reduction approaches?

Appendix I. National Landscape Study Component Materials

Overview

The SAKI evaluation provides an opportunity to understand the broader landscape of relevant sexual assault policy and program developments and if and how that work was influenced by SAKI. The National Study component of the evaluation will provide an understanding of the national impact that SAKI has had on unfunded as well as funded jurisdictions. In addition to the initial landscape assessment of all 50 states based upon publicly available information about relevant sexual assault legislation and policies within those jurisdictions, evaluators will disseminate a web survey to organizations of professional experts involved in sexual assault case processing across the United States.

The web survey aims to determine these experts' awareness of the SAKI program, the nature and jurisdiction of relevant reform efforts occurring in the U.S., and whether and how these experts perceive SAKI to be contributing to those backlog reduction and sexual assault case reform efforts. The survey will ask experts about their willingness to engage in follow-up correspondence to learn more about any specific initiatives they identify in the survey, as well as for information about the key stakeholders involved in developing and implementing those efforts. Evaluators will reach out to these survey participants to identify and obtain the key stakeholders' contact information, and will connect with the leaders of initiatives identified via this survey to request their participation in a brief (i.e., less than one half-hour) interview to understand more about the nature, scope of, and impetus for the highlighted initiatives.

Data gathered from the web survey and interviews will allow researchers to determine the reach and nature of the SAKI program influence on both funded and unfunded sites, and help highlight the unique ways that the SAKI program involvement spurs backlog reduction and system reform efforts in the U.S.

National Experts' Web Survey

1. How did you learn about Bureau of Justice Assistance's National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI)? *[Open-ended/I haven't heard about SAKI]*
2. Are you aware of any efforts to process previously unsubmitted (i.e., "backlogged") sexual assault kits either by a state or a local jurisdiction in the U.S.?
Examples of efforts include the inventory, submission, testing, investigation, and/or prosecution of previously unsubmitted cases. *[Yes/No]*
 - Please provide a brief description the effort(s). If known, please tell us where (i.e., city, county, or the entire state) the initiative(s) is occurring, and what agency or individual(s) lead the initiative. *[Open-response.]*

- To your knowledge, has the SAKI program influenced any aspect of this effort?
[Yes/No/Don't know]
 - If yes, please describe. [Open-response.]
3. Are you aware of any efforts to improve sexual assault case processing either by a state, county, and/or a local jurisdiction? [Yes/No]
Aspects of sexual assault case processing that may be under reform include the reporting, evidence collection (SANE), investigation, prosecution, and/or engagement of victims in sexual assault cases. Improvements may be in the form of legislation, protocol development, community outreach efforts, trainings, organizational restructuring, the development of workgroups, etc.
- Please provide a brief description the effort(s). If known, please tell us where (i.e., city, county, or the entire state) the initiative(s) is occurring, and what agency or individual(s) lead the initiative. [Open-response.]
 - To your knowledge, has the SAKI program influenced this effort in any way?
[Yes/No/Don't know]
 - If yes, please describe. [Open-response.]
4. Would you be willing to be contacted for a brief conversation about some of the items discussed in this survey? [Yes/No]
- If yes, please provide your email address: [Open-response.]
5. If there is someone else you think would be helpful for us to contact about backlog reduction and sexual assault case processing efforts in the jurisdictions you identified, please list their name, agency/organization affiliation, and email address (if known) here. [Open-response.]

National Initiative Leaders Interview Protocol Draft

1. Please tell us about [initiative mentioned in the web survey].
 - *[Additional prompts for this question will be tailored in advance to the type of initiative identified in the survey. For example, if statewide SAK submission legislation is being developed, prompts will assess whether this legislation includes a timeline, monitoring, applies to current and/or previously unsubmitted SAKs, etc. If victim advocates have been recruited into a local law enforcement agency, prompts will assess the number of victim advocates, how they are funded, and their role within the agency, etc.]*

2. What factors helped initiate this effort?
3. When did the development of this effort start, and how long did it take to implement?
4. What challenges were faced in developing this effort?
5. What factors facilitated the development of this effort?
6. *[If not mentioned elsewhere]:* Was the Bureau of Justice Assistance’s Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) influential in the development of this effort? For example, were SAKI grantees consulted for advice, or were materials from the SAKI website or elements of programming (e.g., legislation or protocols) from SAKI grantees referred to in the development of this program?
7. Do you know of any other efforts to process previously unsubmitted (i.e., “backlogged”) sexual assault kits or to improve the processing of current sexual assault cases within your state or jurisdiction?
 - *If yes, restart protocol for new initiative.*