ADDENDUM

Research questions regarding bloodstain pattern classification

OSAC Bloodstain Pattern Analysis Subcommittee
November 17, 2016

Introduction

This document serves as an addendum to the OSAC Research Needs Assessment Form entitled "*Bloodstain Pattern Classification*" approved by the Bloodstain Pattern Analysis Subcommittee on November 17, 2016. The BPA Subcommittee is of the opinion this addendum provides additional details not captured in said form.

What is the problem?

1) Different people (of similar competence/experience) may give different classifications for the same pattern.
   Evidence: CTS proficiency tests/casework testimony

2) The inter and intra pattern variability is high: two impact patterns may exhibit as much variation as an impact pattern compared to an expiration pattern
   Evidence: BPA course exercises/personal experimentation/casework examples

3) The descriptions of patterns are sometimes/often a description of the mechanism. The thought process during pattern classification is not well worked out: before classifying a pattern, objective, measurable characteristics should direct the analyst into the correct classification.
   Evidence: SWGSTAIN terminology list/BPA language used in terminology

Why do we care about these problems?

Accurate conclusions regarding mechanisms are vital to a fair outcome in court.

What are the research questions?

1) How do BPA analysts currently classify patterns?

2) Find the characteristics of individual patterns that are relevant to pattern classification.

3) How much variation is there in classification among different BPA analysts?

4) What terms do we need to describe a bloodstained area in an objective and unambiguous way? (Find data descriptors that describe relevant bloodstain characteristics in a physical measurable way)

5) Find a universal way to articulate pattern classification in order to come to the same outcome for all trained analysts.