Michele Triplett, King County, WA THE STRENGTHOF CONCLUSIONS

Background

- Historically: The FP discipline has given discrete conclusions (ID/no ID), but not stated the strength of conclusions.
- In order for others to assess the conclusions, the strength of the conclusion (weak or strong) needs to be stated.

Background

Dec 2015, published an easy and accurate way to assess the strength of a conclusion.
This presentation is a simplified explanation of the published material.

Journal of Cold Case Review

Volume 1, Issue 2, December 2015

Complexity, Level of Association and Strength of Fingerprint Conclusions

By Michele Triplett^[1]

Abstract

False convictions and false incarcerations have pushed the topic of forensic errors into the national spot light. Friction ridge comparisons (referred to as fingerprints for the remainder of this paper) are very accurate but errors have occurred. The strength of any conclusion needs to be indicated since criminal proceedings rely heavily on this type of information. The following paper discusses a possible explanation for errors and offers a more accurate and transparent approach for arriving at and reporting results. The proposed approach labels the complexity and demonstrable level of association found between two impressions which allow others to more accurately discern the strength of a

Why State the Strength?

Determines significance (vital information)

- Medical condition (autism, down syndrome, cancer, broken leg): mild or severe? hairline or complex fracture?
- Car broken: how much to fix? how long in the shop?
- Car accident: were they injured?
- Found money: 5 cents or \$100?
- How solid is the conclusion? Strong or at risk for error?
- Transparency

 Without criteria to determine strength, strong conclusions appear weak (Bornyk case), weak conclusions appear strong/overstated (2 ID's in Dandridge case)

Limit Overstatements

- Noted in 2009 NAS Report
- IAI 2010, rescinding resolutions
- 2012 Human Factors Report
- SWGFAST determinations
- OSAC's Work

Agencies: 2015 Army Crime Lab New Wording

"The latent print on Exhibit ## and the record finger/palm prints bearing the name XXXX have corresponding ridge detail. The likelihood of observing this amount of correspondence when two impressions are made by different sources is considered extremely low."

2016 DOJ Proposal Language for Testimony and Reporting

Past Methods to Show Trustworthiness

- Locard's Rule
- Fingerprints have been accepted for 100+ years
- 15 points in common
- Practitioners are certified, 25 years of experience
- 100% confidence (shows conviction)
- Error rate studies (shows how often practitioners are accurate, not when accurate)
- Verified (shows agreement, not accuracy most errors were verified, yet incorrect)
- SWGFAST Sufficiency Graph
- Mathematical models

Limitations of Past Methods to Show Trustworthiness

- Does not measure or ensure accuracy
- Does not diminish errors
- Does not allow others to judge the strength of a conclusion
- Leaves out the relevant information

Limitations of Past Methods to Show Trustworthiness

- Does not measure or ensure accuracy
- Does not diminish errors
- Does not allow others to judge the strength of a conclusion
- Leaves out the relevant information

Quality, and Interpretation of Data

Alternative Approach

 Measure the acceptable Level of Association that holds up under scrutiny.

- 'Acceptable Level of Association' is how past errors were determined. The erroneous conclusions held up to verification, but did not hold up under scrutiny.
- Diminishes bias, Limits Interpretation, and STRENGTHENS CONCLUSIONS

Measuring Acceptable L of A

- Oetermine Complexity
- Complexity determines the <u>Testing</u> needed

(Testing is holding the data and conclusion up to the light of scrutiny, have others try to falsify the conclusion, prove it wrong, have others try to disprove the hypothesis, or prove the null hypothesis – this is much more than verification, much more than an independent analysis, or someone repeating the conclusion, asking: is the conclusion well supported)

Testing determines the <u>acceptable level of association</u>

Example regarding an injury:

ComplexityWhat Is Neededsurface woundneeds a bandageinternal bleedingneeding surgery

Basic

- Region and orientation are known
- Galton points, spatial relationship, and intervening ridges are being interpreted
- Not all data is needed
- Interpretation/correlation of data is easily reproducible by others

MOST TENPRINT COMPARISONS

Advanced

- Region and orientation are unknown (search more difficult)
- Ancillary features (scars, creases, incipient ridges) are being interpreted
- The interpretation of data has slight ambiguity (may not initially be interpreted the same by others);
- However, the interpretation of data can easily be demonstrated to the satisfaction of others

MOST LATENT COMPARISONS

Complex

- The correlation of data is extremely limited (making it necessary to use rarity, ridge shapes, edges, pores, or features in simultaneous impressions)
- Predominant ambiguity (difficult to demonstrate to the satisfaction of others)

 Tonal Shifts, Limited Data, Mayfield, Daoud, McKie

Basic / Advanced / Complex



Basic / Advanced / Complex

Overwhelming amount of clear data, easily repeatable • Little risk of error Compelling amount of data, easily demonstrable Small risk of error Low amount of quantity and quality, not as easily demonstrable

Risk of error increases





Complexity Determines Testing

• Basic: Testing not necessary

Advanced: Testing highly desired

 Complex: Testing against scrutiny required (scrutiny found errors)

Testing Determines Strength...

...based on data, instead of saying
 -Fingerprints has been around for 100 years
 -I have 20 years of experience

- -Studies show low risk of error (right most of the time)
- -I'm 100% confident (but could still be wrong)

Works for all pattern recognition

 This states the quantity and quality of the data, and a tested conclusion, not just someone's opinion.

Testing Determines the Acceptable Level of Association (the conclusion)

No comparis Impression w identified to another sour	son was rce	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
	No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	ı	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate		The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Level of Association Continuum

Verbal Scale

Common for non-quantifiable conclusions

- Broken Bones: hairline, compound
- Hospital Scale: stable, serious, critical
- Cancer: Stage 1, 2, 3, 4
- Still uses the word considered but it's considered through testing for supportability, not simply considered by repeatability or by those who agree
- Gives more options for conclusions, more accurate information

Verification as Scrutiny

- Not Verification as an independent assessment (others may not independently arrive at some conclusions but that does not discount the strength of the conclusion).
- Not Verification as agreement
- Verification as ensuring the conclusion is supported as indicated (corroboration).

Reporting Identifications:

- "The comparison is *Basic*. The level of association is overwhelming and easily repeatable by others."
- "The comparison is Advanced. The level of association is compelling, easily demonstrable, and considered implausible to replicate."
- The comparison is Complex. Testing against strong scrutiny determined the acceptable level of association to be persuasive and considered implausible to replicate."



Results Reported are dependent on the L of A from Testing (which is dependent on the complexity [Qual/Quan])

```
As Acceptability after scrutiny ↑
S ↑
Risk of Error↓
```

Strength is based on rigorousness of the Testing, not on the reproducibility

Blind Testing displays reproducibility of the conclusion but does not determine if the conclusion is well supported (i.e. Blind Verification is not valuable as a means of reviewing the basis of the conclusion)

Notes:

Complex Does Not Mean WEAK Daoud Identification

Repeatability Does Not Mean STRONG
 McKie, Mayfield, Dandrigde

 Difficulty Does Not Mean COMPLEX
 Difficulty is based on training, experience and ability, not on the print

Assessing the complexity of the latent in isolation, it appears basic



Complexity changes during a comparison

... making the latent assessment irrelevant and unnecessary



Comparison is Advanced: The interpretation of data has slight ambiguity (may not initially be interpreted the same by others)

Conclusion may not be independently repeatable, but it is easily demonstrable Little risk of error

Benefits:

- Not new, a way to articulate the basis for conclusions
- QA Measures are dependent on complexity (when needed), not random (all verified, 10% technically reviewed)
- Limits personal interpretation, which limits bias and subjectivity
- More consistent conclusions because they are based on criteria, not personal beliefs
- Allows practitioners to state strength, and others to assess the risk of error
- Allows for more options for conclusions, can report out close AFIS associations



• Could the conclusion be incorrect?

Yes

- However,
 - a) the only conclusion the data supports is XXX or
 - b) the conclusion has been held up to scrutiny and no indication of error has been found.
 Well supported conclusions, not accurate conclusions



Example 2:



- Semi-complex due to ambiguity as a result of tonal shifting
- Persuasive amount of features that are consistent with the #2 finger (right index) of XXX. No inconsistent features viewed. The conclusion that this latent impression was deposited by XXX can be demonstrated to others and would hold up under intense scrutiny.
- Higher risk of error

Testing Determined Acceptable/Persuasive Level of Association, Higher Risk of Error

No compari Impression identified to another sou	ison was o urce	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible	1 3 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	The level o association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion easy to demonstra	f 1 is ite
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
	No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	1	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion i difficult to demonstrat	is of	The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Example 3:



- Known area and direction
- Use of minutia and intervening ridges
- May not be easily repeatable (many would exclude on pattern type)
- Easily demonstrable
- Low risk of error

Compelling Association, Low Risk of Error

No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	
EXCLUSION		INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	n to dark	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion i difficult to demonstrat	F Th as w co in re is co ea te re	ne level of sociation ould be onsidered oplausible to eplicate; onclusion is asily epeatable

Example 4: Mayfield



- Complex: High ambiguity (practitioner or others may assess features differently at a different time)
- Requires strong scrutiny (not simply others agreeing)
- Did not hold up to strong scrutiny
- Very high risk of error

Testing Determined Considerable (or Non-Acceptable) Level of Association, High Risk of Error as an ID

No comparison Impression was identified to another source	5	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible	T a v c r c c c c c c c c	The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion easy to demonstra	f is ite
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
No Fe ind wh an ori cau de	association atures are consistent nen region d ientation n be etermined		The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion i difficult to demonstrat	s (The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Example 5: Daoud



- Complex: High ambiguity (practitioner or others may assess features differently at a different time)
- Requires strong scrutiny (not simply others agreeing)
- Held up to strong scrutiny... low but acceptable level of association (not repeatable by all others but it is demonstrable to others)

Testing Determined Acceptable (Persuasive) Level of Association, Higher Risk of Error

No compari Impression identified to another sou	son was) irce	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The ass wo cor nor duj cor eas der	e level of sociation uld be nsidered n- plicable; nclusion is sy to monstrate
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE		IDENTIFICATION
	No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	1	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate	The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Mayfield vs Daoud

Non-Acceptable Level of Association (Inconclusive)

Low but Acceptable Level of Association

	No asso	ciation			
	found				
No comparison			The level of	The le	velof
	Regiona	and	association	associ	ation
Impression was	orientat	vientation would be		would	lbe
identified to	cannot	be	considered	consid	lered
another source	determined:		rare but	non-	
	wide-ra	nge	possible	duplic	able;
	search o	lidnot		conclu	usion is
	result in	a		easyte	D
4	conclusi	on		demo	nstrate
EXCLUSION		INCON	CILISIVE		IDENITIEICATIC
EACLOSION		INCON	ICLOSIVE		IDENTIFICATIO
100 C					
No asso	ciation	The level of		The level of	The level of
Automatica and a second second		association		association	association
Features	sare	wouldbe		wouldbe	wouldbe
inconsis	tent	considered		considered	considered
when re	gion	common		non-	implausibleto
and				duplicable;	replicate;
orientat	ion			conclusion is	conclusion is
can be				difficult to	easily
determi	ned			demonstrate	repeatable
*Complexity levels range from	n light to dark				
*Complexity levels range from	n light to dark No asso	ciation			
"Complexity levels range from	n light to dark No asso found	ciation			
*Complexity levels range from	n light to dark No asso found	ciation	The level of	The le	vel of
*Complexity levels range from	n light to dark No asso found Region a	ciation	The level of association	The le associ	vel of ation
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was	n light to dark No asso found Region a orientat	ciation and ion	The level of association would be	The le associ would	vel of ation I be
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to	n light to dark No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l	ciation and ion De	The level of association would be considered	The le associ would consid	vel of ation lbe lered
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	n light to dark No asso found Region a orientat cannot l determi	ciation and ion pe ined;	The level of association would be considered rare but	The le associ would consid non-	vel of ation lbe lered
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai	ciation and ion pe ined; inge	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplie	vel of ation Ibe Jered able;
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona cannot determi wide-rai search c	ciation and ion oe ined; nge lid not	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplid conclu	vel of ation Ibe dered able; ision is
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in	ciation ion be ined; nge lid not	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplid conclu easyt	vel of ation Ibe Jered able; Jsion is
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi	ciation ion be ined; nge lid not ia	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easy to demo	vel of ation Ibe dered able; usion is o nstrate
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search o result in conclusi	ciation and ion pe ned; nge lid not a ion INCON	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easy to demo	vel of ation Ibe dered able; usion is o nstrate IDENTIFICATIO
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi	ciation and ion pe ined; nge lid not ia ion INCON The level of	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consic non- duplic conclu easy tr demo	vel of ation Ibe Jered able; ision is p nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi	ciation and ion pe ined; nge lid not ia ion INCON The level of association	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consic non- duplic conclu easy tr demo X The level of association	vel of ation Ibe lered able; ision is p nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search o result in conclusi	ciation and ion oe ined; nge tid not ra on INCON The level of association would be	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easyt demo X The level of association would be	vel of ation lbe lered able; ision is o nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot determi wide-rai search o result in conclusi	ciation and ion be ined; nge lid not ra ion INCON The level of association would be considered	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easy to demo X The level of association would be considered	vel of ation lbe able; ision is o nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist when re	n light to dark No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search o result in conclusi ciation	ciation and ion be nge iid not ra ion INCON The level of association would be considered common	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplid conclu easy to demo X The level of association would be considered non-	vel of ation be lered able; usion is p nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered implausible to
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist when re and	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search o result in conclusi	ciation and ion be ned; nge lid not ia ion INCON The level of association would be considered common	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easy to demo X The level of association would be considered non- duplicable;	vel of ation be dered able; usion is onstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate;
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist when re and orientat	n light to dark No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi ciation sare tent gion	ciation and ion be ined; inge lid not ia ion INCON The level of association would be considered common	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consid non- duplic conclu easy to demo X The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is	vel of ation be dered able; ision is onstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist when re and orientati can be	No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi	ciation and ion pe ined; nge lid not ra ion INCON The level of association would be considered common	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The le associ would consic non- duplic conclu easy tr demo X The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to	vel of ation be dered able; ision is onstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily
*Complexity levels range from No comparison Impression was identified to another source EXCLUSION No assoc Features inconsist when re- and orientati can be determi	n light to dark No asso found Regiona orientat cannot l determi wide-rai search c result in conclusi ciation sare tent gion ion ned	ciation and ion oe ined; nge lid not ia ion INCON The level of association would be considered common	The level of association would be considered rare but possible	The leassoci would consic non- duplic conclu easy ti demo X The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate	vel of ation be lered able; ision is p nstrate IDENTIFICATIO The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

Entire Scale

No comparis Impression w identified to another sour	on vas rce	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
	No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	ı	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate		The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

3 Levels for Identifications3 Levels for Inconclusive2 Levels for Exclusions

No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible	:	The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	
EXCLUSION		INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	ı	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate		The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Identifications

A) Overwhelming Association, easily repeatable

B) Compelling Association, easily demonstrable

C) Persuasive Association, difficult to demonstrate but acceptable

3 Levels for Inconclusive

No comparis Impression w identified to another sour	on vas rce	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	
EXCLUSION			INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
	No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	ı	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate		The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

*Complexity levels range from light to dark

Inconclusive

A) Considerable Association but not sufficient

B) Marginal or Common Amount of Association

C) No Association Found

2 Levels for Exclusion

No comparison Impression was identified to another source	No association found Region and orientation cannot be determined; wide-range search did not result in a conclusion		The level of association would be considered rare but possible		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is easy to demonstrate	N
EXCLUSION		INCONCL	USIVE			IDENTIFICATION
No association Features are inconsistent when region and orientation can be determined	1	The level of association would be considered common		The level of association would be considered non- duplicable; conclusion is difficult to demonstrate		The level of association would be considered implausible to replicate; conclusion is easily repeatable

Exclusions

A) No comparison, ID'd to another subject

B) No Association Exists

Scale (Exclusion, Inconclusive, Identified)

- No Comparison, ID'd to another subject
- No Association Exists (or Overwhelming inconsistency exists)
- No Association Found
- Common Amount of Association
- Testing determined a High or Considerable Amount of Association, but duplication is possible (or an ID does not hold up to scrutiny may be reported as an investigative lead
- Testing determined a Persuasive Amount of Association, duplication considered implausible, <u>difficult to demonstrate but holds up to</u> <u>scrutiny</u>
- Compelling Amount of Association, duplication considered implausible, <u>easy to demonstrate</u>
- Overwhelming Amount of Association, duplication considered implausible, <u>easily repeatable</u>

Scale (Exclusion, Inconclusive,
Identified)
No Comparison, ID'd to another subject
No Association

- No Association Found
- Marginal Association
- Considerable Association, not sufficient (investigative lead)
- Persuasive Association, <u>difficult to demonstrate</u>
- Compelling Association, <u>easy to demonstrate</u>
- Overwhelming Association, <u>easily repeatable</u>

Stating the Level of Association

- Gives others more information so they can judge the relevance of the information
- Give examiners the ability to show the strength more accurately
- Should be expected in any case
- Is the professional way to give conclusions

Additional Benefits

- Allows us to critique the complexity of competency tests, proficiency tests, and certification tests.
- Allows us to hypothesize without having to say, 'I'd have to see the print'.
- Allows us to judge the ability level of practitioners.



Persistent Forensics Lab Problems Undermine Faith in Our Criminal Justice System, John Malcolm, 2016

"... the day when judges and jurors no longer trust the government's experts. That would be a dark day indeed, and if it happens, the government will have only itself to blame."

Questions

Michele Triplett <u>michele.triplett@kingcounty.gov</u> Work: 206-263-2728 Cell: 206-819-3385