Reducing Error Rates: A New Institutional Arrangement for Forensic Science

Roger Koppl
Institute for Forensic Science Administration
Fairleigh Dickinson University



Contact Information

Email:

koppl@fdu.edu

Personal homepage:

http://inside.fdu.edu/pt/koppl.html

IFSA homepage:

http://view.fdu.edu/default.aspx?id=3935



Summary

- Errors exist
- Familiar solutions would help
- We need structural redundancy too
 Keeping a spare tire in the trunk
 My contribution
- Redundancy saves money
 The cost of incarcerating a wrongly convicted felon is 1,000 greater than the cost of a fingerprint exam.
- We have an organizational design problem How do we build redundancy into the system?
- Implement some forms of redundancy right away
- Study more comprehensive programs of redundancy

Error exist

- Limits of science and evidence
- Honest mistakes
- Carelessness
- Incompetence
- Unconscious bias
- Conscious bias
- Fraud



What to do?

- Better selection and training of forensic scientists
- Improved scientific foundations
- Independence
- Masking
- Oversight
- Other
 - Evidence lineups, blind proficiency tests, accreditation . . .
- "Competitive self regulation"

Checks and balances

Redundant examinations



Better selection and training of forensic scientists

- Dror & Charlton
 - "Why Experts Make Errors," Journal of Forensic Identification, 2006
 - "better selection" and "better training"
- NIJ Technical Working Group for Education and Training in Forensic Science (TWGED)
 - "Education and Training in Forensic Science: A Guide for Forensic Science Laboratories, Educational Institutions, and Students," 2004



Better selection and training of forensic scientists

- Valuable and necessary
- Not sufficient as illustrated by
 Brandon Mayfield misidentification
 Three highly trained, top FBI experts aligned in the error
- We need an organizational fix, too
 - Research science is reliable because of its organization
 - Structural redundancy
- A chain is only as strong as its weakest link
 A net is stronger than any of its knots



Improved scientific foundations

- More scientific research on forensic techniques
- DNA model
- Saks & Koehler
 - "The Coming Paradigm Shift in Forensic
 Identification Science," Science, 5 August 2005.



Improved scientific foundations

- Valuable and necessary
- Doesn't address human element
 - Jacqueline Blake
 - Houston Crime Lab
 - Seattle crime lab
- That, again, is an organizational issue



Independence

- Crime labs should be independent of police and prosecution
 - Or defense for that matter
- Addresses organizational question
- Paul Giannelli
 - "The Abuse of Evidence in Criminal Cases: The Need for Independent Crime Laboratories,"
 Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law, 1997

Independence

- Valuable and necessary
- Essential for "competitive self regulation"
- Not sufficient as illustrated by the example of Dr. Steven Hayne of Mississippi
 Performs 1500 autopsies per year



Masking

- Domain-irrelevant information should be hidden ("masked") from forensic examiner
- Reduces conscious and unconscious bias
- Michael Risinger et al.
 - "The Daubert/Kumho Implications of Observer Effects in Forensic Science: Hidden Problems of Expectation and Suggestion," *California Law Review*, 2002



Masking

- Valuable and necessary
- Essential for "competitive self regulation"
- Not sufficient as illustrated by the example of Jacqueline Blake of the FBI lab DNA section Neglected to perform her negative tests
 Apparently for lack of self confidence
 She needed an independent epistemic check



Oversight

- A guardian body must watch over forensics to make sure things are done right
- Peter Neufeld
 - "The (Near) Irrelevance of Daubert to Criminal Justice and Some Suggestions for Reform," *American Journal of Public Health*, 2005
- "Government oversight and the creation of independent academic centers to validate technologies and techniques, encourage best practices, and enforce appropriately cautious standards for the interpretation of data could dramatically enhance the reliability of forensic science and engender greater public confidence in the outcome"



Oversight

- Valuable and necessary
- But
- Who will guard the guardians themselves?
- Only a supplement to
 a well-designed system of checks and balances



Which brings me to . . .



Competitive self regulation

- Checks and balances
- Gives each person the right incentives
- More importantly: creates epistemic checks
- Structural Redundancy

 The essential element in the organization of science
 The results any one lab may be challenged by any other lab
 Redundancy makes science reliable
 Redundancy makes science science
 and not alchemy



Redundancy

- If one forensic scientist has a random 10% chance of erring, 2 independent forensic scientists have only 1% chance of both erring
- Which is right?You need an "aggregation mechanism" voting
- Majority opinion of 3 independent forensic scientists will be wrong only 2.8% of the time.
- Redundancy can reduce error rates



Design matters

ACE+V illustrates

No independence

No masking

Some examiners shop their verifications

Errors

Donna Birks

Brandon Mayfield

Redundancy requires the right design



Competitive self regulation

• Eight features:

Randomized redundancy

Independence

Statistical review

Masking

Forensic counsel for the indigent

Division of labor

Vouchers

Privatization



Randomized redundancy

- A jurisdiction should contain several competing forensic labs
- Random assignment of evidence to system labs
- Some evidence should be chosen at random for multiple testing at other labs
- Double randomization

Assignment of cases

Selection of evidence for redundant examination

Not all evidence can or should be subject to multiple examination



Independence

- Crime labs should be independent of police and prosecution
 - Or defense for that matter
- Reduces bias
 - Conscious
 - Unconscious



Statistical review

- Because redundancy is (doubly) randomized, all labs in the jurisdiction should have a similar statistical profile
- Statistical review is possible
 - For example, if a given lab produces an anomalously large number of inconclusive findings, its procedures and practices should be examined by an officer of the court
- Quality control



Masking

- Forensic scientists should be shielded from domain-irrelevant information when conducting forensic analyses
- Knowing the case at hand is a murder, not a burglary, exposes a fingerprint examiner to a powerful unconscious bias.



Forensic counsel for the indigent

- Just as an indigent defendant has a right to the help of a qualified attorney, an indigent defendant should have the right to the help of a qualified forensic scientist
- Title 18 of US Code
 - Representation under each plan shall include counsel and investigative, expert, and other services necessary for adequate representation.
- American Bar Association
 - The appointment of defense experts for indigent defendants should be required whenever reasonably necessary to the defense.

Division of labor

- Between forensic analysis and interpretation
 When a lab report comes back, it should be transmitted to two forensic scientists—one representing the prosecution and one representing the defense—for interpretation
- Applies adversarial principle to forensics
- Fewer errors of interpretation will go unchallenged George Rodriguez convicted of rape because of improper interpretation of properly conducted blood serum analysis



Vouchers

- An indigent suspect on trial should also have the right to select his own forensic counsel
- Use a government-issued voucher to pay for it

 Such forensic counselors would redeem their

 vouchers at the courthouse, receiving their paychecks

 from an officer of the court
- Forensic counselors would have an incentive to provide high-quality services

Privatization

- Each lab should be private & for profit
- Thus subject to
 civil liability
 administrative fines for poor performance
- Financial incentives to be reliable
- Easier to regulate, especially at federal level
- *Must* be a part of competitive self regulation



What about Cost?

- Only a fraction of cases would be subject to redundant testing
- Today
 - One lab per jurisdiction and one jurisdiction per lab
 - As a first approximation of a complicated situation
 - Hard to gain from economies of scale and scope
- Under competitive self regulation
 - Several labs per jurisdiction and several jurisdictions per lab
 - Gains from economies of scale and scope
- We do not need more resources; we need better organization



What about Cost?

- Competitive self regulation would save money
 - for the criminal justice system
- Errors cost money

Incarceration

Restitution

Appeal

- Forensic tests are relatively cheap
- Forensic science is a bargain for the criminal justice system

Cost Example 1

Independent, triplicate fingerprint examinations in all felony cases going to trial

• 2% rate of false positive errors

\$9 million per year in new fingerprint examinations Eliminate 96% (1,628/1,696) of false felony convictions

\$152 million per year incarcerating wrongly convicted

Net saving: \$141 million per year



Cost Example 2:

Independent, triplicate fingerprint examinations in all felony cases going to trial

0.2% rate of false positive errors
\$9 million per year in new fingerprint examinations
Eliminate 99.6% of 170 false felony convictions
\$15 million per year incarcerating wrongly convicted
Net saving: \$6 million per year



Organizational Design Problem

- Requires careful experimental research
- NSF grant #0622477
- We need more research
- Right now, however, we can implement redundant, independent fingerprint examinations in felony cases going to trial in any jurisdiction willing to try



Closing note

- Research science is organized by the principle of structural redundancy.
- Forensic science can be as reliable as research science,

but only if

it is (re)organized by the principle of structural redundancy.



End

