

Correction to the 29 June Minutes

Madam Chair:

I have a correction to the minutes from the June 29 meeting. I propose striking the entire paragraph describing the SAB Position Statement the Chair read into the record. As written, the draft minutes refer to the Position Statement as a letter, and do not reflect important aspects of the SAB Position Statement.

I propose the minutes dealing with the SAB Position Statement read as follows:

“The Science Advisory Board drafted and submitted a Position Statement to Interim Director Diaz that the SAB Chair read into the record. The Position Statement identified the Board’s concern that the DFS is not consistently seeking SAB input on key operational planning aspects as required by the DFS enabling legislation, Section 13 of the D.C. ACT 19-89 (June 2, 2011) which describes the Science Advisory Board functions. Examples in the Position Statement included: 1) not seeking input on “forensic rehabilitation decisions including development of new protocols and priorities in preparation for reaccreditation” and 2) the SAB not having been engaged in any planning for carrying out “a systematic reexamination of evidence to fully assess” forensic evidence examination failures which contributed to the loss of accreditation. This systematic reexamination is a key step needed to inform DFS corrective actions and protocols.”