

Note: a specific Proposed Resolution must accompany each comment or it cannot be considered.

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
1	4.1-4.2	E	I agree with the many commentors on the previous versions that the educational requirement is not stringent enough and the training requirement appears to differ little from the "40-hour course" model that appears to have been partially responsible for problems in this discipline. Indeed, it is not clear in this document how long the training course is supposed to be. This standard appears to constitute a ratification of the status quo, rather than an effort to improve the discipline.	Require science degree and require rigorous training program that well exceeds 40 hours.	Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours. The currently outlined training program and mentor program is rigorous enough.
2	general	T	General Comment: The standard doesn't discuss the identification of the various types of spatter patterns (i.e. expiration, flow, back spatter, etc.) that would be encountered in the field and covered in a training program. Will these be documented in another training standard?	Consider adding another letter to section 4.2.8 to include "various spatter patterns."	Reject. Section 4.2.8 was not revised in the recirculation, therefore this comment will not be addressed.
3	general	T	The standard does not include training requirements for courtroom testimony. Will this be covered in a subsequent training standard?	If this is the only training document, training standards for courtroom testimony should be added to the document.	Reject. Courtroom testimony is not addressed in this document and was not part of any recirculation revisions. The consensus body will look at including courtroom testimony in a subsequent edition, or a different document.
4	4.2.1	E	The term trainer was added to the section three of the document but is not found anywhere else in the document.	A second sentence should be added to 4.2.1 stating that the supervisor of the training program may designate a trainer to monitor all training activities.	Accept with modification. Term "trainer" removed from section 3 as it is not used in the document.
5	4.2.7	E	Was density purposely omitted from section 4.2.7? If blood needs to be thawed for training exercises, the difference in density of recently thawed blood and room temperature blood would impact pattern formation. Additionally, the positioning of bodies affects the density of blood. The standard could be interpreted as those are the only five areas that need to be covered in principles of physics.	For 4.2.6.3, 4.2.7, and 4.2.8 consider changing the end of each sentence to "including but not limited to:"	Reject. The sections in the proposed resolution were not revised in the recirculation, therefore this comment will not be addressed.
6	4.2.18	T	Does "chemical testing" include presumptive and confirmatory test for blood? No where in the standard is it stated that the trainee needs to confirm that they are in fact looking at blood.	Consider editing 4.2.18 to include presumptive and confirmatory tests as examples of chemical tests. If presumptive and confirmatory tests are not included as "chemical tests" consider adding a standard to 4.2.6 requiring the trainee to be taught how to identify blood.	Reject. The only portion of 4.2.18 revised was the modification of "Demonstrate an understanding of" to "Recognize and describe". The proposed resolution is referring to a portion of the section not revised in the recirculation.
7	4.2.22	E	This standard is one of the best we have reviewed to date in terms of how cognitive bias training is built into the training program. The language for this standard could be a bit stronger, however. Trainees should understand the basic concepts of cognitive bias, but they should also know how cognitive bias applies to BPA specifically.	Edit the sentence to "Recognize and describe 'cognitive bias' and how it applies to BPA including:	Reject. The later portion of the sentence referred to in the proposed resolution was not revised in the recirculation. The consensus body did discuss the comment, since it is a BPA document it is implied and does not need to be expressed.
8	6.1	T	The new language to this standard creates confusion in sub sections of the standard as far as understanding when a trainee is competent, when training is over, and when a trainee should be offering expert opinion. The standard starts by stating that the trainee must be competent to enter the mentorship program. Standard 6.3 then discusses additional competency test that must be performed. It also isn't clear if training is complete and true competency is established until the trainee completes the mentorship program. As standard 6.3 is written, it appears that a trainee can offer an expert opinion without completing the entire mentorship program. Competency for a practical exercise like independent photography of a scene is very different than competency for offering an expert opinion, especially since there's little no information on reporting and testimony training requirements.	The standard can be clearer in stating that two rounds of competency are required, one during initial training and another during the mentorship program. Competency for casework is achieved during the mentorship program. Training is complete when the mentorship program is completed. "Rendering of expert opinion" should be taken out of the first sentence of 6.3. Trainees shouldn't be offering expert opinion until they've demonstrated competency in reporting and testimony standards, which could be touched in this standard and discussed in detail in another.	Accept. To provide clarification: Competency portion of 6.3 moved to 6.1 and first portion of 6.1 revised to read: "Upon completion of initial training, it is up to the mentor to determine if the BPA trainee is ready to participate in a documented mentorship program. The BPA trainee shall participate in a documented mentorship program for no less than one year."
9			I disagree with the required EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS section. There is no good reason to wait five years for implementation of the requirement of a bachelor degree. Additionally, the degree must be in a natural science or criminalistics/forensic science (from a FEPAC-accredited program). Trigonometry is typically learned in a secondary educational setting, not in a tertiary institution.		Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours along with the 5-year implementation extensively. This has been voted on in numerous ballots and consensus body meetings and the requirements outlined received the majority vote.
10			Section 4.2.8 should include "acceleration." Section 4.2.9 "flight paths"??? Do we mean "trajectories?" Section 4.2.10 Part A is redundant with the wording in the section header.		Reject: the proposed resolutions were portions of text not revised in the recirculation.
11			After recently spending time with investigators/law enforcement personnel from agencies around the country I was reminded how demanding the careers are with personnel shortages, overtime over and above familial responsibilities. Free time and the expense of a degree would never fit into their already stressed budgets. I therefore revert back to my original stance on the educational requirement mandating a bachelor's degree, which is that I disagree with that requirement. We in the working group all agreed to have seen in our professional experiences, people from all educational backgrounds make mistakes and conduct faulty analyses due to biases and other error types. Even within our own working group and consensus body we've seen member(s) with high academic achievements create a document(s) replete with incorrect statements and assumptions, therefore it is my opinion that character is superlative to education in a bloodstain pattern analyst.		Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours along with the 5-year implementation extensively. This has been voted on in numerous ballots and consensus body meetings and the requirements outlined received the majority vote.

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
12			<p>The State of Maine has invested heavily in it's BPA program, providing basic level training to all members of the Evidence Response Team and advanced level training and continuing education to select individuals who demonstrate the desire, capability, and motivation necessary to work at that level. That said, requiring a Bachelor's degree would disqualify some of our best people. On the other hand, there are people in our agency who would meet that criteria but would not make good BPA analysts. I think that requiring a Bachelor's degree to become a BPA analyst is too limiting. It is not a requirement for other technical specialties such as crime scene, shooting, and accident reconstruction, so why do we consider it necessary to do BPA?</p>		<p>Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours along with the 5-year implementation extensively. This has been voted on in numerous ballots and consensus body meetings and the requirements outlined received the majority vote.</p>
13			<p>I have to agree with some of the comments from my colleagues before I can approve this revision. I believe the issue lies in the fact that we, as a consensus body, cannot control all of the training provided to current and prospective BPA practitioners. I will use my own experiences once again to say that some of the 40-hour courses I have taken have been excellent and have included the scientific method along with detailed analysis. Others have been abysmal and concentrated on the instructor's vast "knowledge" of numerous areas of crime scene analysis and their own hubris rather than the subject-in-chief. That said, I also understand the time and financial limitations of requiring a bachelor's degree for some students who have the desire to learn, but cannot complete the necessary requirements because of outside responsibilities. This is a real conundrum for us and we have to take all of these issues into consideration before we put out a blanket statement. I realize that being wishy-washy does not help the situation. After reading the below comments, I believe that Peter Valentin has a reasonable solution in his multi-pronged approach and I agree. Giving options seems to be the best resolution to satisfy everyone's vastly different experience, educational levels, and requirements for those who wish to practice in this area.
</p> <p>Putting forth a requirement for a specific, scientific undergrad degree from a FEPAC accredited institution will vastly limit not only those who wish to pursue this avenue, but it will also discourage those without the availability of such an institution to even attempt to acquire this qualification. That could potentially limit the pool of truly dedicated, excellent future analysts and I don't wish to shut the door on anyone with the drive and interest to become successful. Other institutions offer a solid, scientific platform on which to build expertise and understanding of the requisite analytical thought processes to perform well. I believe that we can find a fair balance that is most beneficial to the scientific, judicial, law enforcement and laboratory communities.</p>		<p>Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours along with the 5-year implementation extensively. This has been voted on in numerous ballots and consensus body meetings and the requirements outlined received the majority vote.</p>
14			<p>I disagree with the educational requirement set forth in this document. I will repost my comments from an earlier vote because I feel that it might be the compromise that we desperately need to move forward. But, even as written, the standard is feckless. If we are going to only make this a 'should', we are not doing anything to advance our field forward from the problematic conclusions that incompetent analysts have offered too many times. This standard should not be evaluated by saying that I know good analysts that do not meet this requirement because that is irrelevant to our current problem. We should also not frame this in such a way that minimizes the value of a scientific education because that is also not productive. Medical doctors make mistakes all the time but would any of us argue that medical degrees are not necessary because of that fact? What we should be moving to is a standard that recognizes the importance of scientific/analytical thought and in line with other forensic disciplines. That can be accomplished a few different ways which I spell out in my comments below.
</p> <p>The standard as written is illogical. Many students entering college do not take trigonometry there because they have moved beyond that so they could not demonstrate that they have taken it in college. Furthermore, there would be no way to get lab work done in college in biology, chemistry and physics without taking a class so the earlier portion of the sentence is misplaced. Perhaps what is intended is that someone cannot demonstrate that they have lab work in those areas, a science-related course would count?
</p> <p>Lastly, my comments from an earlier vote and perhaps a framework for resolving this recurring issue:
</p> <p>"...During our discussions on this issue, I informally recommended a multipronged approach to address the difficulties of making such a substantive change to our discipline with no real educational standard.
</p> <p>I proposed that the educational standard be a choice of:
</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A BS degree in a natural science
 2. A BS or BA degree in another major with substantive science coursework (what courses and how many credits to be decided)
 3. Successful completion of coursework (topics/hours/modes to be decided)*
 <p>*This choice would be the option for those already practicing BPA with the commitment to continue their work without returning to college. By deciding what subjects and topics needed to be covered (and to what depth), we would be creating a framework for a training program that agencies/individuals could offer to others in a laboratory or investigative unit. This would not be a watered down 40-hour experience, but rather a comprehensive, examination and practical based training program that would demonstrate knowledge roughly equivalent to the coursework present in option B above. Ideally, this program would be led by someone qualifying under choice 1 or 2 above.
</p> <p>As part of standard option 3, we would offer a window of several years for the successful completion of all the material with the understanding that those who would be willing to enter into a training program might not immediately be able to do so.
</p> <p>Because this idea never gained much momentum, the concept is admittedly light on details. However, I believe it has the potential to satisfy those of</p>		<p>Reject. Consensus body considered degree requirements and hours along with the 5-year implementation extensively. This has been voted on in numerous ballots and consensus body meetings and the requirements outlined received the majority vote.</p>