

Webinar Series
Funded by the U.S. Department of Justice

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Capital Litigation Initiative:
Crime Scene to Courtroom Forensics Training

Webinar #20: Emerging Issues in Forensic Genetic Genealogy

Learning Objectives

After viewing this webinar, you will be able to:

- Explain the correlation between DNA and genetic genealogy
- Name two database tools used to determine genetic relationships
- Explain the difference between DNA short tandem repeats (STR) and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)
- Discuss how a SNP profile is used to obtain matches within genealogy research tools
- Describe the forensic genealogy process used to determine the identity of the Golden State Killer
- Define the term “investigative genetic genealogy”
- Discuss the different types of DNA samples used to determine outcomes from genetic genealogy vs. investigation genetic genealogy
- Discuss the power of investigation forensic genealogy vs. traditional investigation techniques
- List at least five benefits of using genetic genealogy as an investigative technique
- Name the type of information that can be determine through DNA phenotyping
- Contrast the privacy rights/expectations between CODIS and genealogy databases
- Discuss the significance of the Third Party Doctrine with respect to privacy issues arising from genetic genealogy outcomes
- Discuss current Department of Justice policy on surreptitious samples and consent
- Explain the concept of investigation caution when dealing with third party DNA samples
- Discuss the significance of *California v. Greenwood* 486 U.S. 35 (1988) with regard to outcomes obtained through forensic genetic genealogy testing

Funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, Capital Litigation Initiative:
Crime Scene to Courtroom Forensics Training

This project was supported by Grant No. 2015-CP-BX-K006 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the SMART Office. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.