

Index Sheet

Ope Id No: 00332700

School Name: SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY OF PENNA.

Subfolder: Program Review/Program Review Documents

Doc Type: Program Review Report

Rec Date:

Org Date: 07/30/2009

School Year: 2009

ACN:

PRCN: 200910326869

Box Id: 1029

Unique ID: SC1000000640897





July 30, 2009

Robert M. Smith, Ph.D.
President
Slippery Rock University
300 Old Main
1 Morrow Way
Slippery Rock, PA 16057-1383

Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested
7005 1160 0001 1518 6349

RE: **Program Review Report**
OPE ID: 00332700
PRCN: 200910326869

Dear President Smith:

From November 5, 2008 through November 7, 2008, Ms. Geneva Leon, Ms. Jane Eldred, and Mr. James Moore as representatives of the U.S. Department of Education conducted a review of Slippery Rock University's (SRU; the University) administration of the programs authorized pursuant to Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1070 et seq. (Title IV, HEA programs). Specifically, this program review focused on SRU's compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act). The findings of that review are presented in the enclosed report.

Findings of noncompliance are referenced to the applicable statutes and regulations and specify the action required to comply with the statutes and regulations. Please review the report and respond to each finding, indicating the corrective actions taken by SRU. The University's response should be sent directly to Mr. James Moore of this office within 45 calendar days of receipt of this program review report.

Please be sure that your response conforms to the Department's standards for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) being submitted to the Department. PII is any information about an individual which can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity (some examples are name, social security number, and date and place of birth).

PII being submitted electronically or on media (e.g., CD-ROM, floppy disk, DVD) must be encrypted. The data must be submitted in a .zip file encrypted with Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) encryption (256-bit is preferred). The Department uses WinZip. However, files created with

Federal Student Aid, Philadelphia School Participation Team
The Wanamaker Building
100 Penn Square East, Suite 511
Philadelphia, PA, 19107
www.FederalStudentAid.ed.gov

FEDERAL STUDENT AID  START HERE. GO FURTHER.

other encryption software are also acceptable, provided that they are compatible with WinZip and are encrypted with AES encryption.

The Department must receive an access password to view the encrypted information. The password must be e-mailed separately from the encrypted data. The password must be 12 characters in length and use three of the following: upper case letter, lower case letter, number, special character. A manifest must be included with the e-mail that lists the types of files being sent (a copy of the manifest must be retained by the sender).

Hard copy files and media containing PII must be:

- sent via a shipping method that can be tracked with signature required upon delivery
- double packaged in packaging that is approved by the shipping agent (FedEx, DHL, UPS, USPS)
- labeled with both the "To" and "From" addresses on both the inner and outer packages
- identified by a manifest included in the inner package that lists the types of files in the shipment (a copy of the manifest must be retained by the sender).

PII data cannot be sent via fax.

Program records relating to the period covered by the program review must be retained until the later of: resolution of the violations, weakness, and other issues cited or questioned in the program review; or the end of the retention period otherwise applicable to the record under 34 C.F.R. § 668.24(e).

We would like to express our appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation extended during the review. Please refer to the above Program Review Control Number (PRCN) in all correspondence relating to this report. If you have any questions concerning this report, please contact Mr. James Moore on (215) 656-6495 or at james.moore@ed.gov.

Sincerely,



John S. Loreng
Team Leader

cc: Mr. Robert Downey, Jr., Chief of Police, SRU
Ms. Patty Hladio, Director of Financial Aid, SRU

Prepared for

Slippery Rock University



START HERE
GO FURTHER
FEDERAL STUDENT AID

OPE ID: 00332700

PRCN: 200910326869

Prepared by

U.S. Department of Education

Federal Student Aid

School Participation Team - Philadelphia

Program Review Report

July 30, 2009

Table of Contents

	Page
A. Institutional Information.....	2
B. Scope of Review.....	3
C. Findings	4
Finding # 1 Failure to Properly Classify and Disclose Crime Statistics.....	4
Finding # 2 Failure to Report Separately for Non-Contiguous Locations...	5
Finding # 3 Failure to Distribute the Campus Security Report (CSR) in Accordance with Federal Regulations.....	7
Finding # 4 Failure to Maintain an Accurate and Complete Daily Crime Log.....	8
D. CJIS Quality Assurance Review Report	Appendix A

A. Institutional Information

Slippery Rock University
1 Morrow Way
Slippery Rock, PA 16057

Type: Public

Highest Level of Offering: Master's Degree or Doctor's Degree

Accrediting Agency: Middle States - Higher Education

Current Student Enrollment: 8,459 (2008/2009)

% of Students Receiving Title IV: 71.6% (2008-2009 Award Year)

**Title IV Participation, Per U.S. Department of Education Data Base
(Postsecondary Education Participants System):**

2007/2008 Award Year

Federal Pell Grant	\$ 6,210,195
Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG)	\$ 415,837
Federal Work Study (FWS)	\$ 1,037,310
Federal Perkins Loan Program (Perkins)	\$ 850,868
Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFEL)	\$40,678,059

Default Rate FFEL/DL:	2006	2.8%
	2005	2.9%
	2004	3.3%

Default Rate Perkins:	2007	13.0%
	2006	14.4%
	2005	15.9%

B. Scope of Review

The U.S. Department of Education (the Department; ED) conducted a program review at Slippery Rock University (the University; SRU) from November 5-7, 2008. The review was conducted by Ms. Geneva Leon, Ms. Jane Eldred, and Mr. James Moore.

The focus of the review was to evaluate SRU's compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act). SRU was selected from a sample of institutions of higher education with sworn police departments and was not the result of any specific complaint or allegation of non-compliance. The review consisted of an examination of SRU's police incident reports, arrest records, and disciplinary files as well as policies and procedures related to the Clery Act. Staff interviews were also conducted.

The Department's program review coincided with the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)'s Criminal Justice Information Service (CJIS) Audit Unit conducted at SRU. The U.S. Department of Education is partnering with the CJIS Audit Unit (CAU) to ensure accurate crime reporting on America's college campuses. A copy of the CJIS report is attached as Appendix A. The CAU reviewed a total of 24 Part I Offenses and 25 Part II Offenses that were recorded from January through April 2008. Crimes recorded in the calendar 2008 will be reported to the U.S. Department of Education by October 2009, therefore there are no violations for under reporting to the Department noted in this report as it relates to the violations documented in the CJIS report.

The Department reviewed a sample of 30 campus police incident reports, 40 disciplinary reports and 59 arrest citation reports from calendar year 2007. The files were selected randomly from a list of all incidents of crime reported to the SRU Police Department (SRUPD) or other campus security authority and from a listing of all arrests and disciplinary referrals for law violations involving alcohol, illegal drugs, illegal usage of legal controlled substances and weapons during the same calendar year. Approximately 50 incident reports were cross-checked against the daily crime log to ensure that crimes occurring within the patrol jurisdiction were entered properly on the log as required.

Disclaimer:

Although the review was thorough, it cannot be assumed to be all-inclusive. The absence of statements in the report concerning SRU's specific practices and procedures must not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those specific practices and procedures. Furthermore, it does not relieve SRU of its obligation to comply with all of the statutory or regulatory provisions governing the Title IV, HEA programs.

While this report reflects the initial findings of the Department, they are not final. The Department will issue a Final Program Review Determination Letter at a later date.

C. Findings

During the review, the following areas of noncompliance were noted. Findings of noncompliance are referenced to the applicable statutes and regulations and specify the actions to be taken by SRU to bring operations of the financial aid programs into compliance with the statutes and regulations.

Finding # 1: Failure to Properly Classify and Disclose Crime Statistics

Citation:

Federal regulations require that participating institutions compile and publish statistics concerning the occurrence on campus of the following incidents: homicide, manslaughter, forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. In addition, the institution is required to disclose arrests and disciplinary actions related to violations of Federal or State drug, liquor and weapons laws. 34 C.F.R. § 668.46(c)(1)

Noncompliance:

Slippery Rock University failed to properly code two reported incidents (#07-000817 and #07-023724) in accordance with the Clery Act's crime classifications out of a sample of 30 SRUPD incident reports. In each case, a burglary¹ was coded as the larceny/theft offense, Theft from a Building. A larceny/theft offense is not reportable under the Clery Act, therefore, the exclusion these two burglaries resulted in an underreporting of required statistical disclosures. Each incident involved theft of money from a dormitory room and there is no record that a roommate or guest that had permission to be in the room was suspected of the theft. Given these facts, incidents of this sort must be reported as burglaries under the Clery Act. During the exit interview, SRUPD officials reviewed these reports and concurred that the incidents should have been reported as a burglary.

The Department does acknowledge that no coding exceptions were identified in the remaining samples of 59 arrest records and 40 disciplinary reports.

As noted in Section B above, this program review was planned and conducted as part of our partnership with the FBI's CJIS Audit Unit. The CAU identified three discrepancies in the 24 Part I Offenses reviewed (two instances of over-reporting and one reporting inaccuracy) and one discrepancy in the 25 Part II Offenses (one instance of under-reporting). The two over-reported incidents were in the Aggravated Assault and Larceny/Theft; the inaccurate categorization was a Larceny/Theft - Theft from Motor

¹ Burglary. The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft (with or without force). For reporting purposes this definition includes: unlawful entry with intent to commit a larceny or felony; breaking and entering with intent to commit a larceny; housebreaking; safecracking; and all attempts to commit any of the aforementioned. From: *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook (2004 Edition)*.

Vehicle category; and the under-reported incident was a Simple Assault. (See Appendix A for the full report prepared by the CAU.)

Failure to classify and disclose incidents of crime reported in an accurate and complete manner deprives the campus community of important security information.

Required Action:

As a result of this finding, the University must correct the errors in its crime statistics. Additionally it must re-examine and continue to improve its policies, procedures, internal controls, and training programs to ensure that all incidents of crime reported to the police or a non-law enforcement campus security authority are properly coded and included in the CSR's statistical disclosures as required. A copy of all such changes and improvements must be provided with SRU's response to this program review report.

At the time of the site visit, the new Chief of Police was in the process of conducting an assessment of the SRUPD. The Department requests that the Chief prepare and submit in response to this report a brief summary of any findings and proposals for change and/or improvement as they may relate to SRU's compliance with the Clery Act.

Because SRU was able to correct the discrepancies noted by the FBI's CJIS Audit Unit in the QAR report prior to reporting the crimes for Clery Act requirements, the Department does not consider these discrepancies as Clery Act reporting violations. SRU must ensure accurate reporting of its 2008 campus crime reporting and include in your response to this report actions taken to correct this data.

Based on an evaluation of all available information including SRU's response, the Department will determine appropriate additional actions and advise the University accordingly in the Final Program Review Determination letter.

Finding # 2: Failure to Report Separately for Non-Contiguous Locations

Citation:

Federal regulations require institutions to compile and publish a geographic breakdown of crime statistics in the following categories. [See 34 C.F.R. § 668.46 (c)(4).] The Clery Act established geographic definitions of campus and non campus as provided in 34 C.F.R. § 668.46 (a):

- 1) On Campus I: any building or property owned or controlled by the institution within the same reasonably contiguous geographical area and used by the institution in direct support of, or in a manner related to, the institution's educational purposes, including residence halls;
- 2) On Campus II: a subset of On Campus I that includes any building or property that is within or reasonably contiguous to the area defined in #1 above that is controlled by

another person or entity, is frequently used by students, and supports institutional purposes (such as a food or other retail vender);

- 3) Non-Campus Building or Property: any building or property owned or controlled by a recognized student organization; or any building or property owned and controlled by the institution as described in 1) above and is frequently used by students, but is not within the same reasonably contiguous area; and,
- 4) Public Property: all public property that is within the boundaries of the campus or that is immediately adjacent to or accessible from the campus.

Noncompliance:

Slippery Rock University did not report crime statistics separately for all its non-contiguous locations. Specifically, the review team identified three properties that appeared to be improperly defined as on campus (the Miller Tract, the Old Stone House Museum, and the McKeever Environmental Center.) These properties are located off campus, are owned and controlled by SRU, and are used in a manner related to or in direct support of the University's educational purpose. Therefore, these properties should have been included in the Non-Campus Building or Property category.

Required Action:

As a result of this finding, SRU must review and revise its policies and procedures for preparing its campus security report with special attention to the proper application of the definition of campus and ensuring that properties located off campus are correctly categorized as such. To ensure full and accurate disclosure to students and employees, the statistical grids prepared by location should be made part of one consolidated CSR.

In response to this review and to reduce the likelihood of recurrence, SRU must identify and submit a list all buildings and property that meet any of the geographic definitions provided above and revise its Campus Security Report to reflect the breakdown of these categories with the crimes reported. Examples of these categories and non reported categories are provided in the Handbook for Campus Reporting located at the following website: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/handbook.pdf

Based on an evaluation of all available information including SRU's response, the Department will determine appropriate additional actions and advise the University accordingly in the Final Program Review Determination letter.

Finding # 3: Failure to Distribute the Campus Security Report as Required

Citation:

Federal regulations require institutions to provide the CSR to all current students and employees through appropriate publications and mailing. Acceptable means of delivery include regular U.S. Mail, hand delivery, or campus mail distribution to the individual or posting on the institution's Internet site. If an institution chooses to distribute its report by posting to an internet or intranet site, the institution must, by October 1 of each year, distribute a notice to all students and employees that includes a statement of the report's availability and its exact electronic address, a description of its contents, as well as an advisement that a paper copy will be provided upon request. [See 34 C.F.R. § 668.41 (e).]

Noncompliance:

Slippery Rock University did not distribute its Campus Security Report to all current students and employees by October 1, 2008 as required by the Clery Act. During the site visit, SRU police officials produced documentation that a campus-wide e-mail was sent on October 30, 2008, 30 days late.

Additionally, the October 30 e-mail solicited information regarding any incidents of crime that were reported to campus security authorities (CSA) other than the police. Requests for information of this type must be disseminated well in advance of October 1st of each year to ensure that required incidents are included in the statistics for the year in which they were reported and that the CSR is distributed timely. If on the other hand, the purpose of this part of the message was to remind CSA's of their obligation to disclose any incidents reported to them in the current year for inclusion in later CSR's, we would recommend and request that SRU do so in a separate message. As written, the message could be confusing to a non-CSA.

Failure to actively distribute an accurate and complete CSR to current students and employees within the timeframes established by Federal regulations deprives the campus community of timely access to important campus crime information.

Required Action:

As a result of this finding, SRU must review and revise its policies and procedures for distributing its CSR and take all necessary steps to ensure that the Campus Security Report is distributed by October 1 of each year. SRU must also refine its announcement of the CSR to ensure that the collection of crime statistics from non-law enforcement campus security authorities is made prior to the dissemination of the CSR. A copy of all policy changes and improvements must be provided with SRU's response to this program review report.

Based on an evaluation of all available information including SRUs response, the Department will determine appropriate additional actions and advise the University accordingly in the Final Program Review Determination letter.

Finding #4: Failure to Maintain an Accurate and Complete Daily Crime Log

Citation:

Institutions with a police or campus security department must maintain “a written, easily understood daily crime log” listing all crimes that occurred 1) on campus including residence halls; 2) in a non-campus buildings or on non-campus property; 3) on public property within the campus or immediately adjacent to and accessible from the campus; or 4) reports of crimes within the campus police or security department’s patrol. This reporting requirement applies to all crimes, not merely those crimes listed in 34 C.F.R. §668.46 (c)(1) and (3) for the Clery Act. The crime log must record crimes by date the crime was reported and must include the nature, date, time, general location, and disposition of each offense. The crime log must be kept up to date and be freely accessible to any requestor. *34 C.F.R. § 668.46 (f)*

Noncompliance:

Slippery Rock University did not maintain an accurate and complete crime log in accordance with Federal regulations. Specifically, two incidents of crime reported as occurring within the patrol jurisdiction were not entered onto the crime log. The omitted case numbers are 07-002775 (Disorderly Conduct) and 07-016675 (Harassment).

The Clery Act is a consumer information law intended to provide students, employees, and other stakeholders with important crime-related information. All institutions participating in the Title IV programs must keep up-to-date information on campus crime and the crime log is especially important because it provides a timely information source for the campus community.

Required Action:

Slippery Rock University must review and revise its policies, procedures, and internal controls to ensure that all incidents of crime reported as occurring within the patrol jurisdiction are entered on the crime log. These revisions must provide for the designation of a capable official to ensure that the crime log is accurately and completely updated in a timely manner and that it is readily available to the campus community and general public for review upon request. A copy of all revisions must be submitted with SRU’s response to the program review report.

Based on an evaluation of all available information including the University’s response, the Department will determine appropriate additional actions and advise SRU accordingly in the Final Program Review Determination letter.



Summary Exit Briefing Local Agency Review

Slippery Rock University Police
Department



Quality Assurance Review

*Shared Management
Shared Responsibility
Shared Success*

A Partnership in Criminal Justice

Table of Contents

Local Agency Review Process	1
Administrative Interview	1
Data Quality Review	2
Exit Briefing	2
Data Quality Results - Part I	3
Data Quality Results - Part II	4
Administrative Interview Results	5
Classification	5
Arson	5
Scoring	5
Arrests	6
Clearances	7
Jurisdiction	7
Property Values	8
Hate Crime	8
Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)	9
Unfounded	9
Updating/Quality Assurance	10
State Program Services	10

Local Agency Review Process

To adequately conduct a state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program Quality Assurance Review (QAR), the CJIS Audit Unit (CAU) reviews local agencies that contribute to the national Program through their respective state Programs. This helps evaluate the crime reports as they relate to data submission to the national UCR Program via the state UCR Program. The CAU staff contact these agencies through a designated Point of Contact (POC) approximately 45 days prior to the scheduled Review to gather information regarding the flow of reports from the time an incident is reported, to its classification, scoring, and submission to the national UCR Program. During the initial contact call, the auditors discuss logistics pertaining to the on-site Review with the agency POC and make preliminary plans regarding the Review. The CAU staff then follows up with written confirmation of the scheduled QAR to the Chief/Sheriff and UCR POC that will give general information concerning the QAR process.

The local agency QAR consists of three phases:

- Administrative Interview
- Data Quality Review
- Exit Briefing

Administrative Interview

During the administrative interview, the CAU staff learn how an agency manages crime reports and whether the data submitted to the national UCR Program comply with national definitions and guidelines or, if not, how the data are converted to national UCR Program standards prior to submission to the national UCR Program.

The interview is based on the agency's policies and procedures concerning the national UCR Program's standards, definitions and information requirements. Topics covered during the interview include:

- Duties and responsibilities of the UCR POC
- Records management system
- Routing Process
- Classification and Scoring
- Arrests
- Clearances
- Jurisdiction
- Property Values
- Offenders
- Hate Crime
- Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)
- Updating/Quality Assurance
- State Program Services

Data Quality Review

During the data quality review, the CAU staff reviews a predetermined number of Part I and Part II incidents based on a statistical sampling method used at the state level. Record counts are distributed to agencies based on their Return A record counts. Case files, including the officer's narrative and supplemental information, are then compared to data reported to the national UCR Program to determine if national standards and definitions were appropriately applied. The CAU staff then determine if these offenses were appropriately classified. Additionally, the CAU staff reviews incidents to ensure Arrests, Hate Crime, and LEOKA data are reported according to the national standards and definitions.

The following discrepancies can be scored at a summary reporting agency:

- Overreported - Offense reported was not documented in the case file.
- Underreported - Offense is available in the case file and was not reported.
- Inaccurate - Offense reported did not match the case report.

Discrepancies are documented for evaluation and discussion with local agency personnel and/or the state UCR Program manager.

Exit Briefing

The CAU staff provides an exit briefing packet to the local agency that summarizes the findings based on the administrative interview and the data quality review. The exit briefing packet contains a brief description of all the topics covered during the administrative interview and documents local agency compliance with UCR guidelines. During the exit briefing, the CAU staff will review/discuss each of the discrepancies with the local agency UCR POC to verify the auditor's findings. The CAU staff will answer any questions the agency may have.

Data Quality Results - Part I

The data quality portion of the QAR will be compiled with other data to assess the state's compliance to policy, definitions and information requirements. Requirement One, UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 4, "The state Program must conform to the national UCR Program's standards, definitions, and information required."

Month(s) Reviewed: Jan - April 2008

Total Part I Offenses Reviewed: 24

Classification

Overreported

Underreported

Inaccurate

Total Part I Discrepancies:

LEOKA

Overreported

Underreported

Hate Crime

Total Hate Crime Reviewed: _____

Overreported

Underreported

Inaccurate

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Total
(1) Criminal Homicide	0	0	0	0
1a. Murder/Nonnegligent Manslaughter	0	0	0	0
1b. Manslaughter by Negligence	0	0	0	0
(2) Forcible Rape	0	0	0	0
2a. Rape by Force	0	0	0	0
2b. Force Rape Attempt	0	0	0	0
(3) Robbery	0	0	0	0
3a. Firearm	0	0	0	0
3b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	0	0	0	0
3c. Other Dangerous Weapons	0	0	0	0
3d. Hands, Fists, or Feet	0	0	0	0
(4) Aggravated Assault	0	0	0	0
4a. Firearm	0	0	0	0
4b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	0	0	0	0
4c. Other Dangerous Weapons	0	0	0	0
4d. Hands, Fists, or Feet	1	0	0	1
4e. Other Assaults- Simple, Not Aggravated	0	0	0	0
(5) Burglary	0	0	0	0
5a. Forcible Entry	0	0	0	0
5b. Unlawful Entry- No Force	0	0	0	0
5c. Attempted Forcible	0	0	0	0
(6) Larceny-Theft	0	0	0	0
6a. Pocket Picking	0	0	0	0
6b. Purse Snatching	0	0	0	0
6c. Shoplifting	0	0	0	0
6d. Theft from Motor Vehicles	0	0	1	1
6e. Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts/Acc.	0	0	0	0
6f. Theft of Bicycles	0	0	0	0
6g. Theft from Buildings	1	0	0	1
6h. Theft from Coin Operated Machine	0	0	0	0
6i. Theft All Other	0	0	0	0
(7) Motor Vehicle Theft	0	0	0	0
7a. Autos	0	0	0	0
7b. Trucks	0	0	0	0
7c. Other	0	0	0	0
(8) Arson	0	0	0	0
8a-g. Structural	0	0	0	0
8h-i. Mobile	0	0	0	0
8j. Other	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	1	3

Data Quality Results

The data quality portion of the QAR will be compiled with other data to assess the state's compliance to policy, definitions and information requirements. Requirement One, UCR Handbook, Revised 2004; p. 4, "The state Program must conform to the national UCR Program's standards, definitions, and information required."

Month(s)
Reviewed: Jan - April 2008

Total Part II
Records Reviewed: 25

Classification

*Underreported

Arrests

Overreported

Underreported

Total Part II Discrepancies:

*Indicates underreported Part I offenses found in Part II Arrest reports.

Underreported

(1) Criminal Homicide	0
1a. Murder/Nonnegligent Manslaughter	0
1b. Manslaughter by Negligence	0
(2) Forcible Rape	0
2a. Rape by Force	0
2b. Force Rape Attempt	0
(3) Robbery	0
3a. Firearm	0
3b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	0
3c. Other Dangerous Weapons	0
3d. Hands, Fists, or Feet	0
(4) Aggravated Assault	0
4a. Firearm	0
4b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	0
4c. Other Dangerous Weapons	0
4d. Hands, Fists, or Feet	0
4e. Simple Assault	1
(5) Burglary	0
5a. Forcible Entry	0
5b. Unlawful Entry- No Force	0
5c. Attempted Forcible	0
(6) Larceny-Theft	0
6a. Pocket Picking	0
6b. Purse Snatching	0
6c. Shoplifting	0
6d. Theft from Motor Vehicles	0
6e. Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts/Acc.	0
6f. Theft of Bicycles	0
6g. Theft from Buildings	0
6h. Theft from Coin Operated Machine	0
6i. Theft All Other	0
(7) Motor Vehicle Theft	0
7a. Autos	0
7b. Trucks	0
7c. Other	0
(8) Arson	0
8a-g. Structural	0
8h-i. Mobile	0
8j. Other	0
Total	1

The administrative interview portion of the QAR will be compiled with other data to assess the state's compliance to policy, definitions and information requirements. Requirement One, UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 4. "The state Program must conform to the national UCR Program's standards, definitions, and information required."

Classification

1. "The Hierarchy Rule requires that when more than one Part I offense is classified, the law enforcement agency must locate the offense that is highest on the hierarchy list and score that offense involved and not the other offense(s) in the multiple offense situation." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 10)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Arson

2. "For a multiple-offense situation, of which one offense is arson, the reporting agency must report the arson and then apply the Hierarchy Rule to the remaining Part I offenses to determine which one is the most serious." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 12)

Meets UCR Guidelines

3. "Because of the hazardous nature of the professions of police officers and firefighters, arson-related deaths and injuries of these individuals are excluded from the Return A and SHR but law enforcement officer deaths and injuries should be reported on the appropriate LEOKA forms." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 74)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Agency has never had arson and other Part I crime.

Scoring

4. For counting purposes, the agency:
 - a. Counts one offense for each victim of a "Crime Against Persons" (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 41)

Meets UCR Guidelines

b. Counts one offense for each distinct operation or attempt for "Crime Against Property" except motor vehicle theft, where one offense is counted for each stolen vehicle.
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 41)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Arrests

5. "The reporting agency must record on the appropriate ASR (according to age) all persons processed by arrest, citation, or summons during the past month for committing an offense in its jurisdiction . . ."
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 98)

Meets UCR Guidelines

6. "If a person was arrested for several offenses both Part I and Part II, agencies must ignore the Part II crimes and score only the Part I crime appearing highest in the hierarchy."
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 97)

Meets UCR Guidelines

7. "If a person was arrested for several Part II offenses, the agency itself should determine which is the most serious offense and score only that one arrest."
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 97)

Meets UCR Guidelines

8. "The reporting agency must count one arrest for each separate occasion on which a person is arrested." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 98)

Meets UCR Guidelines

9. "If the reporting agency determines that an offender in custody has committed other crimes, it must not score additional arrests for those crimes. Agencies must score only the original arrest."
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 98)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Clearances

10. "An offense is cleared by arrest, or solved for crime reporting purposes, when at least one person is (1) arrested, (2) charged with the commission of the offense, and (3) turned over to the court for prosecution (whether following arrest, court summons, or police notice)." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 79)

Meets UCR Guidelines

11. "If agencies can answer all of the following questions in the affirmative, they can clear the offense exceptionally for the purpose of reporting to UCR." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, pp. 80-81)

1. "The investigation must have clearly and definitely established the identity of at least one offender."
2. "Sufficient probable cause must have been developed to support the arrest, charging, and prosecution of the offender."
3. "The exact location of the offender must be known so that an arrest could be made."
4. "There must be a reason outside the control of law enforcement which prevents the arrest."

Meets UCR Guidelines

12. "The administrative closing of a case or the clearing of it by departmental policy does not permit exceptionally clearing the offense . . ." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 81)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Jurisdiction

13. "To be certain that data (offense or arrest) are not reported more than once by overlapping jurisdictions . . ." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 9)

- a. Agencies report only those offenses committed within their own jurisdictions.

Meets UCR Guidelines

b. "The recovery of property should be reported only by the agency from whose jurisdiction it was stolen, regardless of who or which agency recovered it."
(UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 9)

Meets UCR Guidelines



c. "Agencies must report only those arrests made for offenses committed within their own jurisdictions." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 9)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Property Values

14. "All agencies reporting data to the UCR Program are asked to prepare the Supplement to Return A (Supplement), which is a monthly reporting of the nature of crime and the type and value of property stolen and recovered." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 85)

Meets UCR Guidelines

15. "Questions frequently arise as to the method most commonly used by law enforcement to determine the value of stolen property. To answer these questions, the national UCR Program suggests that reporting agencies:" (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 86)

- a. "Use the fair market value . . ."
- b. "Use the cost to the merchant (wholesale cost) of goods. . ."
- c. "Use the victim's evaluation . . ."
- d. "Use the replacement cost or actual cash cost . . ."
- e. "Use common sense and good judgment . . ."

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Hate Crime

16. "The types of bias to be reported to the FBI's UCR Program are limited to those mandated by the enabling Act and its subsequent amendments, i.e., bias based on race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity." (UCR, Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines, Revised October 1999, p. 2)

Meets UCR Guidelines

17. "At the end of each calendar quarter, the reporting agency must submit a single Quarterly Hate Crime Report, together with an individual Hate Crime Incident Report form for each bias-motivated incident identified during the quarter (if any)." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 125)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)

18. "The form entitled Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA) should be used by agencies to report line-of-duty felonious or accidental killings and assaults on their officers for a given month." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 109)

Meets UCR Guidelines

19. ". . .the reporting agency must enter the number of sworn officers with full arrest powers killed in the line of duty by felonious acts and those killed by accident or negligence while acting in an official capacity." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 110)

Meets UCR Guidelines

20. "Reporting agencies must count all assaults that resulted in serious injury or assaults in which a weapon was used that could have caused serious injury or death. They must include other assaults not causing injury if the assault involved more than mere verbal abuse or minor resistance to an arrest." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 110)

Meets UCR Guidelines

21. "If no officers are killed or assaulted during a given month, reporting agencies should not submit this form. However, the reporting agency must mark the NO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS KILLED OR ASSAULTED REPORT. . .box on the Return A." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 109)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Unfounded

22. "If the investigation shows that no offense occurred nor was attempted, UCR Program procedures dictate that the reported offense must be unfounded in Column 3. Agencies must still record all such Part I offenses and then score them as unfounded on the current month's Return A." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p.77)

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Updating / Quality Assurance

23. "Agencies can make needed adjustments on the current month's report; these do not affect the reliability of the figures because such adjustments tend to offset one another from month to month over a period of time." (UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 82)

Meets UCR Guidelines

State Program Services

24. Submission frequency:

Monthly

25. Is the agency notified of training offered by the state?

YES

26. Does the state provide guidance and communication regarding UCR procedures, updates, etc.?

(Document method agency receives UCR updates e.g. newsletter, listserv in comments section)

YES

Comments:

Auditor Notes: