



COPY

December 17, 2010

James D. Spaniolo, J.D.
President
University of Texas at Arlington
701 South Nedderman Drive
Arlington, TX 76013

Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested
7008 1300 0000 0275 4098

RE: Program Review Report
OPE ID: 00365600
PRCN: 201020627157

Dear President Spaniolo:

From March 23, 2010 to March 25, 2010, Ms. Linda Shewack, Ms. Jackie Shipman, and Mr. James L. Moore, III conducted a review of the University of Texas at Arlington's (UTA's) 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). The review focused solely on the UTA'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 statute and regulations. Please review the report and respond to each finding, indicating the corrective actions taken by UTA. The response should include a brief, written narrative for each finding that clearly states UTA's position regarding the finding and the corrective action taken to resolve the finding. Separate from the written narrative, UTA must provide supporting documentation as required in each finding.

Please note that pursuant to HEA section 498A (b), the Department is required to:

- (1) provide to the institution an adequate opportunity to review and respond to any preliminary program review report¹ and relevant materials related to the report before any final program review report is issued;
- (2) review and take into consideration an institution's response in any final program review report or audit determination, and include in the report or determination –

¹ A "preliminary" program review report is the program review report. The Department's final program review report is the Final Program Review Determination (FPRD).

Federal Student Aid, School Participation Team - Dallas
1999 Bryan Street, Suite 1410, Dallas, TX 75201-1410
www.FederalStudentAid.ed.gov

- a. A written statement addressing the institution's response;
- b. A written statement of the basis for such report or determination; and
- c. A copy of the institution's response.

The Department considers the institution's response to be the written narrative (to include e-mail communication). Any supporting documentation submitted with the institution's written response will not be attached to the final program review determination (FPRD). However, it will be retained and available for inspection by UTA upon request. Copies of the program review report, the institution's response, and any supporting documentation may be subject to release under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and can be provided to other oversight entities after the FPRD is issued.

Findings of noncompliance are referenced to the applicable statutes and regulations and specify the action required to comply with the statute and regulations. Please review the report and respond to each finding, indicating the corrective actions taken by UTA.

The institution's response should be sent directly to Jackie Shipman of this office within 60 calendar days of receipt of this letter.

Protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII):

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, date and place of birth). The loss of PII can result in substantial harm, embarrassment, and inconvenience to individuals and may lead to identity theft or other fraudulent use of the information. To protect PII, the findings in the attached report do not contain any student PII. Please see the enclosure Protection of Personally Identifiable Information for instructions regarding submission to the Department of required data documents containing PII.

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 Jackie Shipman at 214.661.9489 or Jackie.Shipman@ed.gov.

Sincerely,



Cynthia Thornton
Area Case Director
School Participation Team - Dallas

cc: Mr. Robert Hayes, Chief of Police, UTA Police Department
Ms. Karen Krause, Director of Financial Aid, UTA
Mr. Frank Lamas, Director of Residence Life, UTA

Prepared for:

University of Texas at Arlington



START HERE
GO FURTHER
FEDERAL STUDENT AIDSM

OPE ID: 00365600

PRCN: 201020627157

Prepared by:

U.S. Department of Education

Federal Student Aid

School Participation Team - Dallas

Program Review Report

December 14, 2010

Table of Contents

A. Institutional Information.....	2
B. Scope of Review	3
C. Findings.....	4
Finding # 1: Failure to Properly Classify, Compile, and Disclose Crime Statistics.....	4
Finding # 2: Failure to Report Separately for Non-Contiguous Locations.....	8
Appendix A.....	CJIS Quality Assurance Review Report

A. Institutional Information

The University of Texas at Arlington
701 South Nedderman Drive
Arlington, TX 76013

Type: Public

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

Accrediting Agency: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

Current Student Enrollment: 28,085 (2008-2009)

% of Students Receiving Title IV: 60% of undergraduate students (2008-2009)

Title IV Participation, Per U.S. Department of Education Data Base

2008-2009 Award Year

Federal Pell Grant Program	\$ 19,521,660
Federal Family Education Loan Program	96,760,465
Federal Perkins Loan Program	925,001
Federal Work-Study Program	1,183,457
Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant Program	1,640,684
Federal ACG	402,995
Federal SMART Grant	452,629
Federal TEACH Grant	18,838

FFEL Default Rate: 2007 – 5.4%
2006 – 4.8%
2005 – 4.8%

Perkins Default Rate: As of:
6/30/2009 - 15.58%
6/30/2008 - 10.0%
6/30/2007 - 11.9%

The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA, the University) is a public institution of higher education located in Arlington, TX. The campus is protected by the UTA Police Department (UTAPD), which has a staff of 111 and includes 37 sworn officers. The UTAPD operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Authority of the sworn officers is derived from state statutes, which allow for full police powers on UTA property. In addition, the UTAPD has a mutual aid agreement with the City of Arlington that allows the UTAPD and Arlington Police Department to assist each other in the conduct of law

enforcement activities on an as-needed basis. The UTAPD also maintains an excellent working relationship with other Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies.

B. Scope of Review

The U.S. Department of Education (the Department) conducted a campus security program review at UTA from March 23, 2010 to March 25, 2010. The review was conducted by Ms. Linda Shewack, Ms. Jackie Shipman, and Mr. James L. Moore, III.

The focus of the review was to evaluate UTA's compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act). The Clery Act is included in §485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), 20 U.S.C. §1092(f). The Department's implementing regulations are at 34 C.F.R. §§668.41-668.46. UTA was selected for review from a list of institutions of higher education in the state of Texas with sworn police departments; the review was not the result of any specific complaint or allegation of non-compliance. The review included an examination of UTA's police incident reports, arrest records, and disciplinary files as well as the University's policies and procedures related to the Clery Act. The reviewers also interviewed appropriate UTA staff.

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 UTA. The U.S. Department of Education is partnering with the CJIS Audit Unit (CAU) to ensure accurate crime reporting on America's college campuses. The CAU reviews law enforcement agencies' reporting practices, and audits crime statistics that are reported by the states through their participation in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. The results of the QAR are shared with the Department for a comparative analysis of the annual crime statistics data received from participating postsecondary institutions. The CAU reviewed a total of 21 Part I Offenses and 20 Part II Offenses that were recorded from January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009. A copy of the CJIS report is attached as Appendix A.

The Department reviewed a sample of 95 UTAPD incident and arrest reports generated in the course of UTAPD's operations during calendar year 2008. These reports documented incidents of Part I and Part II offenses reported to the UTAPD including a sample of Part II arrests for violations of certain laws pertaining to illegal drugs, illegal usage of controlled substances, liquor, and weapons. Both random and judgmental sampling techniques were used to select reports for this review. Approximately 50 incident reports from the initial sample also were cross-checked against the daily crime log to ensure that crimes occurring within the patrol jurisdiction were entered properly on the log.

Disclaimer:

Although the review was thorough, it cannot be assumed to be all-inclusive. The absence of statements in the report concerning UTA'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 UTA of its obligation to comply with all of the statutory or regulatory provisions governing the Title IV, HEA programs.

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

With regard to the discrepancies noted in the QAR, the exit briefing packet provided by the CAU addressed its finding(s) and UTAPD's compliance with the UCR guidelines. The Department recommends that UTA integrate the information and guidance provided by the CAU into its police operations. However, UTA is not required to take any specific actions pursuant to this program review based on the findings of the QAR.

C. Findings

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

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

Citation:

The Clery Act and the Department's regulations require that institutions participating in the Title IV, HEA programs compile and publish statistics concerning the occurrence on campus of the following crimes: criminal homicide, manslaughter, forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. In addition, institutions are 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) and (7)*. The Department's regulations require that, for Clery Act reporting purposes, participating institutions must compile crime statistics using the definitions of crimes in the Department's regulations at 34 CFR Part 668, Subpart D, Appendix A.. Each institution must also submit its crime statistics to the Department for inclusion in the Department's online campus crime statistics database. *20 U.S.C. § 1092(f)(5)*.

Institutions must also provide a geographic breakdown of crime statistics according to the following categories: 1) on campus; 2) as a subset of the on campus category, dormitories or other residential facilities for students on campus; 3) certain non-campus building or property; and, 4), adjacent and accessible public property. *34 C.F.R. § 668.46(c)(4)*.

Noncompliance:

A. Improper Crime Classifications

UTA did not compile and publish accurate and complete crime statistics for calendar year 2008 as a result of errors in classifying crimes for reporting purposes. Specifically, UTA improperly classified a forcible sex offense (FSO) as an "Assault." The incident report (200809316) indicates that the victim stated that an "unknown male grabbed her thigh and female intimate area through her clothing." Based on this fact, this incident should have been classified as a case of Forcible Fondling. The crime of Forcible Fondling includes, "the touching of the private body parts of another person for the purpose of sexual gratification, forcibly and/or against the person's will." Forcible Fondling is a sub-category of the Clery-reportable forcible sexual assault crime classification and therefore must be included in the ASR statistical disclosures.

Incident # 200805595 was improperly classified as "Assault of a Family Member." The incident report indicates that UTAPD responded to a report of domestic violence. The complainant, "Roommate # 1" indicated that "Roommate # 2," the aggressor, stated, "I'm going to beat you; I'm going to hit you." Roommate #2 then stated, "If I hit you, I'm going to kill you." Mutual combat ensued with Roommate # 2 striking Roommate # 1 in the head and midsection. Roommate # 1 was held over a stove burner by her hair. Roommate # 2 then stated, "If you don't let go of me, I'm going to turn this on." Roommate # 2 also attempted to strangle Roommate # 1, tore out a large section of her hair, and ripped her earrings out, all of which resulted in fear, pain, injury and bleeding. On the basis of these facts, this incident should have been classified as an Aggravated Assault.

Incident # 2008848270 was classified as a single case of "Unauthorized Use of a Motor Vehicle," however the incident report clearly indicates that two motor vehicle thefts (MVT) occurred in the Centennial Court parking lot at about the same time. The incident report focuses primarily on the MVT committed by the suspect who was arrested at the scene. The second reported car theft is noted in the narrative but was not coded into the record management system in a manner that would result in the second incident being counted for Clery Act purposes

Because non-aggravated assaults and unauthorized motor vehicle use are not counted for Clery Act purposes, the four improperly-classified crimes noted above resulted in four instances of under-reporting.

Errors were also identified in UTA's audit trail for Part I offenses both in terms of the number of reported incidents and in the geographical breakdown regarding the site of those incidents. For example, the review team was unable to determine from UTA's supporting documentation which of the six reported aggravated assaults occurred on campus and which occurred on public property. Moreover, the UTAPD's dispatch report lists 3 more aggravated assaults that were not identified on the audit trail (incident numbers 200805269, 200838833, 200838813).

B. Inaccurate Arrest and Disciplinary Referral Statistics

UTA did not report accurate arrest and disciplinary referral statistics to the Department's online crime statistics database for calendar year 2008.

In its submission to the Department's online crime statistics database, UTA identified 29 arrests for liquor law violations (24 on campus; 5 on public property). This is the same number that was published in UTA's 2009 ASR. However, UTA's supporting documentation did not substantiate its liquor law violation (LLV) arrest statistics. According to UTA's audit trail, some of the 24 liquor law arrests on campus actually occurred on sidewalks and are duplicative of arrests reported as occurring on public property. It also appears that one LLV arrest occurred in a fraternity house.

Similarly, UTA's submission to the Department's online campus crime database indicated that a total of 16 arrests were made for drug law violations (DLV). However, UTA's supporting documentation listed 18 DLV arrests. UTA reported 5 on campus arrests in calendar year 2008; however, the audit trail reflects 11 on campus arrests even after one such arrest that occurred on a sidewalk was excluded by the review team. UTAPD incident reports show that one of these 11 arrests occurred in a residence hall but no DLV arrests were identified in the ASR or in UTA's online reporting to the Department as occurring in residence halls.

Regarding weapons law violation (WLV) arrests, UTA's submission to the Department's online campus crime database reported zero WLV arrests on public property; however the audit trail indicates that two such arrests were affected during a traffic stop. These two WLV arrests were not included in any of the geographical reporting categories. UTA reported one WLV arrest to the online database; however this reporting conflicted with the three WLV arrests identified from UTA's audit trail.

UTA was also unable to substantiate its disciplinary referral (DR) statistics for drug and liquor law violations. UTA's audit trail records cited 47 DRs as occurring in calendar year 2008; however UTA only reported 46 DLV referrals, 24 of which were included in the residence hall category. The review team's analysis of UTA's supporting documentation indicated that only 22 referrals should have been included in the residence hall category. Similar errors were identified in the statistics and supporting documentation for LLV DR's. UTA reported 142 LLV referrals to the online database. However, UTA's audit trail only accounts for 129 such referrals. Institutional officials acknowledged that reporting errors had occurred and that LLV DR statistics were over-reported.

As noted in Section B of this report, the program review was planned and conducted as part of our partnership with the FBI's CJIS Audit Unit. The CAU identified three over-reported incidents and one classification error in the 21 Part 1 Offenses reviewed. Incidents #s 2009-05970, 2009-06964, and 2009-07021 were classified as Forcible Rape-Rape by Force and Incident # 2009-06352 was classified as Burglary-Unlawful Entry-No Force. The CAU has determined that the three Forcible Rape incidents did not occur within UTA's jurisdiction

and the burglary incident should have been classified as a Theft from Building. Therefore, for Clery Act purposes, these incidents do not meet the criteria for disclosure in UTA's 2009 annual security report, which should have been distributed no later than October 1, 2010. (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 violates the HEA and the Department's regulations and deprives the campus community and the public of vitally important information regarding crime and safety concerns.

Required Action:

UTA must correct all errors in its crime statistics. This requirement applies to the exceptions noted above and any other errors identified during UTA's preparation of its response to this report. UTA must reclassify the crimes and violations identified above and correct the errors in its crime statistics as published in the ASR and as submitted to the Department's online database. As part of its response preparation, UTA must re-examine the reported location of all Clery-countable incidents to ensure that all crime statistics are disclosed by geographical category in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 668.46 (c)(4).

To ensure that UTA can substantiate its crime statistics for calendar year 2008 and in all future years, UTA must develop a means of compiling and recording the data so that an accurate and complete audit trail is developed and maintained. In response to this finding, UTA must revise its 2008 audit trail and submit a copy of that document with the University's response. While the Department does not dictate the exact form of an audit trail, the production of one is necessary for UTA to demonstrate its compliance with the Clery Act's statistical reporting requirements.

Additionally, the University must examine and improve its policies, procedures, internal controls, and training programs to ensure that all incidents of crime reported to the UTAPD, non-law enforcement campus security authorities, and other local law enforcement agencies are properly classified and included in the UTA's ASR, which will have to be amended and re-distributed in accordance with instructions that will be provided in our Final Program Review Determination letter. A copy of all such revisions must accompany the University's response.

The University must also clarify how it applied the geographical definitions to residence halls, University-owned apartments, and buildings and /or property owned and/or controlled by recognized student organizations during calendar year 2008. This statement must also explain any changes in the University's application of these definitions for calendar year 2009 based either on its own due diligence and/or UTA's ongoing dialogue with Department officials.

If UTA believes that any of the initial crime classifications challenged in this finding are correct, the University must provide an explanation along with documentation in support of its position that shows that the incident was in fact classified and reported properly.

Based on an evaluation of all available information including UTA's response, the Department will determine if additional actions will be required and will advise the University accordingly in its Final Program Review Determination.

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

Citation:

The Clery Act and the Department's regulations require that all participating institutions must also compile, publish, and distribute a separate crime statistics disclosure for each of its campuses. *34 C.F.R. 668.46 (d)*.

Noncompliance:

UTA did not report crime statistics separately for all of its non-contiguous locations. Specifically, the review team identified at least one additional location, the University of Texas at Arlington – McLennan Community College in Waco, Texas, for which the University did not compile, publish, and distribute separate crime statistics. This location is listed on UTA's Eligibility and Certification Approval Report and was approved as an additional location on April 15 2004. UTA's 2009 ASR only included crime statistics for the main campus.

Failure to comply with the Clery Act's requirements for each separate campus of the University violates the HEA and the Department's regulations and deprives that particular campus community of crime information that is most relevant to their safety and security.

The Department takes notice that UTA's 2010 ASR does include statistical fields for three grouping of buildings and properties under the heading, "UTA Properties – Fort Worth."

Required Action:

As a result of this finding, UTA must review and revise its policies and procedures for preparing its campus security report with special attention to the proper application of the geographical definitions in 34 C.F.R. 668.46 (a) to ensure proper categorization. To ensure full and accurate disclosure to all students and employees, the statistical grids prepared by location should be made part of one consolidated ASR.

As part of this review and to reduce the likelihood of recurrence, UTA must identify all buildings and property that meet any of applicable geographical definitions, take steps to ensure accurate classification of each building and/or property, identify any buildings or

property that constitute separate campuses and then ensure that separate crime statistics disclosures are compiled, published, and distributed for all non-contiguous locations.

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



Summary Exit Briefing Local Agency Review

University Of Texas PD



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
- 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 errors 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.

Errors 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 errors 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-June 2009

Total Part I
Offenses Reviewed: 21

Classification

Overreported

*Underreported

Inaccurate

Total Errors in Part I Offenses:

* Includes underreported Simple Assaults discovered in Part I Offense review. UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 26, "Simple Assault is not a Part I offense - it is a Part II offense but is collected under 4e as a quality control matter and for the purpose of looking at total assault violence."

LEOKA

Overreported

Underreported

Hate Crime

Total Hate
Crime Reviewed: _____

Overreported

Underreported

Inaccurate

Data Quality Results - Part II

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-June 2009** Total Part II Records Reviewed: **20**

Classification

*Underreported **0**

Arrests

Overreported **0**

Underreported **2**

Total Errors in Part II Arrests: **2**

*Indicates underreported Part I offenses discovered in Part II Arrest review including underreported Simple Assaults. UCR Handbook, Revised 2004, p. 26, "Simple Assault is not a Part I offense - it is a Part II offense but is collected under 4e as a quality control matter and for the purpose of looking at total assault violence."

Data Quality Results - Part I

	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	3	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0
4e. Other Assaults- Simple, Not Aggravated	0	0		0
(5) Burglary	0	0	0	0
5a. Forcible Entry	0	0	0	0
5b. Unlawful Entry- No Force	0	0	1	1
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	0	0
6e. Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts/Acc.	0	0	0	0
6f. Theft of Bicycles	0	0	0	0
6g. Theft from Buildings	0	0	0	0
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	3	0	1	4

	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	0
(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	0

Administrative Interview Results

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:

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

Administrative Interview Results

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

Comments:

Auditor Notes: