



U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Clarksburg, WV 26306

August 3, 2012



Mr. Derek Veitenheimer
UCR Program Manager
Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance
Suite 615
One South Pinckney Street
Madison, WI 53703-3220

Dear Mr. Veitenheimer:

Enclosed is the final audit report for the Uniform Crime Reporting Quality Assurance Review Audit conducted by the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division. If comments were received, they were appended into the audit report. Thank you for your cooperation throughout the audit process. Should you have any questions, please contact Ms. Veronica A. Emilio at (304) 625-5114 or <veronica.emilio@leo.gov>.

Sincerely yours,

Michelle S. Klimt
Section Chief
Law Enforcement Support Section
Criminal Justice Information
Services Division

Enclosure

1 – Mr. Walter M. Neverman
Director
Crime Information Bureau
Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 2718
Madison, WI 53701-2718



U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Criminal Justice Information Services Division
CJIS Audit Unit

May 2012

Uniform Crime Reporting Quality Assurance Review Report

WISCONSIN

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Requirement One	3
Requirement Two	9
Requirement Three	10
Requirement Four	11
Requirement Five	12
Requirement Six	13
Hate Crime	14
Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)	16
Attachment	

State Program Manager Response

Executive Summary

Overview

The Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program provides a nationwide view of crime based on the submission of crime information by law enforcement agencies throughout the country. Designed to enhance the national UCR Program, the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) assesses the validity of the crime information submitted through reviews of reporting procedures at the state UCR Program and the contributing local law enforcement agencies. The QAR evaluates and provides feedback regarding the conditions under which a state UCR Program is developed and required to routinely operate. This evaluation includes assessing compliance to the six national UCR Program requirements.

Audit Recommendations

Based on the fourth cycle QAR conducted during May 2012, the FBI CJIS Division recommends that Wisconsin:

1. Ensure local agencies accurately report offenses according to the national UCR Program definitions.
2. Ensure the state Program has adequate field staff assigned to conduct audits.
3. Ensure local agencies accurately report hate crime according to the national UCR Program definitions.

The following information is a summation of data collected during local and state administrative interviews, local data quality assessments, and data collected from the FBI Crime Statistics Management Unit (CSMU).

The charts below display the error rates for the current Wisconsin QAR.

SUMMARY / HATE CRIME

SUMMARY AGENCY RESULTS	PART I	ERROR RATE	PART II	ERROR RATE	HATE CRIMES	ERROR RATE
Total Offenses Reviewed	143		135		25	
Offenses Overreported	0	0.00%			12	48.00%
Offenses Underreported	0	0.00%	8	5.93%	0	0.00%
Offenses Inaccurate	5	3.50%			0	0.00%
TOTAL ERRORS	5	3.50%	8	5.93%	12	48.00%

NIBRS (National Incident Based Reporting System)

NIBRS AGENCY RESULTS	GROUP A	ERROR RATE	GROUP B	ERROR RATE
Total Offenses Reviewed	181		165	
Offenses Overreported	2	1.10%		
Offenses Underreported	0	0.00%	18	10.91%
Offenses Inaccurate	6	3.31%		
TOTAL ERRORS	8	4.42%	18	10.91%

In October 2008, the UCR Subcommittee endorsed the establishment of a QAR error rate. The current error rate is 5.16 percent (+/-2.21 percent). This rate is derived using all Summary and NIBRS offense classification errors discovered by the QAR team for state reviews conducted during the period of October 1, 2010, through, September 30, 2011. Please note that during the reference time period the lowest state error rate of a state reviewed was 1.10 percent and the highest state error rate was 9.59 percent.

QAR Assessment Chart

Requirement One – Summary Reporting		
Correctly applies Hierarchy rule	Meets	
Arson		
Correctly scores arson in multiple-offense situations	Meets	
Correctly excludes arson-related deaths of police officers and firefighters	Meets	
Scoring		
Correctly scores crimes against persons	Meets	
Correctly scores crimes against property	Meets	
Arrests		
Correctly reports arrestee data	Meets	
Multiple offense (Part I and Part II) situations – scores Part I offense with arrest	Meets	
Multiple offense situations – scores most serious Part II offense with arrest	Meets	
Correctly counts one arrest for each person arrested	Meets	
Correctly counts arrest for offenders in custody	Meets	
Clearances		
Correctly clears by exceptional means	Meets	
Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR	Meets	
Meets criteria for submitting clearances	Meets	
Jurisdiction		
Reports only offenses within jurisdiction	Meets	
Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction	Meets	
Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction	Meets	
Property		
Correctly submits property information	Meets	
Correctly determines property values	Meets	
Unfounded		
Reports false or baseless data on Return A as unfounded	Meets	

Requirement One – NIBRS	
Scoring	
Correctly scores crimes against persons	Meets
Correctly scores crimes against property	Meets
Correctly scores crimes against society	Meets
Arrests	
Correctly reports arrestee data	Meets
Correctly reports type of arrest	Meets
Clearances	
Correctly clears by exceptional means	Meets
Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR	Meets
Jurisdiction	
Reports only offenses within jurisdiction	Meets
Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction	Meets
Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction	Meets
Property	
Correctly submits property information	Meets
Correctly determines property values	Meets
Correctly applies no value to non-negotiable instruments	Meets
Correctly submits unknown property values	Meets
Correctly submits drug quantities	Meets
Correctly submits values of drugs stolen	Meets
Offenders	
Correctly submits offender data	Meets

Requirement Two		
Data submissions can be updated	Meets	
Requirement Three		
State Program population coverage is at or above the national average	Meets	
Requirement Four		
State Program provided assistance with record-keeping practices and crime reporting procedures	Meets	
State Program had adequate staff assigned to conduct audits	Does Not Meet	
Requirement Five		
Data submitted in correct format for entry into the national UCR database	Meets	
Requirement Six		
Data submitted in time to meet the national UCR Program deadline	Meets	
Hate Crime – Summary Reporting		
Reports Hate Crime	Meets	
Correctly uses all bias criteria	Meets	
Correctly submits Quarterly Hate Crime Report	Meets	
Hate Crime – NIBRS		
Reports Hate Crime	Does Not Meet	
Correctly uses all bias criteria	Meets	
Correctly applies use of “None” for bias motivation	Meets	
Correctly applies “Unknown” bias	Meets	
LEOKA – Summary Reporting		
Reports LEOKA	Meets	
Correctly submits all officers killed	Meets	
Correctly counts all assaults	Meets	
Reports NO LEOKA on Return A	Meets	
LEOKA – NIBRS		
Reports LEOKA	Meets	
Correctly submits all officers killed	Meets	
Correctly counts all assaults	Meets	

Introduction

Background

The UCR QAR is a support mechanism designed to augment the national UCR Program by assisting states and the local agencies in submitting more accurate crime data. The QAR was established in response to a study of the national UCR Program which identified a universal concern with the uniform reporting of crime data.

Scope

The QAR operates on a triennial audit cycle performed in conjunction with other FBI CJIS Audit Unit services. The QAR assesses summary and incident-based reporting methods to determine discrepancies in crime reporting practices and accuracy of crime statistics. The QAR is a voluntary review, however, participation in the QAR process affords state UCR repositories an opportunity to have the quality of their data reviewed as it relates to the conditional national UCR Program requirements. The objective of the QAR is to assess the validity of the reported crime data as specified by the national UCR Program guidelines set forth in the *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook*, Revised 2004; *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook, NIBRS Edition*; *National Incident-Based Reporting System Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines*; *Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines*; and *UCR State Program Bulletins*. The QAR provides feedback on identified state UCR Program needs to ensure consistency and accurate crime reporting that will increase the integrity of their crime statistics.

Methodology

On-site reviews of state UCR Programs and local agencies consist of administrative interviews and data quality reviews. Administrative interviews are conducted with appropriate agency personnel to learn how an agency manages incidents and whether the data submitted to the national UCR Program comply with national definitions and guidelines. Data quality review consists of examination of case files including the officer's narrative and supplemental information as compared to data reported to the national UCR Program to determine if national standards and definitions were appropriately applied. Additionally, this review ensures arrests, Hate Crime, and LEOKA data are reported according to the national standards and definitions. A simple random sampling method is used to calculate a predetermined number of incidents for the data quality review.

About This Report

The QAR Report is divided into the following sections: Requirement One, Requirement Two, Requirement Three, Requirement Four, Requirement Five, Requirement Six, Hate Crime, and LEOKA. Sections One, Two, Six, Hate Crime and LEOKA contain summary charts which display the results of local agency policy compliance reviews as well as overall compliance for the state UCR Program. Red text within a summary chart indicates a compliance deficiency. Each requirement is defined and referenced. State-wide non-compliance issues are presented in bolded text for emphasis and ease of reference. These result in recommendations which are numbered and correspond to the recommendations in the executive summary.

Requirement One

The state Program must conform to the national UCR Program's standards, definitions, and information requirements. These requirements, of course, do not prohibit the state from gathering other statistical data beyond the national collection.

SUMMARY

Classification

Offenses reported according to national Program definitions: "When agencies report offense data to a state or the national UCR Program, they must first appropriately classify offenses known to police into the Part I or II standard offense categories as defined by the Program." (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 15)

Correctly applies Hierarchy Rule: "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)

Arson

Correctly scores arson in multiple-offense situations: "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)

Correctly excludes arson-related deaths of police officers and firefighters: "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)

Scoring

Correctly scores crimes against persons: "... the offenses of *criminal homicide, forcible rape, and aggravated assault* are crimes against the person. For these crimes, *one offense is counted for each victim.*" (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 41)

Correctly scores crimes against property: "*Robbery, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson* are crimes against property. For these crimes, *one offense is counted for each distinct operation or attempt* except in the case of motor vehicle theft for which *one offense is counted for each stolen vehicle and one offense for each attempt to steal a motor vehicle.*" (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 41)

Arrests

Correctly reports arrestee data: “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)

Multiple offense (Part I & II) situations – scores Part I offense with arrest: “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)

Multiple offense situations – scores most serious Part II offense with arrest: “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)

Correctly counts one arrest for each person arrested: “The reporting agency must count one arrest for each separate occasion on which a person is arrested.” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 98)

Correctly counts arrest for offenders in custody: “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)

Clearances

Correctly clears by exceptional means: “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.

1. Has the investigation definitely established the identity of the offender?
2. Is there enough information to support an arrest, charge, and turning over to the court for prosecution?
3. Is the exact location of the offender known so that the subject could be taken into custody now?
4. Is there some reason outside law enforcement control that precludes arresting, charging, and prosecuting the offender? (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, pp. 80-81)

Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR: “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 criteria for submitting clearances: “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)

Jurisdiction

Reports only offenses within jurisdiction: “To be certain that data (offense or arrest) are not reported more than once by overlapping jurisdictions . . .” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 9) Agencies report only those offenses committed within their own jurisdictions.

Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction: “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)

Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction: “Agencies must report only those arrests made for offenses committed within their own jurisdictions.” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 9)

Property

Correctly submits property information: “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)

Correctly determines property values: “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:

- 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 . . .” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised, 2004, p. 86)

Unfounded

Reports false or baseless data on Return A as unfounded: “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)

Requirement One

Procedure Assessment Overview

	Arson			Scoring		Arrests				
	Correctly applies Hierarchy Rule	Correctly scores arson in multiple-offense situations	Correctly excludes arson-related deaths of police officers and firefighters	Correctly scores crimes against persons	Correctly scores crimes against property	Correctly reports arrestee data	Multiple offense (Part I & II) situations- Scores Part I offense with arrest	Multiple offense situations- scores most serious Part II offense with arrest	Correctly counts one arrest for each person arrested	Correctly counts arrest for offenders in custody
Stoughton Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Univ Of WI Madison PD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

The information provided in this table was gathered at the audited local agencies. The areas reviewed under Requirement One were Classification, Arson, Scoring, Arrests, Clearances, Jurisdiction, Property, and Unfounded.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Requirement One

Procedure Assessment Overview

	Clearances			Jurisdiction			Property		
	Correctly clears by exceptional means	Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR	Meets criteria for submitting clearances	Reports only offenses within jurisdiction	Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction	Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction	Correctly submits property information	Correctly determines property values	
Stoughton Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Univ Of WI Madison PD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

The information provided in this table was gathered at the audited local agencies. The areas reviewed under Requirement One were Classification, Arson, Scoring, Arrests, Clearances, Jurisdiction, Property, and Unfounded.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Requirement One

Part I Classification Error Overview

	Part I Offenses Reviewed	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Total
Stoughton Police Department	63	0	0	4	4
Univ of WI Madison PD	25	0	0	0	0
Waukesha Police Department	55	0	0	1	1
Total	143	0	0	5	5
Error Rate		0.00%	0.00%	3.50%	3.50%

This chart provides cumulative totals of all offenses reviewed and errors discovered. Additionally, it provides a breakdown of results for each agency and error rates.

Requirement One

Part I Classification Error Detail

Number of Errors	Error Type	Reported As	Case File
1	Inaccurate	6B	6I
1	Inaccurate	6I	6G
1	Inaccurate	6B	6G
1	Inaccurate	6I	5B
1	Inaccurate	6F	5B
5			

Requirement One

Part II Classification Error Overview

	Part II Offenses Reviewed	Underreported Part I
Stoughton Police Department	55	6
Univ of WI Madison PD	25	0
Waukesha Police Department	55	2
Total	135	8
Error Rate		5.93%

This chart provides the total number of Part I offenses that were found in Part II offenses. These offenses would result in underreported Part I offenses.

NIBRS

Classification

Offenses reported according to national Program definitions: “Essential to the maintenance of uniform and consistent data is the utilization of standard definitions of the offenses used.” (UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 11)

- During the data quality review at local agencies, the FBI CJIS auditors discovered 18 underreported Group A offenses in the Group B incident reports.

1. Ensure local agencies accurately report offenses according to the national UCR Program definitions.

Scoring

Correctly scores crimes against persons: “. . . one offense is counted for each victim of a ‘Crime Against Person.’ ” (UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 29)

Correctly scores crimes against property: “one offense is counted for each distinct operation for ‘Crime Against Property’ (except motor vehicle theft, where one offense is counted for each stolen vehicle).” (UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 29)

Correctly scores crimes against society: “. . . one offense is counted for each ‘Crime Against Society.’ ” (UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 29)

Arrests

Correctly reports arrestee data: “Arrestee data are to be reported for all persons apprehended for the commission of Group A or Group B Crimes, that is, all offenses except Justifiable Homicide (not a crime). . . . The arrestee data to be reported describe the arrestee (e.g., his/her age, sex, race, etc.) and the circumstances of the arrest.” (UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 55)

Correctly reports type of arrest: “Describe the type of apprehension (at the time of initial contact with the arrestee) by selecting one of the following:

On-View Arrest – taken into custody without a warrant or previous incident report
Summoned/Cited – not taken into custody
Taken Into Custody – based on warrant and/or previously submitted incident report”
(UCR Handbook, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 56)

Clearances

Correctly clears by exceptional means: “In order to clear an offense by exceptional means, each of the following four conditions must be met:

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.”
(*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 34)

Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR: “The administrative closing of a case or the ‘clearing’ of it by departmental policy does not permit exceptionally clearing an offense . . .”
(*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 34)

Jurisdiction

Reports only offenses within jurisdiction: “To be certain that data are not reported more than once by overlapping jurisdictions . . .” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 6) Agencies report only those offenses committed within their own jurisdictions.

Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction: “. . . the recovery of property is reported only by the agency that first reported it missing and/or stolen, regardless of who or what agency recovered it.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 6)

Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction: “Agencies report only those arrests made for offenses committed within their own boundaries/jurisdictions.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 6)

Property

Correctly submits property information: “Property information is to be submitted separately for each type of property loss, . . .” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 41)

Correctly determines property values: “Questions frequently arise as to how to value property involved in a criminal incident. The following guidelines are suggested: (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, pp. 43-44)

- a. Use fair market value . . .
- b. Use cost to the merchant (wholesale cost) of goods . . .
- c. Use victim’s valuation . . .
- d. Use replacement cost or actual cash cost . . .
- e. When the victim obviously exaggerates the value of stolen/destroyed/damaged property for insurance purposes, common sense and good judgment will dictate a fair market value to be placed on the stolen items by law enforcement.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, pp. 43-44)

Correctly applies no value to non-negotiable instruments: “The theft of nonnegotiable instruments such as traveler’s checks, personal checks, money orders, stocks, bonds, food stamps, etc., should be scored but no value recorded.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 44)
“Nonnegotiable instruments, (documents requiring further action to become negotiable, e.g., unendorsed checks and unendorsed money orders . . .)” (*NIBRS Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines*, August 2000, p. 84)

Correctly submits unknown property values: “If the value is unknown, one dollar (\$1.00) which means unknown, i.e., 1=Unknown should be entered.” (*NIBRS, Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines*, August 2000, p. 86)

Correctly submits drug quantities: “. . . in order to obtain some measure of the drug problem, the ‘Estimated Quantity’ of seized drugs or narcotics is to be reported.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 45)

Correctly submits values of drugs stolen: “. . . when drugs are involved in other types of crime (e.g., they were stolen in a burglary or burned in an arson) their value is to be reported.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 43)

Offenders

Correctly submits offender data: “Offender data include characteristics (age, sex, and race) of each offender (up to 99) involved in a crime incident whether or not an arrest has been made.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 53)

Requirement One

Procedure Assessment Overview

	Scoring			Arrests		Clearances		Jurisdiction		
	Correctly scores crimes against persons	Correctly scores crimes against property	Correctly scores crimes against society	Correctly reports arrestee data	Correctly reports type of arrest	Correctly clears by exceptional means	Correctly handles administrative closings for UCR	Reports only offenses within jurisdiction	Reports only recovered property stolen from jurisdiction	Reports only arrests for offenses within jurisdiction
Appleton Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Milwaukee Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

The information, listed in the table above, was compiled from the NIBRS Exit Briefing Packets at the audited local agencies. The areas reviewed under Requirement One were Administrative, Offense, Property, Victim, Offender, Arrestee, and Group B Arrest Report.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Requirement One

Procedure Assessment Overview

	Property						Offenders
	Correctly submits property information	Correctly determines property values	Correctly applies no value to nonnegotiable instruments	Correctly submits unknown property values	Correctly submits drug quantities	Correctly submits values of drugs stolen	Correctly submits offender data
Appleton Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Milwaukee Police Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

The information, listed in the table above, was compiled from the NIBRS Exit Briefing Packets at the audited local agencies. The areas reviewed under Requirement One were Administrative, Offense, Property, Victim, Offender, Arrestee, and Group B Arrest Report.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Requirement One

Group A Classification Error Overview

	Group A Offenses Reviewed	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Total
Appleton Police Department	33	0	0	2	2
Brown Deer Police Department	27	0	0	1	1
Green Bay Police Department	31	1	0	1	2
Madison Police Department	34	1	0	0	1
Manitowoc Police Department	26	0	0	1	1
Milwaukee Police Department	30	0	0	1	1
Total	181	2	0	6	8
Error Rate		1.10%	0.00%	3.31%	4.42%

Overreported, underreported and inaccurate offenses discovered in data element 6 are scored as classification errors

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Total Discrepancies	Number Reviewed	Percentage of
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0	0	181	0.00%
9. Location Type	0	0	6	6	181	3.31%
11. Method of Entry	0	0	2	2	17	11.76%
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0	0	37	0.00%
14. Property Loss	0	6	1	7	206	3.40%
15. Property Description	2	2	20	24	196	12.24%
16. Property Value	0	0	8	8	196	4.08%
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0	0	6	0.00%
23. Victim Number	1	0	0	1	181	0.55%
25. Type of Victim	0	0	5	5	181	2.76%
36. Offender Number	0	1	5	6	192	3.13%
37. Age of Offender	0	0	5	5	117	4.27%
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	5	5	117	4.27%
39. Race of Offender	0	0	7	7	117	5.98%
40. Arrestee Number	2	1	0	3	70	4.29%
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	1	1	70	1.43%

Overreported: 5

Underreported: 10

Inaccurate: 65

Data element discrepancies discovered (excluding classification data element 6 errors) are provided for information only to identify systemic technical issues or areas where additional training may be needed.

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Appleton Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	0
11. Method of Entry	0	0	0
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	0	0
15. Property Description	0	0	2
16. Property Value	0	0	0
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	0	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	0
36. Offender Number	0	0	0
37. Age of Offender	0	0	0
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	0
39. Race of Offender	0	0	1
40. Arrestee Number	1	0	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	1

Overreported: 1

Underreported: 0

Inaccurate: 4

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Brown Deer Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	1
11. Method of Entry	0	0	1
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	1	1
15. Property Description	0	0	6
16. Property Value	0	0	1
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	0	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	0
36. Offender Number	0	0	5
37. Age of Offender	0	0	5
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	5
39. Race of Offender	0	0	4
40. Arrestee Number	0	0	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	0

Overreported: 0

Underreported: 1

Inaccurate: 29

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Green Bay Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	0
11. Method of Entry	0	0	1
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	1	0
15. Property Description	1	1	1
16. Property Value	0	0	1
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	1	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	0
36. Offender Number	0	0	0
37. Age of Offender	0	0	0
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	0
39. Race of Offender	0	0	1
40. Arrestee Number	0	0	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	0

Overreported: 2

Underreported: 2

Inaccurate: 4

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Madison Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	0
11. Method of Entry	0	0	0
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	0	0
15. Property Description	0	1	1
16. Property Value	0	0	0
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	0	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	1
36. Offender Number	0	0	0
37. Age of Offender	0	0	0
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	0
39. Race of Offender	0	0	0
40. Arrestee Number	0	0	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	0

Overreported: 0

Underreported: 1

Inaccurate: 2

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Manitowoc Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	0
11. Method of Entry	0	0	0
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	0	0
15. Property Description	1	0	2
16. Property Value	0	0	1
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	0	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	0
36. Offender Number	0	0	0
37. Age of Offender	0	0	0
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	0
39. Race of Offender	0	0	0
40. Arrestee Number	1	0	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	0

Overreported: 2

Underreported: 0

Inaccurate: 3

Requirement One

Group A Data Element Discrepancies Milwaukee Police Department

	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate
8A. Bias Motivation	0	0	0
9. Location Type	0	0	5
11. Method of Entry	0	0	0
13. Weapon / Force	0	0	0
14. Property Loss	0	4	0
15. Property Description	0	0	8
16. Property Value	0	0	5
20. Suspected Drug Type	0	0	0
23. Victim Number	0	0	0
25. Type of Victim	0	0	4
36. Offender Number	0	1	0
37. Age of Offender	0	0	0
38. Sex of Offender	0	0	0
39. Race of Offender	0	0	1
40. Arrestee Number	0	1	0
43. Type of Arrest	0	0	0

Overreported: 0

Underreported: 6

Inaccurate: 23

Requirement One

Group B Classification Error Overview

	Group B Offenses Reviewed	Underreported Group A Offenses
Appleton Police Department	30	2
Brown Deer Police Department	25	3
Green Bay Police Department	25	3
Madison Police Department	30	1
Manitowoc Police Department	25	4
Milwaukee Police Department	30	5
Total	165	18
Error Rate		10.91%

Underreported Group A offenses discovered in Group B offenses are scored as classification errors.

Requirement Two

The state Program must have a proven, effective, statewide UCR Program and have instituted acceptable quality control procedures.

SUMMARY

Data submissions can be updated: “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)

NIBRS

Data submissions can be updated: Updated information is to be reported to the national Program on discovery of an additional unreported offense, victim, and/or offender; a subsequent arrest or exceptional clearance; discovery of a significant amount of unreported property loss; the recovery of stolen property; or the incorrect entry of important data, such as the offense code, the victim’s or arrestee’s sex or race, etc. (*NIBRS Volume 1: Data Collection Guidelines*, August 2000, p. 18)

Requirement Two

Updated Data Submissions

Summary Agencies	Data Submissions can be Updated
Stoughton Police Department	Yes
Univ of WI Madison PD	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	Yes
NIBRS Agencies	Data Submissions can be Updated
Appleton Police Department	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	Yes
Madison Police Department	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	Yes
Milwaukee Police Department	Yes

The information provided in this table was gathered at the audited local agencies. The area reviewed under Requirement Two was the state quality control procedures.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Requirement Three

Coverage within the state by a state Program must be, at least, equal to that attained by the national UCR Program. The information presented below represents data collected from the FBI CSMU.

Population Covered

National Program average	93.10 %
State Program average	92.70 %

(A recommendation was not given because the state Program average falls short of the national Program average by only .4%).

Requirement Four

The state Program must have adequate field staff assigned to conduct audits and to assist contributing agencies in record-keeping practices and crime reporting procedures. The information presented below represents responses given during the administrative interview portion of local agency and state Program reviews. In certain cases, these responses will not correlate to recommendations made for Requirement Four.

State Program provided assistance with record-keeping practices
and crime reporting procedures **Yes**
State Program had adequate staff assigned to conduct audits.....**No**

- **During the administrative interview at the state Program, the FBI CJIS Division auditors learned that the state Program did not have adequate field staff assigned to conduct audits.**
- 2. Ensure the state Program has adequate field staff assigned to conduct audits.**

Requirement Five

The state Program must furnish to the FBI all of the detailed data regularly collected by the FBI from individual agencies that report to the state Program in the form of duplicate returns, computer printouts, and/or appropriate electronic media. The information presented below represents data collected from the FBI CSMU and the administrative interview portion of the state Program review.

Data submitted in correct format for entry into the national UCR database Yes

Requirement Six

The state Program must have the proven capability (tested over a period of time) to supply all the statistical data required in time to meet national UCR publication deadlines. The information presented below represents data collected from the FBI CSMU and the administrative interview portion of the state Program review.

Data submitted in time to meet the national UCR Program deadline..... **Yes**

Requirement Six

Timely Submissions

Summary Agencies	Timely Submissions
Stoughton Police Department	Yes
Univ of WI Madison PD	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	Yes
NIBRS Agencies	Timely Submissions
Appleton Police Department	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	Yes
Madison Police Department	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	Yes
Milwaukee Police Department	Yes
State Program Submissions to national UCR Program	
Summary	Yes
NIBRS	Yes

The information provided in this table was gathered at the reviewed local agencies and from the FBI Crime Statistics Management Unit. The area reviewed under Requirement Six was timely submission.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes= Meets UCR guidelines

No= Does not meet UCR guidelines

Hate Crime

The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 resulted in establishment of guidelines to collect, as part of the UCR Program, data about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. Bias against persons with disabilities was added to the data collection in 1997.

SUMMARY

Reports Hate Crime data: “. . . agencies must report a hate crime only if investigation revealed sufficient objective facts to lead a reasonable and prudent person to conclude that the offender’s actions were motivated, in whole or in part, by bias.” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 118)

Correctly uses all bias criteria: “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, pp. 1-2)

Correctly submits Quarterly Hate Crime Report: “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)

NIBRS

Reports Hate Crime data: “. . . bias is to be reported only if investigation reveals sufficient objective facts to lead a reasonable and prudent person to conclude that the offender’s actions were motivated, in whole or in part, by bias against a racial, religious, ethnic/national origin, or sexual orientation group.” (*UCR Handbook*, Revised 2004, p. 38)

- **During the data quality review at local agencies, the FBI CJIS Division auditors discovered 12 hate crime incidents were overreported.**
3. **Ensure local agencies accurately report hate crime according to the national UCR Program definitions.**

Correctly uses all bias criteria: “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, pp. 1-2)

Correctly applies use of “None” for bias motivation: “. . . incidents which do not involve any facts indicating biased motivation on the part of the offender are to be reported as ‘None,’ . . .” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 38)

Correctly applies “Unknown” bias: “. . . incidents involving ambiguous facts (i.e., where some facts are present but are not conclusive) are to be reported as ‘Unknown.’ ” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 38)

Hate Crime

Hate Crime Overview

	Hate Crime Incidents Reviewed	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Reports Hate Crime data	Correctly uses all bias criteria	Correctly submits Quarterly Hate Crime
Stoughton Police Department	0	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Univ of WI Madison PD	0	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	0	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total	0	0	0	0			

The information provided in this chart was gathered at the audited local agencies. This chart illustrates Hate Crime reported to the National Program within the period reviewed. It does not illustrate Hate Crime discovered within the sample of Part I and Part II incidents.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Hate Crime

Hate Crime Overview

	Hate Crime Incidents Reviewed	Overreported	Underreported	Inaccurate	Reports Hate Crime data	Correctly uses all bias criteria	Correctly applies use of None for bias motivation	Correctly applies Unknown bias
Appleton Police Department	2	2	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	0	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	1	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison Police Department	10	4	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	1	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Milwaukee Police Department	11	6	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total	25	12	0	0				

The information provided in this chart was gathered at the audited local agencies. This chart illustrates Hate Crime reported to the National Program within the period reviewed. It does not illustrate Hate Crime discovered within the sample of Group A and Group B incidents.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

LEOKA

In order to identify situations and provide statistical data on officers killed and assaulted, the UCR Program collects LEOKA data from contributing agencies. LEOKA submissions include data on sworn officers feloniously or accidentally killed or assaulted in the line of duty.

SUMMARY

Reports LEOKA: “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)

Correctly submits all officers killed: “. . . 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)

Correctly counts all assaults: “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)

Reports NO LEOKA on Return A: “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)

NIBRS

Reports LEOKA: “The form entitled ‘Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted’ (LEOKA) is to be used by agencies to report line-of-duty felonious or accidental killings of and assaults on sworn law enforcement officers.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 61)

Correctly submits all officers killed: “. . . Officers Killed” relates to sworn officers with full arrest powers killed in the line of duty. The number of officers slain by felonious acts and those killed by accident or negligence should be entered.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 61)

Correctly counts all assaults: “. . . all assaults on officers with or without injuries should be included on this form.” (*UCR Handbook*, NIBRS Edition, 1992, p. 63)

LEOKA

LEOKA Overview

	Underreported LEOKA	Overreported LEOKA	Reports LEOKA	Correctly submits all officers killed	Correctly counts all assaults	Reports NO LEOKA on Return A
Stoughton Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Univ Of WI Madison PD	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waukesha Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total	0	0				

The information provided in this chart was gathered at the audited local agencies. If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines

Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)

LEOKA Overview

	Underreported LEOKA	Overreported LEOKA	Reports LEOKA	Correctly submits all officers killed	Correctly counts all assaults
Appleton Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brown Deer Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Green Bay Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manitowoc Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Milwaukee Police Department	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total	0	0			

The information provided in this chart was gathered at the audited local agencies.

If any areas are marked No, they are not necessarily recommendations but may indicate areas of concern for the state Program.

Yes = Meets UCR Guidelines

No = Does Not Meet UCR Guidelines



State of Wisconsin

SCOTT WALKER
Governor

JOHN MURRAY
Executive Director

1 S Pinckney Street
Suite 615
Madison WI 53703-3220

Phone: (608) 266-3323
Fax: (608) 266-6676
<http://oja.wi.gov>

July 26, 2012

Veronica Emilio
FBI CJIS Audit Unit
Federal Bureau of Investigation
1000 Custer Hollow Road
Clarksburg, WV 26306

Dear Veronica,

Below are the Wisconsin UCR program's responses to the three recommendations made by the recent audit conducted by the FBI CJIS Quality Assurance Review team.

Recommendation:

Ensure local agencies accurately report offenses according to the national UCR Program definitions.

Response:

The Wisconsin State program will continue to provide email and telephone support to offense reporting and scoring questions from law enforcement agencies. We will work to become more visible to make agencies aware that they can utilize the state program as a resource for accurately reporting UCR data.

The State will continue to work Greg Swanson of the FBI to schedule annual statewide UCR training sessions. We've registered over 400 law enforcement personal to attend UCR training sessions conducted by the FBI in August 2012.

It is difficult to sponsor agency visits and/or state sponsored UCR Training due to the lack of staff and state funding for the UCR program (the state currently relies federal Justice Assistance grants to run the state UCR program) but the state will make efforts to offer state sponsored training instruction to supplement annual FBI Training if it can be fit into the budget.

An online training video, as well as additional resources, is available on the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance's website. The state will continue to invest resources into the online content in an effort to make UCR information widely accessible for all of Wisconsin UCR agencies.

Recommendation:

Ensure the state Program has adequate staff assigned to conduct audits.

Response:

Incorporating a State audit program will be difficult to implement due to lack of state funding received to run the UCR program. Wisconsin relies on the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants as the primary funding source for the administration of the Wisconsin UCR program, and due to the cuts in recent funding, basic technical assistance is the most the State has been able to provide. We will, however, continue to use and develop in-house software edits and statistical reasonableness reports to identify UCR data that require verification. We also continue to utilize IBR validation checks to review and minimize errors.

The Wisconsin UCR program is committed to, as much as current resources allow, conducting the essential data integrity checks needed. Our program recognizes the need to for quality UCR data and will continue to use our existing validation checks and continue to explore and/or expand other statistical reasonable tests and data verification processes as much as the current budget allows.

As part of our upcoming biennial budget request we plan to include a proposal for additional positions and resources to perform field audits and training. We see these being the basic necessary functions needed to address your recommendations and administer the State UCR program.

We will also continue to work with the FBI audit team to address any agency concerns about data reporting and will continue to be supportive of the FBI's Quality Assurance Reviews. The state will also be receptive to discussing possible areas of concern for the FBI to focus on during the next round of QAR audits.

Recommendation:

Ensure local agencies accurately report hate crime according to the national UCR Program definitions.

Response:

The Wisconsin State program will ensure that additional information about Hate Crime reporting is provided to all law enforcement agencies in the state. The program will also work to reintroduce a UCR newsletter that provides updates about the UCR program and includes specific scoring rules related to certain topics of interest. In response to your recommendation, the state program will ensure a section related to the scoring of Hate Crime offenses be included in the newsletter.

In conjunction with other online training resources available on the Office of Justice Assistance's website, additional Hate Crime training materials will be made available. The state will also continue to work the FBI's Hate Crime reporting unit to ensure proper data verification is made on all reported Hate Crime incidents.

To reiterate, the state is seeking resources during the next two-year state budget that begins July 1, 2013 to provide permanent state funding to administer the UCR program. Additional staff will be requested for the purpose of conducting audits and field training sessions.

Veronica Emilio was very helpful in explaining the QAR process and the state appreciated her expertise during 2012 Quality Assurance Review. We look forward to working with the FBI to improve the Wisconsin State program through the various routes we have outlined above.

Sincerely,

Derek Veitenheimer
Director
Wisconsin Justice Information Center