

SECTION I

Summary of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program

The Uniform Crime Reporting Program is a nationwide, cooperative statistical effort of over 17,000 city, county, and state law enforcement agencies voluntarily reporting data on crimes brought to their attention. During 1997, law enforcement agencies active in the UCR Program represented over 254 million United States inhabitants or 95 percent of the total population as established by the Bureau of the Census. The coverage amounted to 97 percent of the United States population in Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), 90 percent of the population in cities outside metropolitan areas, and 87 percent in rural counties.

Since 1930, the FBI has administered the Program and issued periodic assessments of the nature and type of crime in the Nation. While the Program's primary objective is to generate a reliable set of criminal statistics for use in law enforcement administration, operation, and management, its data have over the years become one of the country's leading social indicators. The American public looks to Uniform Crime Reports for information on fluctuations in the level of crime, while criminologists, sociologists, legislators, municipal planners, the media, and other students of criminal justice use the statistics for varied research and planning purposes.

Historical Background

Recognizing a need for national crime statistics, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) formed the Committee on Uniform Crime Records in the 1920s to develop a system of uniform police statistics. Establishing offenses known to law enforcement as the appropriate measure, the Committee evaluated various crimes on the basis of their seriousness, frequency of occurrence, pervasiveness in all geographic areas of the country, and likelihood of being reported to law enforcement. After studying state criminal codes and making an evaluation of the recordkeeping practices in use, the Committee in 1929 completed a plan for crime reporting which became the foundation of the UCR Program.

Seven offenses were chosen to serve as an Index for gauging fluctuations in the overall volume and rate of crime. Known collectively as the Crime Index, these offenses included the violent crimes of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault and the property crimes of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft. By congressional mandate, arson was added as the eighth Index offense in 1979.

During the early planning of the Program, it was recognized that the differences among criminal codes precluded a mere aggregation of state statistics to arrive at a national total. Further, because of the variances in punishment for the same offenses in different state codes, no distinction between felony

and misdemeanor crimes was possible. To avoid these problems and provide nationwide uniformity in crime reporting, standardized offense definitions by which law enforcement agencies were to submit data without regard for local statutes were formulated. The definitions used by the Program are set forth in Appendix II of this publication.

In January 1930, 400 cities representing 20 million inhabitants in 43 states began participating in the UCR Program. Congress enacted Title 28, Section 534, of the United States Code authorizing the Attorney General to gather crime information that same year. The Attorney General, in turn, designated the FBI to serve as the national clearinghouse for the data collected. Since that time, data based on uniform classifications and procedures for reporting have been obtained from the Nation's law enforcement agencies.

Advisory Groups

Providing vital links between local law enforcement and the FBI in the conduct of the UCR Program are the Criminal Justice Information Systems Committees of the IACP and the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA). The IACP, as it has since the Program began, represents the thousands of police departments nationwide. The NSA encourages sheriffs throughout the country to participate fully in the Program. Both committees serve in advisory capacities concerning the UCR Program's operation.

To function in an advisory capacity concerning UCR policy and provide suggestions on UCR data usage, a Data Providers' Advisory Policy Board (APB) was established in August 1988. The Board operated until 1993 when a new Board to address all FBI criminal justice information services was approved. The Board functions in an advisory capacity concerning UCR policy and on data collection and use. The UCR Subcommittee of the Board ensures continuing emphasis on UCR-related issues.

The Association of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs and committees on UCR within individual state law enforcement associations are also active in promoting interest in the UCR Program. These organizations foster widespread and more intelligent use of uniform crime statistics and lend assistance to contributors when the needs arise.

Redesign of UCR

While throughout the years the UCR Program remained virtually unchanged in terms of the data collected and disseminated, a broad utility had evolved for UCR by the 1980s. Recognizing the need for improved statistics, law enforcement called for a thorough evaluative study that would modernize the UCR Program. The FBI fully concurred with the need for an updated Program and lent its complete support, formulating a comprehensive three-phase redesign effort. The Bureau of Justice

Statistics (BJS), the Department of Justice agency responsible for funding criminal justice information projects, agreed to underwrite the first two phases. Conducted by an independent contractor, these phases were structured to determine what, if any, changes should be made to the current Program. The third phase would involve implementation of the changes identified. Abt Associates, Inc. of Cambridge, Massachusetts, overseen by the FBI, BJS, and a Steering Committee comprised of prestigious individuals representing a myriad of disciplines, commenced the first phase in 1982.

During the first phase, the historical evolution of the UCR Program was examined. All aspects of the Program, including the objectives and intended user audience, data items, reporting mechanisms, quality control, publications and user services, and relationships with other criminal justice data systems, were studied.

Early in 1984, a conference on the future of UCR, held in Elkridge, Maryland, launched the second phase of the study, which would examine potential futures for UCR and conclude with a set of recommended changes. Attendees at this conference reviewed work conducted during the first phase and discussed the potential changes that should be considered during phase two.

Findings from the evaluation's first phase and input on alternatives for the future were also major topics of discussion at the seventh National UCR Conference in July 1984. Overlapping phases one and two was a survey of law enforcement agencies.

Phase two ended in early 1985 with the production of a draft, *Blueprint for the Future of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program*. The study's Steering Committee reviewed the draft report at a March 1985 meeting and made various recommendations for revision. The Committee members, however, endorsed the report's concepts.

In April 1985, the phase two recommendations were presented at the eighth National UCR Conference. While various considerations for the final report were set forth, the overall concept for the revised Program was unanimously approved. The joint IACP/NSA Committee on UCR also issued a resolution endorsing the *Blueprint*.

The final report, the *Blueprint for the Future of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program*, was released in the summer of 1985. It specifically outlined recommendations for an expanded, improved UCR Program to meet informational needs into the next century. There were three recommended areas of enhancement to the UCR Program. First, reporting of offenses and arrests would be made by means of an incident-based system. Second, collection of data would be accomplished on two levels. Agencies in level one would report important details about those offenses comprising the current Crime Index, their victims, and arrestees. Law enforcement agencies covering populations of over 100,000 and a sampling of smaller agencies would be included in level two, which would collect expanded detail on all significant offenses. The third proposal involved introducing a quality assurance program.

To begin implementation of NIBRS, the FBI awarded a contract to develop new offense definitions and data elements for the redesigned system. The work involved (a) revision of the definitions of certain Index offenses, (b) identification of

additional significant offenses to be reported, (c) refinement of definitions for both, and (d) development of data elements (incident details) for all UCR offenses in order to fulfill the requirements of incident-based reporting versus the current summary reporting.

Concurrent with the preparation of the data elements, the FBI studied the various state systems to select an experimental site for implementation of the redesigned Program. In view of its long-standing incident-based Program and well-established staff dedicated solely to UCR, the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) was chosen. The SLED agreed to adapt its existing system to meet the requirements of the redesigned Program and collect data on both offenses and arrests relating to the newly defined offenses.

To assist SLED with the pilot project, offense definitions and data elements developed under the private contract were put at the staff's disposal. Also, FBI automated data processing personnel developed Automated Data Capture Specifications for use in adapting the state's data processing procedures to incorporate the revised system. The BJS supplied funding to facilitate software revisions needed at the state level. Testing of the new Program was completed in late 1987.

Following the completion of the pilot project conducted by SLED, the FBI produced a draft set of guidelines for an enhanced UCR Program. Law enforcement executives from around the country were then invited to a conference in Orange Beach, Alabama, where the guidelines were presented for final review.

During the conference, three overall endorsements were passed without dissent. First, that there be established a new, incident-based national crime reporting system; second, that the FBI manage this Program; and third, that an Advisory Policy Board composed of law enforcement executives be formed to assist in the direction and implementation of the new Program.

Information about the redesigned UCR Program, called the National Incident-Based Reporting System, or NIBRS, is contained in four documents produced subsequent to the Orange Beach Conference. Volume 1, *Data Collection Guidelines*, contains a system overview and descriptions of the offenses, offense codes, reports, data elements, and data values used in the system. Volume 2, *Data Submission Specifications*, is for the use of state and local systems personnel who are responsible for preparing magnetic tapes/floppy disks/etc., for submission to the FBI. Volume 3, *Approaches to Implementing an Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) System*, is for use by computer programmers, analysts, etc., responsible for developing a state or local IBR system which will meet NIBRS' reporting requirements. Volume 4, *Error Message Manual*, contains designations of mandatory and optional data elements, data element edits, and error messages.

A NIBRS edition of the *UCR Handbook* has been produced to assist law enforcement agency data contributors implementing NIBRS within their departments. This document is geared toward familiarizing local and state law enforcement personnel with the definitions, policies, and procedures of NIBRS. It does not contain the technical coding and data transmission requirements presented in Volumes 1 through 4.

NIBRS will collect data on each single incident and arrest within 22 crime categories. For each offense known to police within these categories, incident, victim, property, offender, and arrestee information will be gathered when available. The goal of the redesign is to modernize crime information by collecting data presently maintained in law enforcement records; the enhanced UCR Program is, therefore, a by-product of current records systems. The integrity of UCR's long-running statistical series will, of course, be maintained.

It became apparent during the development of the prototype system that the level one and level two reporting proposed in the *Blueprint* might not be the most practical approach. Many state and local law enforcement administrators indicated that the collection of data on all pertinent offenses could be handled with more ease than could the extraction of selected ones. While "Limited" participation, equivalent to the *Blueprint's* level one, will remain an option, it appears that most reporting jurisdictions, upon implementation, will go immediately to "Full" participation, meeting all NIBRS data submission requirements.

Implementation of NIBRS will be at a pace commensurate with the resources, abilities, and limitations of the contributing law enforcement agencies. The FBI was able to accept NIBRS data as of January 1989, and to date, the following 15 state-level programs have been certified for NIBRS participation: Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. An additional 18 state agencies, several local law enforcement agencies in 3 states not having state-level programs, and 5 federal agencies (the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Defense-Air Force, Federal Protective Service, and the FBI) have submitted test tapes or disks containing the expanded data. Seven other state agencies, agencies in the District of Columbia and Guam, and other federal agencies are in various stages of planning and development.

Recent Developments

QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW—The FBI is currently piloting a voluntary Quality Assurance Review (QAR) for UCR. The purpose of the QAR is to assess the validity of crime statistics through an on-site review of local case reports. It also includes an examination of policy and procedures for collecting and compiling local agency statistics by the state repositories. At the local level, FBI staff appraise a sample of incident and arrest reports to evaluate the accuracy of data submitted to the national Program. Among the areas explored are offense classification and scoring, victim and arrest counts, crime clearances, and stolen property descriptions and values. Following the review, a written evaluation of the agency's reporting methods, i.e., meeting submission criteria, overreporting, or underreporting, is sent to the agency.

Since its June 1997 implementation, the QAR has been conducted at 25 agencies during 11 state reviews. While refinement of the process continues, it is projected that the Program will be operational mid-1999. Once finalized, the QAR may allow for an adjustment of crime statistics at the national level, and it will still serve as a support mechanism for system users to provide a valid assessment of crime statistics.

UCR AUTOMATION PROJECT—As the FBI continues to provide local, state, and national crime data to the user community, the need to expedite the collection, analysis, and dissemination of that data grows. Consequently, the UCR Automation Project has been initiated to identify and apply state-of-the-art technology to the UCR Program in order to provide more efficient, high-quality products and services under both the summary and NIBRS data collection methods.

To ensure the needs of the people who use the system are taken into account, focus group interviews were conducted within the CJIS Division; with members of the Association of State UCR Programs; and with members of the UCR Automation Project Team which includes representatives from the CJIS Advisory Policy Board, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), International Association of Chiefs of Police, Major Cities Chiefs' Association, SEARCH Group, Inc., National Center for Juvenile Justice, National Sheriffs' Association, and Ohio Office of Criminal Justice.

The UCR Automation Project will proceed in two phases. Phase I began in mid-March 1998 and includes requirements analysis, conceptual design, content analysis, and acquisition support. The results of the requirements analysis will be reviewed by internal and external UCR customers in early fall, with the remaining tasks due to be completed before spring. Phase II will be the system building and implementation phase. It will include developing software according to specifications identified in the content analysis and training the staff on new hardware/software.

NIBRS IMPLEMENTATION—Since late 1995, the FBI and the BJS have been directing a study by SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, to identify impediments to NIBRS implementation. The initial phase of research, completed in 1997, involved surveys of several state Programs, consultations with software developers, and meetings of regional focus groups. Principle findings yielded several recommendations which are being addressed in the second phase of the project.

Currently in Phase II, SEARCH is working collaboratively with the FBI, the BJS, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Sheriffs' Association, Major Cities Chiefs' Association, Association of State UCR Programs, and key subject matter experts, as well as local and state practitioners responsible for NIBRS implementation throughout the Nation. Phase II activities are organized into four main "tracks" including: (1) development of standard analytic methodologies; (2) data elements, software, and data input strategies; (3) communication, benefits, coordination and development of momentum; and (4) technical assistance to state and local justice agencies.

At the May 1998 UCR Subcommittee meeting, SEARCH staff presented a project update which identified areas of the NIBRS design that were pinpointed as troublesome during several site visits to local and state agencies. SEARCH also recommended temporarily relaxing NIBRS standards in those areas. Although additional recommendations may surface as a result of more site visits, the UCR Subcommittee requested that FBI staff study the preliminary findings, assess the impact of relaxing certain NIBRS standards, and provide the pros and cons

of each relaxation proposal. The Subcommittee also asked that the Working Groups be advised of the FBI assessment so that the input from UCR participants in the various regions can be considered. More information about SEARCH and its progress is available on the World Wide Web Site at <http://www.nibrs.search.org>.

In an effort to educate more law enforcement agencies about NIBRS, the UCR Program distributed an informational video in July 1998. The video, endorsed by the CJIS Advisory Policy Board, the UCR Subcommittee, and the Major Cities Chiefs' Association, will better acquaint potential participants with the capabilities of NIBRS as an enhanced information-gathering and crime-reporting tool.

Another initiative to promote the entry of law enforcement agencies into NIBRS is the establishment of a NIBRS team by the CJIS Statistical Unit. Previously, submitted NIBRS data were reviewed by statisticians who worked on both summary and incident-based statistics as needed. A team of statisticians has been officially tasked to work solely with incident-based data, reviewing them for quality. Not only will the team expedite the certification of agencies as NIBRS compliant, but its formation stands as an example of the CJIS Division's continued commitment to the user community in establishing a viable incident-based data collection system.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES—Section V of this year's edition of *Crime in the United States* premieres a combination of traditional UCR summary data and NIBRS data in a report on juvenile arrests by gender. A decline in juvenile arrests, as well as details concerning the age and sex of the arrestees, can be discerned from a review of the summary data. NIBRS statistics augment the arrest records with data on injuries to the victims and the types of weapons used among other details. Though the current illustration is based on a small sample, the NIBRS data clearly demonstrate the potential benefits of more comprehensive statistics.

UPGRADING TECHNOLOGY—To meet the ever-increasing technological needs of the data user community, *Crime in the United States* is being provided in various media. The 1995 through current editions of this publication are now available on CD-ROM. Users may also visit the World Wide Web Site to download this and other information at <http://www.fbi.gov>.

Another innovation, Law Enforcement OnLine (LEO), is an intranet developed and operated by the FBI for the exclusive use of law enforcement. This state-of-the-art technology provides a national focal point for law enforcement electronic communication, education, and information sharing.

Chart 2.1

CRIME CLOCK

1997



one
**CRIME INDEX
OFFENSE**
every 2 seconds

one
VIOLENT CRIME
every 19 seconds

one
PROPERTY CRIME
every 3 seconds

one
MURDER
every 29 minutes

one
FORCIBLE RAPE
every 5 minutes

one
ROBBERY
every 1 minute

one
**AGGRAVATED
ASSAULT**
every 31 seconds

one
BURGLARY
every 13 seconds

one
LARCENY-THEFT
every 4 seconds

one
**MOTOR VEHICLE
THEFT**
every 23 seconds

The Crime Clock should be viewed with care. Being the most aggregate representation of UCR data, it is designed to convey the annual reported crime experience by showing the relative frequency of occurrence of the Index Offenses. This mode of display should not be taken to imply a regularity in the commission of the Part I Offenses; rather, it represents the annual ratio of crime to fixed time intervals.