



CITY OF DALLAS

Dallas City Council

Mayor
Tom Leppert

Mayor Pro Tem
Dwayne R. Caraway

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem
Pauline Medrano

Council Members
Jerry R. Allen
Tennell Atkins
Carolyn R. Davis
Angela Hunt
Vonciel Jones Hill
Delia Jasso
Sheffield Kadane
Linda Koop
Ann Margolin
Ron Natinsky
David A. Neumann
Steve Salazar

Office of the City Auditor

Audit Report

**AUDIT OF DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT'S
CRIME STATISTICS**
(Report No. A10-011)

April 23, 2010

City Auditor

Craig D. Kinton

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Audit Results	
Section I: Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting	6
Section II: Antiquated Information Technology System Lacks Proper Controls	9
Section III: Dallas Police Department Crime Reporting Is Less Efficient	11
Appendices	
Appendix I Background, Objective, Scope and Methodology	13
Appendix II <i>Form Return A - Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police</i>	18
Appendix III Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting	20
Appendix IV Major Contributors to This Report	24
Appendix V Management’s Response	25

Executive Summary

The Dallas Police Department (DPD) makes a good faith effort to comply with the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines provided by the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In addition, the offenses reported on the *Form Return A - Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police* (Return A), filed with the Texas Department of Public Safety (TxDPS) by DPD for calendar year 2008 appear substantially correct. (See Appendix II for an example of the Return A and instructions). There are, however, opportunities for DPD to improve: (1) UCR compliance and crime reporting; (2) information technology internal controls; and, (3) the efficiency with which DPD accumulates crime data.

Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR)

The UCR program administered since 1930 by the FBI:

- Focuses on eight types of crime known as Part I Offenses that constitute the Crime Index: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson
- Provides statistics that indicate the level of crime in America
- Allows voluntary participation

Monthly UCR reports filed by DPD with the TxDPS are DPD's "Official Crime Statistics."

Source: FBI UCR program and DPD

The DPD's ability to properly classify and score offenses in accordance with UCR guidelines is complicated by certain factors, such as:

- UCR guidelines are subject to interpretation
- Offense characteristics are complex and definitions may vary between the Texas Penal Code and the UCR guidelines. As a result, DPD personnel must use a significant amount of professional judgment during an investigation to ensure that: (1) the offense can be prosecuted in Texas; and, (2) the same offense characteristics are classified properly for UCR.
- UCR guidelines use a hierarchy rule that omits lesser crimes in multiple-offense situations
- UCR guidelines use a separation of time and place rule so the time interval between the multiple offenses and the distance between the locations where the offenses occurred are significant for reporting purposes

In light of these complexities, DPD assigned personnel from the Communications/Detention Services Division (Staff Review) and the Administrative and Accountability Unit (UCR Unit) to the preparation, analysis, and review of crime. These units use a systematic approach to:

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

- Review the narrative descriptions of offenses submitted by DPD personnel
- Compare these descriptions to UCR definitions to properly classify and score the offenses which are then incorporated into the monthly Return A forms submitted to TxDPS

DPD General Order 210 allows the patrol officer or expeditor to evaluate whether sufficient evidence exists to determine that a crime has been committed before the call or complaint is included on the Return A. This process, commonly referred to by DPD as “Investigations Of,” is based upon DPD’s interpretation of the UCR guidelines for the Return A. Other major police departments also use this interpretation. The use of “Investigations Of,” as with the investigation of any offense, may result in incomplete and/or inaccurate UCR reporting if: (1) Calls and complaints are not properly or thoroughly investigated; or, (2) Insufficient information exists in the police report to make an offense determination.

A more strict interpretation of the UCR guidelines for the Return A is to enter all calls or complaints reported or known to the police prior to investigating whether an actual offense occurred. If a call or complaint is later determined to be false or baseless, it would be shown on the Return A as “Unfounded”. The number of all calls or complaints received, reduced by those determined to be “Unfounded”, would result in the actual number of offenses reported.

Different UCR guideline interpretations may provide reported crime statistics that are not comparable between jurisdictions. Efforts to improve comparability are important since certain federal grants are allocated to local governments based upon UCR data, and UCR data is often used to make crime statistics comparisons among jurisdictions even though DOJ cautions against this use of the reported data.

The Direct Entry Field Reporting System (DEFRS), a series of mainframe based programs initially implemented in the 1970s, does not include the information technology controls DPD needs to ensure data reliability and completeness and protect confidential criminal history information. In addition, DPD crime reporting is less efficient because DEFRS has limited research and analytical functionality and DPD personnel are not required to use standard offense titles.

On January 27, 2010, the Dallas City Council authorized a “not to exceed” contract of \$7,395,529 for the purchase and implementation of a records management system for DPD, Court and Detention Services, and Dallas Fire-Rescue. This records management system will replace the DEFRS system and, if implemented with appropriate internal controls, research and analysis capabilities, and standardized offense titles, the system should improve data

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

reliability and completeness, better protect confidential criminal history information, and improve crime reporting efficiency.

While DPD makes a good faith effort to comply with the UCR guidelines and the offenses reported by DPD on the Return A appear substantially correct, opportunities were identified and recommendations were made to improve: (1) UCR compliance and crime reporting; (2) information technology internal controls; and, (3) the efficiency with which DPD accumulates crime data. (See Appendix III - *Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting*, for examples of the UCR compliance and crime reporting issues identified and the associated recommendations).

The audit objective was to determine whether DPD complies with UCR guidelines. The scope of the audit was limited to the accuracy of the seven¹ UCR Part I offenses reported by DPD from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008.

Management’s response to this report is included as Appendix V. The DPD’s proposed action to address the recommendation in Section I of this report is to seek a more precise interpretation of the UCR Handbook guidelines from the DOJ. This action is an appropriate step to affirm the legitimacy of DPD’s processes and enhance UCR reporting uniformity among law enforcement agencies.

¹ Although Arson is reported as a portion of the monthly UCR, this statistical information is provided to DPD by Dallas Fire-Rescue. The Arson information was not evaluated.

Audit Results

Overall Conclusion

The Dallas Police Department (DPD) makes a good faith effort to comply with the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines provided by the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In addition, the offenses reported on the *Form Return A - Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police* (Return A), filed with the Texas Department of Public Safety (TxDPS) by the DPD for calendar year 2008 appear substantially correct. There are, however, opportunities for DPD to improve: (1) UCR compliance and crime reporting; (2) information technology internal controls; and, (3) the efficiency with which DPD accumulates crime data.

DPD General Order 210 allows the patrol officer or expeditor to evaluate whether sufficient evidence exists to determine that a crime has been committed before the call or complaint is included on the Return A. This process, commonly referred to by DPD as "Investigations Of," is based upon DPD's interpretation of the UCR guidelines for the Return A. Other major police departments also use this interpretation. The use of "Investigations Of," as with the investigation of any offense, may result in incomplete and/or inaccurate UCR reporting if: (1) Calls and complaints are not properly or thoroughly investigated; or, (2) Insufficient information exists in the police report to make an offense determination.

In addition, the Direct Entry Field Reporting System (DEFRS), a series of mainframe based programs initially implemented in the 1970s, does not include the information technology controls DPD needs to ensure data reliability and completeness and protect confidential criminal history information. DPD crime reporting is also less efficient because DEFRS has limited research and analysis capabilities and DPD personnel are not required to use standard offense titles.

On January 27, 2010, the Dallas City Council authorized a "not to exceed" contract of \$7,395,529 for the purchase and implementation of a records management system for DPD, Court and Detention Services, and Dallas Fire-Rescue. This records management system will replace the DEFRS system and, if implemented with appropriate internal controls, research and analysis capabilities, and standardized offense titles, the system should improve data reliability and completeness, better protect confidential criminal history information, and improve crime reporting efficiency.

Section I: Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting

The offenses, reported on the Return A, filed by DPD with TxDPS and DOJ for calendar year 2008 appear substantially correct. However, there are opportunities for DPD to improve UCR compliance and crime reporting.

The DEFERS data, which is the source for the information included on the Return A, was extracted and summarized by the seven Part I UCR crime classifications reviewed. Then, the data was reconciled by Part I UCR crime classification to the Return A. Part II crimes were also reviewed to determine whether the offenses should have been classified as Part I crimes. The following are the results:

- The DPD correctly reported 170 criminal homicides on the Return A; however, DPD did not correctly report 24 justifiable homicides on the Return A. Justifiable homicides are not offenses; therefore, they should be shown on Return A, Column 3 as “Unfounded”. Justifiable homicides do not increase the actual count of criminal homicides in the City of Dallas; however, the TxDPS and the FBI use the Return A information to track the number of justifiable homicides.
- An additional 11 forcible rapes, or 2.2 percent, were identified that were not included in the 499 forcible rapes reported by DPD on the Return A
- Statistical samples of 6,466 reported robberies, 4,285 reported aggravated assaults, 21,149 reported burglaries, 42,402 reported larcenies-thefts, and 12,208 reported motor vehicle thefts did not identify Return A reporting errors.
- An additional eight aggravated assaults, or .2 percent, and one robbery, were identified during a review of UCR Part II Sexual Assaults (Please see **Note** on page 23 for additional information).

However, the review of the Return A and the DEFERS data for Part I and Part II crimes showed instances where some errors and omissions were made.

In addition, DPD General Order 210 allows the patrol officer or expediter to evaluate whether sufficient evidence exists to determine that a crime has been committed before the call or complaint is included on the Return A. This process, commonly referred to by DPD as "Investigations Of," is based upon DPD's interpretation of the UCR guidelines for the Return A. Other major police departments also use this interpretation. The use of "Investigations Of," as with the investigation of any offense, may result in incomplete and/or inaccurate UCR reporting if: (1) Calls and complaints are not properly or thoroughly investigated; or, (2) Insufficient information exists in the police report to make an offense determination.

DPD "Investigations Of"

DPD categorizes an incident as "Investigations Of" when a patrol officer or expediter does not believe sufficient evidence exists to believe a crime has been committed. The incident is then assigned to a detective to make a final determination.

Source: DPD General Order 210-00

For example:

- In 2008, DPD completed 4,229 UCR Part I "Investigations Of." Approximately 944 of the 4,229, or 22 percent, were found to be Part I crimes and were reclassified and reported as such for UCR purposes. According to DPD, the remaining 3,285, "Investigations Of," or 78 percent, did not meet the elements of an offense; therefore, DPD did not report these "Investigations Of" on the Return A.

If DPD had included the 4,229 Part I "Investigations Of" they would have been reported in Column 2, *Offenses Reported or Known to Police*. The 3,285 Part I "Investigations Of" would have been reported in Column 3, *Unfounded*, i.e. false or baseless complaints. Column 4, *Number of Actual Offenses*, would have reflected the net of Column 2 and Column 3, or 944 offenses. (Note: This example assumes that DPD had the necessary proof to "Unfound" the offense).

The UCR Handbook and the instructions for the current version of the Return A, shows all Part 1 offenses either **reported** or **known** to police should be recorded in Column 2 of the Return A and unfounded in Column 3, if they are later found to be false or baseless. (Note: The instructions and guidelines use the terms *offense* and *complaint* interchangeably).

According to DPD when the Office of the City Auditor brought errors and/or omissions to their attention, DPD made the necessary corrections on subsequent crime reports to the TxDPS and DOJ. (See Appendix III – *Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting* for examples of the UCR compliance and crime reporting issues identified and the associated recommendations).

Recommendation I

We recommend the Chief of Police implement procedures to improve compliance with the UCR Handbook (2004) and the instructions for Return A and correct classification errors and omissions. (Note: The implementation of the new records management system may be necessary to completely address these classification errors and omissions).

Please see Appendix V for management’s response to the recommendation.

Section II: Antiquated Information Technology System Lacks Proper Controls

DEFRS, a series of mainframe based programs initially implemented in the 1970s, does not include the Information Technology (IT) controls DPD needs to ensure data reliability and completeness and protect confidential criminal history information. As a result, DPD cannot be certain that DEFERS crime information is complete or that DPD fully complies with the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Security Policy which requires, *“Each CJIS Systems Agency and each Interface Agency shall administer an IT Security Program throughout their user community.”*

Access to DEFERS is based upon 697 Remote Local Area Network (LAN) Nodes (RLN) rather than specific users. 102 of the 697 RLNs, or 15 percent, include the capability to delete records. DEFERS records can be deleted without a record history (audit trail) log during the review state which occurs between the time DPD personnel initially make a report and the time that the Communications/Detention Services Division (Staff Review) classifies the offense. According to DPD, DEFERS allows a

Remote Local Area Network Nodes

RLNs are access points gained by using software that operates through DPD’s personal computers and allows the users’ direct access to DEFERS to enter and retrieve offense information.

Remote access to the DEFERS helps DPD update offense information more timely.

report to remain in the review state for several weeks. After the offense is classified, DEFERS still allows records to be deleted; however, at this point, only the Department of Communications and Information Services (CIS) personnel can delete a record and an audit trail log is produced.

Therefore, all DEFERS users have the ability to delete records if they access DEFERS through any one of the 102 RLNs. Although an audit trail log might indicate that an offense record was deleted, there would be no indication of who authorized or executed the deletion. Neither CIS nor DPD had a process in place to periodically obtain and review DEFERS audit trail logs. Given that CIS only retains the weekly logs for approximately one year, a review of actual deletions occurring during fiscal year 2008 was not possible.

In addition, DEFERS records of the RLN locations are not accurate and several of the RLNs that have the capability to delete offense records are located in areas outside of DPD’s control. For example, 13 RLNs were located in Court and Detention Services while others were located in the Planning Section of Development Services and in Code Compliance Services.

A basic IT control objective is to protect critical data from unauthorized access, improper modification, disclosure, or deletion. Generally, this is accomplished through a combination of authorization and authentication controls and by

restricting the functions certain users can perform. Authorization controls ensure that access to the system is granted to a user only after login (combination of ID and password) verification. Authentication controls verify that the login belongs to the user who is trying to gain access to the system. Setting permissions restricts users to only functions that are needed for their specific job responsibilities.

Eliminating or minimizing functions such as “delete” and replacing them with functions, such as “void”, ensure that an audit trail exists for all changes made to the system. These controls in combination with DPD’s periodic review of audit trail logs would help to ensure data reliability and completeness, and protect confidential criminal history information.

Recommendation II

We recommend the Chief of Police ensure that:

- The ability to delete DEFERS records be eliminated and an option to void a record, after obtaining approval, be added so when correcting entries are necessary a more complete audit trail is available
- RLNs are physically located and documented
- Only authorized users with a valid business reason retain RLN access
- Access to DEFERS is granted only after user authorization and authentication
- RLN permissions are periodically reviewed and limited to those necessary for the user to accomplish tasks specific to their job function
- The DPD and CIS personnel periodically review DEFERS access and audit trail logs to monitor DEFERS access and ensure that data changes were approved and necessary

Please see Appendix V for management’s response to the recommendation.

Section III: Dallas Police Department Crime Reporting Is Less Efficient

The DPD crime reporting is less efficient because DEFERS has limited research and analytical functionality and DPD personnel are not required to use standard offense titles. At least 22 full-time and five part-time DPD employees, at a conservatively estimated cost of approximately \$1.3 million a year, are used to classify, score and report the UCR information to TxDPS. This cost estimate does not include each DPD officer’s time to enter the initial report into DEFERS or any supervisory review of these entries.

DPD Staff Levels With UCR Responsibilities	
Lieutenant	2
Sergeants	4
Senior Corporals	6
Civilian Staff	15
Totals	<u><u>27</u></u>

Source: DPD fiscal year 2008

DEFERS does not meet current DPD offense research and analysis needs

Change Management

Change management is the ongoing process of planning, coordinating, monitoring, communicating, and controlling changes to the production information technology.

Source: Administrative Directive 2-28, *Change Management of Information Technology*

The DEFERS is not well documented and changes made to the programs over the years were not updated and documented using a rigorous change management process. Furthermore, neither DPD nor CIS has personnel sufficiently familiar with DEFERS to make efficient modifications to meet DPD’s current offense research and analysis needs. As a result, DPD uses manual processes which require more personnel to analyze offense information and determine the appropriate UCR classification.

The DPD personnel are not required to use standard offense titles when entering offense information into DEFERS

The DPD personnel enter offense information in a narrative format with no restrictions on how a specific offense title is described or what symbols (i.e., *, %, etc.) can be used. For example, for the UCR Part 1 offense category criminal homicide, DPD personnel have used the following offense titles:

- MURDER
- HOMICIDE
- AGG ASSAULT/MURDER
- CAPITAL MURDER
- UNEXP DEATH/CAPITAL MURDER

- AGG ASSAULT/DW//HOMICIDE

The use of inconsistent offense titles reduces DPD’s UCR classification and scoring effectiveness because DPD personnel cannot research DEFERS by offense title. Instead, they can only research using the UCR Code. As a result, DPD personnel cannot cross-check their research results to test UCR classification accuracy so additional manual verification is required. Standardized offense titles would reduce the need for manual verification and DPD would have more certainty that all offenses are properly classified in the system.

Recommendation III:

We recommend the Chief of Police:

- Ensure that the information technology system includes the research and analytical functionality necessary to reduce manual verification of UCR information
- Require DPD personnel to use standard offense titles when entering information into DEFERS or any subsequent records management systems

Please see Appendix V for management’s response to the recommendation.

Appendix I

Background, Objective, Scope and Methodology

Background

Dallas Police Department Crime Reporting

During calendar year 2008, Dallas Police Department (DPD) personnel were dispatched to over 600,000 incidents and initiated over 395,000 cases of which approximately 87,000 were classified as Part I crimes. Table I below shows the percentage change between calendar year 2007 and 2008 for seven Part 1 Uniform Crime Report offenses.

Table I

**Comparison of Seven Part 1 Uniform Crime Report Offenses
Calendar Years 2007 and 2008**

Offense	2008	2007	Percentage Change
Murder	170	200	(15.0)
Rape	499	511	(2.4)
Robbery	6,466	7,222	(10.5)
Aggravated Assault	4,285	5,315	(19.4)
Total Violent Crime	11,420	13,248	(13.8)
Burglary	21,149	22,472	(5.9)
Theft	42,402	47,699	(11.1)
Auto Theft	12,208	13,791	(11.5)
Total Non-Violent Crime	75,759	83,962	(9.8)
Total All Crime	87,179	97,210	(10.3)

Source: DPD Memorandum to the Mayor and City Council (January 5, 2009)

The DPD Personnel with Crime Reporting Responsibilities

The DPD assigned personnel from the Communications/Detention Services Division (Staff Review) and the Administrative and Accountability Unit (UCR Unit) to the preparation, analysis, and review of crime. Staff Review consists of one Lieutenant, three Sergeants, and fifteen civilian employees. The UCR Unit has primary responsibility for generating the Official Statistics for DPD. The UCR Unit is comprised of a Lieutenant, a Sergeant, and six Senior Corporals.

Automated Systems Used in Crime Reporting

The DPD uses automated information systems to gather and maintain crime data. The Direct Entry Field Reporting System (DEFRS) is used to record information relative to crime. DEFRS provides a method of receiving and entering offense-related data. A monthly report is generated titled *Form Return A - Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police* (Return A). Return A along with applicable report supplements: Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted; Age, Sex and Race of Persons Arrested; Monthly Return of Arson Offenses Known to Law Enforcement; Monthly Report of Type and Quantity of Drugs Seized; the Hate Crime Report; and, the Law Enforcement Employees Report are filed by DPD with the Texas Department of Public Safety (TxDPS). Also, as an offense report is completed copies of the report are automatically printed at the proper DPD investigative units.

The DEFRS is a series of mainframe based programs that was initially implemented in the 1970s. Since then, certain modifications have been made to the system. These include installing an interface with the Direct Entry Arrest Reporting System (DEARS), the addition of Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs) so DPD can enter offenses from patrol cars, and, in 1992, the System of Total Automated Reporting and Retrieval (STARR) system was installed. STARR provides for the indexing of documents back to January 1, 1991. Reports in the DEFRS system are available for additions (supplement) for a one year period. The reports are available for display and printing after six months through the STARR system.

Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR)

The UCR program has been administered by the FBI since 1930. The UCR is designed to provide statistics that indicate the level of crime in America recorded by police organizations. Participation in the program is voluntary. The UCR program focuses on the following eight types of crime known as Part I Offenses that constitute the Crime Index:

- Criminal Homicide (murder)
- Forcible Rape
- Robbery
- Aggravated assault
- Burglary
- Larceny-theft
- Motor vehicle theft
- Arson

An Audit Report on – Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics

Beginning in 1976, the State of Texas adopted the UCR as its official statewide crime report. The TxDPS’s UCR Section (Section) became the intermediary between the FBI and the local law enforcement agencies. Currently, the Section collects and summarizes the UCR data received from local law enforcement agencies and forwards the information to the FBI.

Limitations on the Use of UCR for Analysis and Comparison to Other Cities

The FBI discourages the use of UCR data to compile rankings of individual jurisdictions and cautions against using the data in this manner since the analyses provide misleading perceptions. These misleading perceptions are due in part to how individual jurisdictions interpret UCR guidelines and the fact that analyzing UCR data in isolation does not consider the uniqueness of each reporting locale.

For example, Dallas is the ninth largest city (by population) in the United States; however, Dallas is located in the seventh largest metropolitan area which causes the “policing population” density of Dallas to fluctuate greatly due to daily commuting. Conversely, Phoenix is the sixth largest city (by population) in the United States, but Phoenix is only the thirteenth largest metropolitan area. As a result Phoenix’s “policing population” density is much less than Dallas. Other unique factors that could affect crime statistic rankings consist of cultural conditions, modes of transportation, economic conditions, and climate.

Another simple factor that would reduce the amount of crime reported, and thus affect the rankings of UCR reported crime, would be the apathy of the population towards the law enforcement agency. Therefore, the better a police department performs and gains the public’s trust, the more crime is reported.

UCR Has Several Weaknesses

The UCR is only a single measure. It includes only those crimes reported to the police, it uses a hierarchy rule that omits lesser crimes in one criminal situation, and it includes many minor crimes. The UCR is actually driven by its largest category: larceny-theft, which includes many minor crimes, such as thefts from vending machines and shoplifting. Community disorder symptoms, such as fear, intimidation, graffiti, drug dealing, and vandalism, are absent.

UCR statistical information reported to the FBI is affected by the following two rules used in arriving at the number of crimes to be reported as stated in the UCR Crime Reporting Handbook:

- Hierarchy Rule – The law enforcement matter in which many crimes are committed simultaneously is called a multiple-offense situation by the

UCR guidelines. As a general rule, a multiple-offense situation requires classifying each of the offenses occurring and determining which of them are Part I crimes. 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. An example applying the Hierarchy Rule from the UCR Crime Reporting Handbook states:

- Two people broke into a car dealership after closing hours. They took the cash from the dealership’s office safe and two new automobiles from the garage. Applying the Hierarchy Rule to crime reporting: A Burglary-forcible Entry, Larceny-theft, and a Motor Vehicle Theft were committed. Following the Hierarchy Rule, only the Burglary-Forcible Entry, the highest of the offenses on the list of Part I offenses, must be scored.
- Separation of Time and Place Rule – An individual or group will perpetrate a number of offenses over a short period of time. If there is a separation of time and place between the commission of several crimes, the reporting agency must handle each crime as a separate incident and must classify and score each offense individually. Same time and place means that the time interval between the offenses and the distance between locations where they occurred are insignificant. Normally, the offenses must have occurred during an unbroken time duration and at the same or adjoining location(s). An example applying the Separation of Time and Place Rule from the UCR Crime Reporting Handbook states:
 - A robber entered a bank, stole \$5,000 from a teller at gunpoint, and then escaped in a getaway car. At a shopping center parking lot across town, the robber and an accomplice stole a car in their effort to elude the police. In applying the Separation of Time and Place Rule, because of the separation of time and place between the robbery and the theft of the motor vehicle, these incidents must not be handled as a multiple-offense situation. The two crimes must each be classified and scored as separate offenses – one Robbery-Firearm and one Motor Vehicle Theft-Auto.

An example of when multiple offenses would be recorded as one UCR crime:

- A criminal breaks into the vehicles of ten different persons in an apartment parking lot and steals items from each automobile. Since the offense occurred at the same time and the same place, only one crime is reported for UCR purposes.

Objective, Scope and Methodology

The audit objective was to determine whether DPD complies with UCR guidelines. The scope of the audit was limited to the accuracy of the seven² UCR Part I offenses reported by DPD from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008. (Note: We did not audit additional statistics provided to the TxDPS in the monthly UCR reports, such as the supplemental reports.)

We conducted this audit under the authority of the City Charter, Chapter IX, Section 3, and in accordance with the Fiscal Year 2009 Audit Plan approved by the City Council. This performance audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based upon our audit objective. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions.

Our testing criteria was based upon the FBI’s UCR Handbook (revised 2004) and the DPD’s General Orders and written Standard Operating Procedures pertinent to the UCR coding and DPD’s UCR Crime Reporting Unit. We interviewed personnel from the FBI’s Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) division, the TxDPS’s UCR program, as well as management and staff of the DPD.

We obtained data representing all offenses reported in the calendar year 2008 from DEFERS. From that data we:

- Extracted the reported crimes for each of the seven UCR Part I crimes
- Reconciled the number of those crimes to the monthly Return A filed with the TxDPS
- Tested those crimes identified as Part I offenses to ensure they were reported in accordance with UCR guidelines
- Reviewed Part II crimes to determine whether the offenses should have been classified as Part I crimes

² Although Arson is reported as a portion of the monthly UCR, this statistical information is provided to DPD by Dallas Fire-Rescue. The Arson information was not evaluated.

Form Return A - Monthly Return of Offenses Known to the Police

RETURN A - MONTHLY RETURN OF OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE

This report is authorized by law Title 28, Section 534, U.S. Code. Your cooperation in completing this form will assist the FBI, in compiling timely comprehensive, and accurate data. Please submit this form monthly, by the seventh day after the close of the month, and any questions to the FBI, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Attention: Uniform Crime Reports/Module E-3, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306; telephone 304-625-4830, facsimile 304-625-3566. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, you are not required to complete this form unless it contains a valid OMB control number. The form takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. Instructions for preparing the form appear on the reverse side.

1-720 (Rev. 3-08-06)
 OMB No. 1110-0001
 Expires 01-30-10

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES	DATA ENTRY	2	3	4	5	6
		OFFENSES REPORTED OR KNOWN TO POLICE (INCLUDE 'UNFOUNDED' AND ATTEMPTS)	UNFOUNDED, I.E., FALSE OR BASELESS COMPLAINTS	NUMBER OF ACTUAL OFFENSES (COLUMN 2 MINUS COLUMN 3) (INCLUDE ATTEMPTS)	TOTAL OFFENSES CLEARED BY ARREST OR EXCEPTIONAL MEANS (INCLUDES COL 6)	NUMBER OF CLEARANCES INVOLVING ONLY PERSONS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE
1. CRIMINAL HOMICIDE						
a. MURDER AND NONNEGLIGENT HOMICIDE (Score attempts as aggravated assault) If homicide reported, submit Supplementary Homicide Report	11					
b. MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE	12					
2. FORCIBLE RAPE TOTAL	20					
a. Rape by Force	21					
b. Attempts to commit Forcible Rape	22					
3. ROBBERY TOTAL	30					
a. Firearm	31					
b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	32					
c. Other Dangerous Weapon	33					
d. Strong-Arm (Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc.)	34					
4. ASSAULT TOTAL	40					
a. Firearm	41					
b. Knife or Cutting Instrument	42					
c. Other Dangerous Weapon	43					
d. Hands, Fists, Feet, Etc. - Aggravated injury	44					
e. Other Assaults - Simple, Not Aggravated	45					
5. BURGLARY TOTAL	50					
a. Forcible Entry	51					
b. Unlawful Entry - No Force	52					
c. Attempted Forcible Entry	53					
6. LARCENY - THEFT TOTAL (Except Motor Vehicle Theft)	60					
7. MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT TOTAL	70					
a. Autos	71					
b. Trucks and Buses	72					
c. Other Vehicles	73					
GRAND TOTAL	77					

CHECKING ANY OF THE APPROPRIATE BLOCKS BELOW WILL ELIMINATE YOUR NEED TO SUBMIT REPORTS WHEN THE VALUES ARE ZERO. THIS WILL ALSO AID THE NATIONAL PROGRAM IN ITS QUALITY CONTROL EFFORTS.				DO NOT USE THIS SPACE	
<input type="checkbox"/>	NO SUPPLEMENTARY HOMICIDE REPORT SUBMITTED SINCE NO MURDERS, JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES, OR MANSLAUGHTERS BY NEGLIGENCE OCCURRED IN THIS JURISDICTION DURING THE MONTH.	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO AGE, SEX, AND RACE OF PERSONS ARRESTED UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE REPORT SINCE NO ARRESTS OF PERSONS WITHIN THIS AGE GROUP.	RECORDED	INITIALS
<input type="checkbox"/>	NO SUPPLEMENT TO RETURN A REPORT SINCE NO CRIME OFFENSES OR RECOVERY OF PROPERTY REPORTED DURING THE MONTH.	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO AGE, SEX, AND RACE OF PERSONS ARRESTED 18 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER REPORT SINCE NO ARREST OF PERSONS WITHIN THIS AGE GROUP.	EDITED	
<input type="checkbox"/>	NO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS KILLED OR ASSAULTED REPORT SINCE NONE OF THE OFFICERS WERE ASSAULTED OR KILLED DURING THE MONTH.	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO MONTHLY RETURN OF ARSON OFFENSES KNOWN TO LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT SINCE NO ARSONS OCCURRED.	ENTERED	
				ADJUSTED	
				CORRES	

Month and Year of Report	Agency Identifier	Population
Prepared by	Title	
Telephone Number	Date	
Agency and State	Chief, Sheriff, Superintendent, or Commanding Officer	

An Audit Report on – Dallas Police Department's Crime Statistics

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING *RETURN A*

(Detailed instructions are given in the *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook*)

1. All Offenses listed on the *Return A* which occur during the month should be scored whether they become known to the police as the result of:
 - a. Citizens' complaints.
 - b. Reports of police officers.
 - c. "On view" (pick-up) arrests.
 - d. Citizens' complaints to sheriff, prosecutor, county police, private detectives, constables, etc.
 - e. Any other means.
2. The offenses listed in Column 1 are the Part I offenses of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program plus the offenses of simple assault and manslaughter by negligence. Follow the instructions for classifying and scoring as presented in the *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* . Offenses committed by juveniles should be classified in the same manner as those committed by adults even though the juveniles may be handled by juvenile authorities.
3. Adjustments should be made on this month's return for offenses omitted or scored inaccurately on returns of preceding months or those now determined to be unfounded. Offenses that occurred in a previous month but only became known to you this month should be scored this month.
4. Consider all spaces for each classification of offenses in Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The breakdowns for forcible rape, robbery, assault, burglary, and motor vehicle theft, when added should equal the total for each of these offenses. Do not enter zeroes where no count exists.
5. Attempts of rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft are to be scored on this form.
6. **Column 2:** Enter opposite the proper offense classification the total number of such offenses reported or known through any means. "Unfounded" complaints are included. Attempts are included except in homicide classifications.
7. **Column 3:** Enter the number of complaints which were proven to be "unfounded" by police investigation. An "unfounded" offense is one in which a complaint was received, but upon investigation, proves either to be baseless or not to have actually occurred. Remember that recovery of property or clearance of an offense does not unfound a complaint.
8. **Column 4:** Number of actual offenses. This number is obtained by subtracting the number in Column 3 from that in Column 2.
9. **Column 5:** Enter the total number of offenses **cleared** during the month. This total includes the clearances which you record in Column 6. An offense is cleared when one or more persons are charged and turned over for prosecution for that offense. Clearance totals also include exceptional clearances which are explained in the *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook* .
10. **Column 6:** Enter here the number of offenses which are cleared through the arrest, releasing to parents, or other handling of persons under the age of 18. In those situations where an offense is cleared through the involvement of both an adult and a person under 18 years of age, count the clearance only in Column 5.
11. The grand totals for Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are the totals of each of the seven classifications.
12. Tally books can be used to maintain a running count of offenses through the month. Totals for the *Return A* can then be taken directly from the Tally book. These Tally books can be obtained by corresponding with the FBI, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Attention: Uniform Crime Reports/Module E-3, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306; telephone 304-625-4830, facsimile 304-625-3566.
13. This *Return A* report should be forwarded to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports even though no offenses of this type listed were committed during the month. However, it is not necessary to submit supplemental reports in such cases. Simply check the appropriate box within the block near the bottom of the *Return A* report.
14. Any inquiry regarding the completion of this form, the classification and scoring of offenses, or prior to submitting crime data by computer printout, contact the Uniform Crime Reporting Program at the above-mentioned address.

Opportunities to Improve Uniform Crime Report Compliance and Crime Reporting

Crime Statistic Category	Issues	Recommendations
UCR Compliance		
Justifiable Homicides	The DPD did not follow Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines regarding the reporting of justifiable homicides. The DPD correctly reported 170 criminal homicides on the Return A; however, DPD did not correctly report 24 justifiable homicides on the Return A. Justifiable homicides are not offenses; therefore, they should be shown on Return A, Column 3 as “Unfounded”. Justifiable homicides do not increase the actual count of criminal homicides in the City of Dallas; however, the TxDPS and the FBI use the Return A information to track the number of justifiable homicides.	Implement appropriate procedures to capture and accumulate justifiable homicide information for inclusion in the Return A filed with TxDPS.
Complaints/Offenses	DPD General Order 210 allows the patrol officer or expeditor to evaluate whether sufficient evidence exists to determine that a crime has been committed before the call or complaint is included on the Return A. This process, commonly referred to by DPD as “Investigations Of,” is based upon DPD’s interpretation of the UCR guidelines for the Return A. Other major police departments also use this interpretation.	We recommend the Chief of Police implement procedures to improve compliance with the UCR Handbook (2004) and the instructions for Return A and correct classification errors and omissions.

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

Crime Statistic Category	Issues	Recommendations
	<p>The use of “Investigations Of,” as with the investigation of any offense, may result in incomplete and/or inaccurate UCR reporting if: (1) Calls and complaints are not properly or thoroughly investigated; or, (2) Insufficient information exists in the police report to make an offense determination.</p>	
<p>Offenses Cleared by Exceptional Means</p>	<p>Six of the 30 randomly selected records sampled showed that DPD incorrectly applied the “Cleared by Exceptional Means” (CBEM) UCR guidance. (Note: DPD uses the term “Cleared by Exceptional Arrest”).</p>	<p>Institute procedures to ensure that all arrests CBEM meet the guidelines contained in the UCR Handbook (2004).</p>

DPD Coding		
<p>Aggravated Assaults and one Robbery that Occurred in Conjunction with Sexual Assaults</p>	<p>Eight Part I aggravated assaults and one robbery were identified during a review of 60 judgmentally selected records of UCR Part II Sexual Assaults. The DPD classified these offenses as a 17XXX (Sex Offense) and failed to correctly apply the Hierarchy Rule. The Hierarchy Rule specifies that the offense should be classified to the highest UCR offense within the crime that occurred.</p>	<p>Institute proper procedures to ensure that all aggravated assaults and robberies meeting the UCR guidelines are properly classified.</p>
<p>Burglaries</p>	<p>Two Part I burglaries were identified during a review of 95 judgmentally selected records of UCR Part II offenses.</p>	<p>Institute proper procedures to ensure all burglaries or attempted burglaries meeting the UCR guidelines are properly classified.</p>

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

Crime Statistic Category	Issues	Recommendations
Burglary of Motor Vehicles (BMV)	Thirteen UCR Part I burglaries of motor vehicles were incorrectly classified as UCR Part II offenses or as 00000 (No-Code) offenses during a review of 60 randomly selected records.	Institute proper procedures to ensure that all burglaries of motor vehicles meeting the UCR guidelines are properly classified.
Thefts	Eleven of 60 randomly selected records were identified as Thefts and were incorrectly classified as a “No-Code” ³ . The UCR code was not corrected to properly reflect the offense when the investigation revealed that a theft had occurred.	Institute proper procedures to ensure all UCR Part I thefts which meet the UCR guidelines are properly classified.
Blank Fields Used in UCR Field of the Official Record Keeping Data Base System	One hundred and forty-six records with police report service numbers did not have any UCR codes from a review of all records with blank UCR codes. Without a UCR code, the record would not be evaluated for UCR reporting purposes.	Implement proper procedures to ensure all records with service numbers are classified and assigned a UCR code and evaluated for UCR reporting purposes.

³ “No-Codes” are used by DPD for UCR classification purposes. The actual “No-Code” consists of “00000”. This code (“00000”) is typically used by DPD to reflect offenses that are subject to the Hierarchy rule and/or the Separation of Time and Place rule and should not be counted.

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

Crime Statistic Category	Issues	Recommendations
DPD General Orders and Policies		
General Order 210.09 Allows Direct Files of Shoplifting (Thefts) to the Direct Entry Arrest Reporting System (DEARS)	The JCL program (JD2C53) that accumulates, segregates, and presents the data for the Return A does not accumulate data from the DEARS program. No specific instances were noted in the direct arrest files reviewed; however, the potential does exist that DEARS offenses would not be reported on the Return A.	Change General Order 210.09 deleting the ability of officers to direct file shoplifting (theft) charges without obtaining an offense number.
Other		
Use of Official Record Keeping System by Trainees	The DPD allows police officer trainees to make fictitious entries into the Direct Entry Field Reporting System (DEFRS). These entries affect the accuracy of the monthly filing of the UCR Return A.	Establish a training version of the DEFRS so that trainees can obtain the exposure they need to use DEFRS without creating the potential for reporting errors on Return A.

Note: In addition to testing reported Part I crimes, we also tested for the potential that DPD underreported crimes by evaluating approximately 69,000 Part II crimes and over 73,000 “No-Code” records. Using auditor judgment and audit analysis software, sample populations of records were derived based upon key word searches from non-Part I records. Key word searches of the offense and modus-operandi fields allowed the auditor to isolate records with a higher likelihood for underreporting. The resulting judgmentally selected populations were then used for testing. When the test results were compared to reported crimes, the likelihood of significant underreporting appeared negligible. Statistical projections of error rates were not made since judgment was introduced into the sampling process. According to DPD when the Office of the City Auditor brought errors and/or omissions to their attention, DPD made the necessary corrections on subsequent crime reports.

Appendix IV

Major Contributors to This Report

Carol Smith, CPA, CIA, CFE, Audit Manager
Charles Pearre, CFE, Project Manager
Kevin Hannigan, CIA, Auditor
Theresa Hampden, CPA, Quality Control Manager

Management's Response

Memorandum

RECEIVED

APR 08 2010

City Auditor's Office



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE: April 7, 2010

TO: Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor

SUBJECT: Response to Audit Report:
Audit of the Dallas Police Department's Crime Statistics

Our responses to the audit report recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation I:

We recommend the Chief of Police implement procedures to improve compliance with the UCR Handbook (2004) and the instructions for Return A and correct classification errors and omissions. (Note: The implementation of the new records management system may be necessary to completely address these classification errors and omissions).

Management Response / Corrective Action Plan

Agree Disagree

The Department has implemented a variety of improvements in response to the Auditors findings regarding classification errors and omissions. They include correction of the identified reports, additional training, procedure changes and additional audits of offense reports by UCR personnel. These steps should reduce classification errors and provide additional safeguards for ensuring the integrity of the process.

However, the Department does believe officers must conduct a preliminary investigation to determine if an offense occurred and this does not conflict with UCR guidelines. The UCR guidelines are primarily designed to instruct police departments on how to classify and score offenses. In short, the guidelines are applied once it is determined an offense has occurred.

The Police Department intends to initiate a request to be forwarded to the UCR Advisory Policy Board (APB) to address the legitimacy of DPD processes and establish more precise interpretations for UCR guidelines. The request for topic is initiated through the state CJIS office where it is forwarded to the Working Group for discussion. If approved, the topic is forwarded to either the AD Hoc Committee or to the full APB for consideration. If approved by the APB, the topic is forwarded to the Director of the FBI for approval. Working Groups and the APB meet twice per year. This process can take from 6 – 18 months.

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

Page 2 of 3
Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor
April 7, 2010

Implementation Date

The Police Department is currently drafting the request to the CJIS office to begin the process for a UCR Advisory Policy Board review. It is anticipated the formal request will be sent in approximately 1 month.

Responsible Manager

Lt. Chris Aulbaugh

Recommendation II:

We recommend the Chief of Police ensure that:

- The ability to delete DEFERS records be eliminated and an option to void a record, after obtaining approval, be added so when correcting entries are necessary a more complete audit trail is available
- RLNs are physically located and documented
- Only authorized users with a valid business reason retain RLN access
- Access to DEFERS is granted only after user authorization and authentication
- RLN permissions are periodically reviewed and limited to those necessary for the user to accomplish tasks specific to their job function
- DPD and CIS personnel periodically review DEFERS access and audit trail logs to monitor DEFERS access and ensure that data changes were approved and necessary

Management Response / Corrective Action Plan

Agree Disagree

The Police Department will partner with CIS to implement the steps in this recommendation. The supervisor of the Police Department’s UCR Unit is currently in the process of communicating the findings to CIS and working to develop solutions where possible and practical. The new Records Management System will be the ultimate solution to a variety of the issues identified in this finding.

Implementation Date

The new records management system is anticipated to be available in 18 – 24 months.

Responsible Manager

Lt. Chris Aulbaugh

“Dallas: The City That Works: Diverse, Vibrant, and Progressive.”

**An Audit Report on –
Dallas Police Department’s Crime Statistics**

Page 3 of 3
Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor
April 7, 2010

Recommendation III:

We recommend the Chief of Police:

- Ensure that the information technology system includes the analytical and retrieval functionality necessary to reduce manual verification of UCR information
- Require DPD personnel to use standard offense titles when entering information into DEFRS or any subsequent records management systems

Management Response / Corrective Action Plan

Agree Disagree

The Police Department is working with CIS to implement a new records management system that will replace the mainframe system currently in use. The new system will include analytical and retrieval functionality that will reduce the need for manual verification of UCR information.

The implementation of the records management system will also assist in ensuring the offense titles for Part 1 offenses are more standardized.

Implementation Date

The new records management system is anticipated to be available in 18 – 24 months.

Responsible Manager

Lt. Chris Aulbaugh

If you have any questions, or need additional information, please call me at 214-671-3901.



David M. Kunkle
Chief of Police

C: Ryan Evans, First Assistant City Manager