



July 11, 2011

Michael V. Martin, Ph.D.
Chancellor
Louisiana State University and A & M College
156 Thomas Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested
7006 0100 0002 1997 8123

RE: Expedited Program Review Determination
OPE ID: 00201000
PRCN: 201020627101

Dear Dr. Martin:

From January 26, 2010 through January 28, 2010, Mr. Michael Rhodes, Ms. Linda Shewack, and Mr. James L. Moore, III of the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) conducted a review of the Louisiana State University's (LSU; the University) administration of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act). The Clery Act is included in Section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f) and the Department's regulations are at 34 C.F.R. § 668.46. The purpose of this Final Program Review Determination letter is to advise the University of the finding and close the program review.

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

The Department's program review coincided with the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)'s Criminal Justice Information Service (CJIS) Audit Unit conducted at LSU. The U.S. Department of Education is partnering with the CJIS Audit Unit (CAU) to ensure accurate crime reporting on America's college campuses. The CAU reviews law enforcement agencies' reporting practices, and audits crime statistics that are reported by the states through their participation in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. The results of the QAR are shared with the Department for a comparative analysis of the annual security report data received from participating postsecondary institutions. The CAU reviewed a total of

School Participation Team - Dallas
1999 Bryan Street, Suite 1410, Dallas, TX 75201-6817
www.FederalStudentAid.ed.gov
1-800-4-FED-AID

FEDERAL STUDENT AID  START HERE. GO FURTHER.

15 Part I Offenses and 24 Part II Offenses that were reported during the January to June 2009 timeframe. During the CAU review, no instances of non-compliance were identified. As such, no further action is required by the Department based on the outcome of the QAR. A copy of CJIS's report is attached as Appendix A.

The Department reviewed a sample of 176 Louisiana State University Police Department (LSUPD) incident and arrest reports generated in the course of police operations during calendar year 2008. These reports documented incidents of Part I and Part II offenses reported to the LSUPD including a sample of Part II arrests for violations of certain laws involving illegal drugs, illegal usage of controlled substances, liquor, and weapons. Both random and judgmental sampling techniques were used to select reports for this review. Approximately 75 incident reports from the initial sample were cross-checked against the daily crime log to ensure that crimes occurring within the patrol jurisdiction were entered properly on the log.

Disclaimer:

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

Findings and Final Determinations:

The following area of noncompliance was identified during the program review. The finding of noncompliance is referenced to the applicable statutes and regulations and specifies the actions required by LSU to bring operations into compliance with the statutes and regulations. The Department has made a Final Determination regarding this finding. The following is an explanation of the violation and its resolution.

Finding # 1: Inaccurate Reporting of Crime Statistics to the Department's Office of Postsecondary Education

Citation:

The Clery Act and the Department's regulations require that institutions participating in the Title IV, HEA programs, must compile, publish, and distribute statistics concerning the occurrence on campus of the following crimes: criminal homicide, manslaughter, forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. In addition, the institution is required to disclose arrests and disciplinary referrals involving violations of Federal or State drug, liquor and weapons laws. *34 C.F.R. § 668.46(c)(1)*. For Clery Act reporting purposes, participating institutions must classify incidents of crime based on the definitions in Appendix A to Subpart D of Section 668 of the General Provisions Regulations. *34 C.F.R. 46(c)(7)*. Each participating institutions must also submit its crime statistics to the Department

for inclusion in the Office of Postsecondary Education's (OPE) online campus crime statistics database. 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f)(5).

Noncompliance:

LSU reported crime statistics in its 2008 annual security report that conflicted with the statistics it reported to the Department of Education's OPE online campus crime statistics database. Errors were identified in crime statistics reported for the 2006, 2007, and 2008 calendar years.

Specifically, the discrepancies identified are as follows:

Category	ASR	OPE
2006 – Forcible Sex Offenses	2	0
2008 – Robbery	2	0
2008 – Aggravated Assault	1	0
2007 - Liquor Law Violation DR*	7	0

“*” – Disciplinary Referrals

Failure to classify and disclose incidents of crime reported in an accurate and consistent manner violates the HEA and the Department's regulations, confuses users of the ASR and OPE database, and deprives the campus community and the public of vitally important crime information.

Institutional Action Taken to Resolve Noncompliance:

During the site visit, LSUPD officials determined that the statistics published in the 2009 ASR were correct. It was further determined that the variance was the result of certain incidents of crime reported to non-law enforcement campus security authorities (CSA) being included in the ASR statistical disclosures that were excluded from the OPE submission. The review team has analyzed the crime statistics in LSU's 2010 ASR as well as LSU's crime statistics submitted to the OPE website and determined that all required corrections for calendar years 2007 and 2008 were made. LSUPD officials and the review team discussed policy and procedural changes that should improve campus policing operations and lead to full compliance with the Clery Act going forward.

Final Program Review Determination:

LSU has taken the corrective actions necessary to resolve this finding. Therefore, LSU may consider this finding closed, with no further action required.

Record Retention:

Program records relating to the period covered by this program review must be retained until the later of: resolution of the violations, weakness, and other issues identified during the program

review or the end of the retention period applicable to all Title IV-related records including campus crime and security documents under 34 C.F.R. § 668.24(e)(1) and (e)(2).

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

Sincerely,



Cynthia Thornton
Area Case Director
School Participation Team Dallas

Enclosure as Stated

cc: Mr. Lawrence J. Rabalais, Jr., Chief of Police, LSUPD
Ms. M. Helen Haire, Major, Special Services Division, LSUPD
Ms. Mary G. Parker, Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Student Aid, LSU
Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D., President, Southern Association of Colleges & Schools – COC



Summary Exit Briefing Local Agency Review

**LA State University Police
Department**



Quality Assurance Review

*Shared Management
Shared Responsibility
Shared Success*

A Partnership in Criminal Justice

Table of Contents

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

Local Agency Review Process

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

The local agency QAR consists of three phases:

- Administrative Interview
- Data Quality Review
- Exit Briefing

Administrative Interview

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

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

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

Data Quality Review

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

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

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

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

Exit Briefing

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

Data Quality Results - Part I

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

Month(s)
Reviewed: Jan. to June 2009

Total Part I
Offenses Reviewed: 15

Classification

Overreported

Underreported

Inaccurate

Total Part I Discrepancies:

LEOKA

Overreported

Underreported

Hate Crime

Total Hate
Crime Reviewed: _____

Overreported

Underreported

Inaccurate

Data Quality Results - Part II

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

Month(s)
Reviewed: Jan. to June 2009

Total Part II
Records Reviewed: 24

Classification

*Underreported 0

Arrests

Overreported 0

Underreported 0

Total Part II Discrepancies:

0

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

Data Quality Results - Part I

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

Data Quality Results - Part II

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

Administrative Interview Results

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

Classification

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Arson

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Scoring

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Administrative Interview Results

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Arrests

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Clearances

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Jurisdiction

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

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Administrative Interview Results

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

Comments:

Meets UCR Guidelines

Property Values

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Hate Crime

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA)

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Comments:

Unfounded

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

Administrative Interview Results

Comments:

Updating / Quality Assurance

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

Meets UCR Guidelines

State Program Services

24. Submission frequency:

Monthly

Comments:

Auditor Notes: