

Virginia State Police



Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division Newsletter

January 2012
Volume 21, Issue 1

| | Page |
|--|------|
| UCR Highlights Anomaly Detection | 2 |
| UCR - Tip of the Month | 3 |
| UCR - Group A Offenses | 4 |
| UCR - Group B Arrests | 5 |
| UCR – Year–End Considerations | 5 |
| VCIN – Revised VCIN Manual | 6 |
| VCIN – AMBER Alert | 6 |
| VCIN – Proper Validation Procedures | 7 |

AFIS ACTIVITIES - AFIS to Integra-ID – Phase 1

Virginia State Police (VSP) has begun the endeavor to migrate the current AFIS system to NEC's Integra-ID platform. The new platform will provide Mobile ID functionality, dynamic workflow management capabilities and, a redundant hardware architecture. The project has been divided into three phases to assist with budgeting constraints and project manage-ability. The first phase delivering the Mobile ID functionality and necessitating the creation of the unified database, a key component of the Integra-ID system, is scheduled to be delivered in mid-year 2012.

UCR Highlights IBR Training

This past October, the state IBR Program, along with the FBI, conducted training sessions held in Bristol, Roanoke and Lynchburg. These three sessions provided "Level One" IBR training, focusing on IBR concepts and definitions, to approximately one-half of the reporting agencies in Virginia. This same training was presented in the Tidewater, Richmond and Northern Virginia areas the previous April.

After the last IBR training sessions, it was suggested that we post the offense/incident classifying exercises done in the class to the IBR website. We have followed your suggestions, and you will find the three exercises (crimes against persons, crimes against property, and crimes against society/multiple offenses) under the Training/Tutorial link on the IBR website.

UCR Highlights - Continued

Anomaly Detection

For IBR purposes, an anomaly can be thought of as any data field or combination of data fields that initially appears to be 'out of the ordinary' or 'unusual.'

We continue to expand our list of anomalies. Currently, we identify over twenty different anomalies that we send to reporting agencies on a quarterly basis. For IBR purposes, an anomaly can be thought of as any data field or combination of data fields that initially appears to be 'out of the ordinary' or 'unusual.' It is important to keep in mind that an anomaly may indicate a data error OR there may be no error. We ask agencies to review the incidents that we have identified and resubmit any that need correction.

A few examples of the anomalies include:

1. With 520 weapon law violation offenses, 'unknown weapon - code 95', 'no weapon - code 99', or 'personal weapons - code 40' are being reported in Field 13A Type of Weapon Involved. These weapon types do not meet the criteria for a 520 offense, which is defined as the "violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, concealment or use of firearms, cutting instruments, explosives, incendiary devices or other deadly weapons."
2. An incest offense (36A) or a statutory rape (36B) is reported with a victim younger than 13 years old. Victims aged 12 years or less are considered too young to give consent; therefore, the incident should be reported as a forcible sex offense.
3. A Credit Card/Automatic Teller Machine Fraud offense (26B) is submitted with the credit/debit card (property description of 09) as the stolen/defrauded property. The property description reported with this offense should list what type of property was fraudulently obtained by using the credit/debit card. The card itself should not be reported with this offense in most cases. Theft of the card would most often be reported as a separate larceny-theft incident.

UCR Highlights - Continued

Tip of the Month

Last year we began posting a 'Tip of the Month' as a bulletin on the IBR website. Posted at the beginning of each month, situations that frequently come to the attention of the IBR staff are discussed along with ideas or 'tips' to help agency personnel resolve these issues. We encourage all IBR personnel to review these postings on a regular basis. The most recent 'tips' include:

1. Additions to the UCR/IBR Program Requirements

As authorized by the FBI, a new cargo theft field and additional property and location categories are now being submitted to the UCR/IBR program. Agencies and software vendors have been notified and updated documentation has been posted to the IBR website. In the new Data Dictionary, all revisions and additions are identified with yellow highlights. The primary changes are the addition of the cargo theft field, new location codes, and new property categories. We know there will be many questions about the changes. Please feel free to contact the state IBR Program office.

2. Changes to agency contact/personnel information

Whenever you have changes in the agency's contact information, agency head and/or primary IBR contact staff, please let the State Program office know. Even though you have the ability to make those changes directly to the IBR website, the State Program office is not electronically notified when revisions are made by agency personnel. In addition, if you change IBR software vendors, we need to know. In order to ensure a smooth transition, agencies are required to submit three months of IBR submission files directly to our IT department when they contract with a different vendor. In this way, we are not only made aware of the change, but we can also monitor the submission files and provide you with feedback on monthly data volume for your review and verification that your IBR submission files are complete and accurate.

3. Larceny/theft offenses

The IBR program breaks down larcenies/thefts into eight categories, including 23A pocket-picking, 23B purse-snatching, 23C shoplifting, 23D theft from a building, 23E theft from coin-operated machine or device, 23F theft from a motor vehicle, 23G theft of motor vehicle parts or accessories, and 23H all other larceny. We are finding that many incidents are submitted with the general category of 23H all other larcenies. This may be due to a link in IBR software that assigns the 'all other' category to the state statute for larceny. Agencies are asked to review case narratives and choose the most specific larceny/theft sub-category.

4. Attempted murder

In the UCR/IBR program, there is no attempted murder. Attempted murder and non-negligent manslaughter offenses must be coded as aggravated assaults (13A). If you use the code of 09A (homicide), the offense will be submitted as 'completed' and the incident will be counted an actual homicide.



UCR Highlights – Continued

Statistics – Group A Offenses

The CJIS Newsletter is published by:
Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of State Police



Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Post Office Box 27472
Richmond, Virginia 23261-7472

Written and Edited by:

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Captain Thomas W. Turner | 804-674-4605 |
| Lt. Ronald C. Maxey, Jr. | 804-674-2023 |
| Lt. William J. Reed, Jr. | 804-674-6719 |
| F/Sgt. K. Scott Downs | 804-674-2630 |
| F/Sgt. Matthew Patterson | 804-674-6759 |
| Ms. Mary Crawford | 804-674-2150 |
| Ms. Shannon K. Pounders | 804-674-6746 |
| Ms. Virginia H. Gunn | 804-674-6724 |
| Ms. Debbie S. Mann | 804-674-6750 |
| Ms. Donna K. Tate | 804-674-2210 |
| Dr. Norm R. Westerberg | 804-674-2143 |
| Mr. J. Larry Howell | 804-674-2200 |
| Ms. Anita Miles | 804-674-2449 |
| Ms. Robbie G. Wheat | 804-674-6703 |
| Ms. Dana R. Snead | 804-674-4667 |

| Group A Offenses - Nine Months | 2010 | 2011 | Percent Change |
|--|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Murder & Non-negligent Manslaughter | 297 | 231 | -22.2 |
| Kidnapping/Abduction | 1,261 | 1,097 | -13.0 |
| Forcible Rape | 1,219 | 1,159 | -4.9 |
| Other Forcible Sex Offenses | 2,927 | 2,609 | -10.9 |
| Robbery | 4,253 | 3,950 | -7.1 |
| Aggravated Assault | 7,516 | 6,762 | -10.0 |
| Simple Assault & Intimidation | 77,717 | 74,772 | -3.8 |
| Arson | 965 | 866 | -10.3 |
| Extortion/Blackmail | 115 | 84 | -27.0 |
| Burglary | 22,095 | 21,768 | -1.5 |
| Larceny Theft | 112,114 | 107,115 | -4.5 |
| Motor Vehicle Theft | 7,989 | 7,262 | -9.1 |
| Counterfeiting/Forgery | 5,479 | 5,119 | -6.6 |
| Fraud Offenses | 19,215 | 19,059 | -0.8 |
| Embezzlement | 2,088 | 2,013 | -3.6 |
| Stolen Property Offenses | 1,167 | 1,114 | -4.5 |
| Destruction/Damage/ Vandalism of Property | 58,908 | 55,569 | -5.7 |
| Drug/Narcotic Offenses | 37,158 | 37,686 | 1.4 |
| Non-Forcible Sex Offenses | 174 | 158 | -9.2 |
| Pornography/Obscene Material | 510 | 509 | -0.2 |
| Gambling Offenses | 87 | 131 | 50.6 |
| Prostitution Offenses | 826 | 656 | -20.6 |
| Bribery | 24 | 20 | -16.7 |
| Weapon Law Violations | 6,786 | 6,575 | -3.1 |
| TOTAL | 370,890 | 356,284 | -3.9 |

UCR Highlights – Continued

Statistics – Group B Offenses

| Group B Arrests - Nine Months | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| | Adult | Juvenile | Adult | Juvenile | Percent Change Adult | Percent Change Juvenile |
| | 2010 | | 2011 | | | |
| Group A | 96,491 | 12,933 | 95,178 | 12,123 | -1.4 | -6.3 |
| Group B | 157,530 | 13,919 | 150,894 | 11,589 | -4.2 | -16.7 |
| TOTAL | 254,021 | 26,852 | 246,072 | 23,712 | -3.1 | -11.7 |

Comparing preliminary nine months' data for 2010 and 2011, the number of Group A and Group B arrests both experienced declines for adults (-1.4% and -4.2% respectively). Juvenile Group A arrests decreased (-6.3%). There were far fewer Juvenile Group B arrests during the first three reporting quarters of 2011 than in 2010 (-16.7%).

Year-End Considerations

The final date for submitting 2011 data that will be included in 'Crime in Virginia' and 'Crime in the U.S.' is quickly approaching. Based on prior years, mid-March of 2012, will be the deadline to submit any revisions, updates, and/or corrections to 2011 crime and arrest data that will be published in the state and federal reports. These numbers are based on data that agencies submit error-free. We suggest that on the day after you submit each IBR file, you check back on the website and view the 'error report.' The 'error report' includes descriptions of any errors. It is also important to verify that data intended to be submitted was actually included in the IBR file and was accepted. Occasionally, an IBR file may appear on the website as 'processed.'

However, the error report will show that no data was accepted because the IBR file contained a fatal error, such as an incorrect agency name. In addition, it is a good idea to verify that you've submitted the appropriate monthly IBR file. We've seen cases where an agency has submitted the same IBR monthly file multiple times in error.

Please contact the state IBR Program office with any questions or concerns. As always, thank you all for your efforts to make the state's crime data as complete and accurate as possible.

Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)

Revised VCIN Manual

The 2009 version of the VCIN Operating Manual has been updated. The current version of the VCIN Operating Manual is the 2011 edition, and has been placed on the LEO.GOV website for download. All agency heads and TACs are reminded to download the 2011 VCIN Operating Manual, as well as, the updated NCIC Operator Manual and NCIC Code Manual. To help operators understand the new changes, a list of changes and the applicable sections has been posted for reference.

Additionally, the new 2011 VCIN Operating Manual requires each terminal

Virginia AMBER Alert Activated Twice During 2011

Virginia had two cases where the AMBER Alert Plan was activated in 2011. On June 24, 2011, Harrisonburg reported to the Virginia State Police and the Virginia Missing Children's Clearinghouse that a one year old child had been abducted. A statewide alert was broadcasted with information about the child and abductor shortly after the abduction took place. As a result of the alert, the abductor contacted an attorney and surrendered to local authorities.

The second alert came on Christmas Eve, December 24, 2011, in the City of Richmond, Virginia. Following a double homicide where a two year child was abducted by the suspected murderer.

A statewide alert was sent out with a description of the abductor along with vehicle information. Approximately six hours after the abduction, the two year old child was located and safely returned to his family.

In both cases, there was a positive outcome where both children were recovered safely.

Nationally, since its inception, the AMBER Alert Network has led to the recovery of over 500 children. Virginia began its AMBER Alert Network in 2002, and has been activated 31 times. On average, the Virginia AMBER Alert is activated three to four times a year.

To raise awareness of the need to continuously educate our children on the importance of being safe at home, school, and play, the Virginia State Police also partners with the U.S. Department of Justice to host a poster contest for fifth graders across the Commonwealth. Each year a statewide winner is selected, and submitted to compete in a national contest. Additional information regarding the contest is available at (<http://www.vsp.state.va.us/MissingChildrenPosterContest.shtm>)

For more information on the Virginia AMBER Alert plan and its criteria, please go to www.vaamberalert.com.



Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)

Notes on Proper Validation Procedures

Is your agency in compliance with VCIN and NCIC record validation policies?

Validation of records has a three-tiered purpose. The purpose of validation is to ensure that records are: 1) Complete, 2) Accurate, and 3) Still outstanding or active. Most agencies complete the first two requirements, but the third requirement has a tendency to get lost in the shuffle.

The File Transactions Section of the VCIN Operating Manual reads:

- Validation obliges the ORI to confirm that the record is complete, accurate, and still outstanding or active. Validation is accomplished by reviewing the original entry, current supporting documents, and by recent consultation with any appropriate complainant, victim, prosecutor, court, non-terminal agency or other appropriate source or individual. In the event the ORI is unsuccessful in its attempts to contact the victim, complainant, etc., the entering authority must make a determination based on the best information and knowledge available whether or not to retain the original entry in the file.
- Each originating agency must validate all records on the validation listing as follows:
 1. All records contained on the validation listing must be reviewed by the originating agency.
 2. The entering agency must modify each record being validated, to include updated information, and the name of the person, (last name, first name and middle initial), that validated the record in the Name of Validator (VLN) Field.
 3. Validation shall be accomplished by reviewing the original entry, the current supporting documents, and by recent consultation with the appropriate sources:
 - **WANTED PERSONS:** PROSECUTOR, COURT AND/OR COMPLAINANT
 - **VEHICLES/GUNS/BOATS/SECURITIES/LICENSE PLATES/PARTS, ARTICLES:** APPROPRIATE VICTIM
 - **MISSING PERSONS:** REPORTING PARTY (other than officer)
 - **PROTECTIVE ORDERS:** COURT
 4. All records that are no longer current must be removed from VCIN and NCIC. All records remaining in the system must be valid and active.
 5. All records shall contain all available information.
 6. All information contained in each record must be accurate.
 7. Agencies must have a written procedure in place outlining how their agency conducts the validation of their wanted file records.

In addition to checking the existing record against supporting documentation, adding missing information, and updating incorrect information, the entering agency is also responsible for making contact with the appropriate source which led to the generation of the record. Contact with the source is required to ensure that the record should even exist in the system(s). Many situations can render a record "invalid".



Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)

Notes on Proper Validation Procedures - Continued

Examples include:

1. Stolen items were located by reporting victims.
2. Warrants were served but not removed from the system(s).
3. Commonwealth Attorneys no longer wish to prosecute on warrants.
4. Missing persons were located by reporting parties.
5. Courts failed to provide copies of amended or dissolved protection orders.

This list is not all-inclusive, but reflects the importance of making contact with the appropriate source which led to the generation of the record being validated.

What happens if an agency is unsuccessful in attempting to contact the appropriate source? Primarily, the agency should make **EVERY** effort to contact the source. This may include telephone contact, sending an officer by the last known address of the reporting party, speaking with neighbors and family members of the reporting party, sending a list of warrants and protection orders to the court, etc. Should the agency still be unsuccessful in attempting to contact the appropriate source, the VCIN and NCIC Manuals offer, "In the event the ORI is unsuccessful in its attempts to contact the victim, complainant, etc., the entering authority must make a determination based on the best information and knowledge available whether or not to retain the original entry in the file." This decision is best left to the agency head and should be addressed through the agency's written validation policy.

Additional information on validation procedures may be referenced in Section 3.4 of the "INTRODUCTION" chapter of the NCIC Operating Manual and in the "FILE TRANSACTIONS" section of the VCIN Operating Manual.

