

KENTUCKY'S UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING SYSTEM

Prior to July 1, 1987:

Kentucky's Uniform Crime Reporting System was based on monthly summary counts of criminal offense and arrests. The summary data was submitted by state and local law enforcement agencies. Summary data was adequate for broad analysis of general crime trends. However, it did not provide necessary tools for the detailed analytical needs of criminal justice professionals, the law enforcement community, and Kentucky legislators.

July 1, 1987:

Kentucky law enforcement agencies were required to submit "Incident" as opposed to "Summary" information. Incident reporting provided full detail crime specifics as opposed to mere counts of occurrences. This marked the beginning of Kentucky's Incident Based Reporting System. This required the submission of either the Uniform Offense Report (UOR1) or the uniform data elements as contained in the state wide data base. While not complete, Kentucky's Incident Based Reporting System continued to make progress toward full implementation.

Cooperation: The Key to Incident Based Reporting

Kentucky's Law enforcement agencies are beginning to meet the challenge of an Incident Based Reporting System. District Court Clerks are providing arrest information through the submission of Uniform Citations with court dispositions needed to complete the Incident Based Reporting System. The Criminal justice community; law enforcement, corrections, and the judiciary are moving toward compatibility through legislative initiatives that mandate the foundation for a system of information that will provide detailed analytical capabilities.

1995:

Currently Kentucky reports summary statistics in **Crime in Kentucky** and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A majority of law enforcement agencies are submitting incident or offense based information. However, several agencies are still submitting summary information due to various factors.

With the approach of the year 2000, the Kentucky State Police is currently attempting to address the needs of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the 21st Century. Our current computer system and software is not fully NIBRS compliant in that all data elements required by the FBI for NIBRS certification are not being captured. This will require switching to a new computer system and software. At the same time the offense and arrest reports must be updated to capture all required elements.

STATE OFFENSE DATA

PART I CRIMES CLASSIFICATION	OFFENSES REPORTED			
	1995	1994	% CHANGE	% DIST.
MURDER	271	241	12.45%	0.21%
RAPE	1,272	1,554	-18.15%	1.00%
ROBBERY	3,937	3,545	11.06%	3.08%
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	8,311	17,468	-52.42%	6.51%
BURGLARY	28,226	28,170	0.20%	22.12%
LARCENY THEFT	75,769	72,055	5.15%	59.37%
AUTO THEFT	9,835	8,404	17.03%	7.71%
TOTAL	127,621	131,437	-2.90%	100.00%

The total number of Part I crimes reported by law enforcement agencies in Kentucky during 1994 and 1995 is shown in the chart above. It should be noted that these overall statistics reflect only offenses reported to or known by the police.

There were 3,816 fewer Part I offenses were reported in 1995, a decrease of 2.90% over 1994. The largest category percentage increase was in auto theft, with an additional 1,431 reported during 1995 - an increase of 17.03%. The next largest percentage of increase in Part I offenses was murder, with 12.45%.

When making comparisons between years, the following should be taken into account: (1) Part I offenses are not inclusive of all offenses reported to the police; (2) Increases or decreases in the number of crimes reported can be attributed to a variety of factors, including methods of reporting and tabulating on the part of the law enforcement agencies; (3) Differing levels of citizens' awareness and their responsibility to report crime have a direct impact on the number of reports received by police.

The largest percentage of decrease was in the aggravated assault category. This occurred due to reclassification of the assault 4th offenses (no serious or aggravated injury) as simple assaults. Assault 4th charges were counted as Part II crimes instead of Part I. The second largest percentage of decrease was in the rape category. This was a direct result of improved reporting and verification procedures which were implemented in 1995. Rape is reported by the number of reported victims rather than the number of offenses against the same victim. Therefore, one crime was counted per victim instead of the number of charges or counts of rape.

KENTUCKY "CRIME INDEX" = 3,449

The crime index, or rate, is used nationally and is derived from the following formula:
 Population divided by 100,000 = X
 Number of offenses divided by X = crime index.
 Kentucky's crime index for 1995 is based on the current estimated population of 3.7 million.

**A SERIOUS CRIME
 OCCURS IN
 KENTUCKY EVERY
 4 MINUTES, 7 SECONDS**

**OFFENSE DATA
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

JURISDICTION	MURDER	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT	BURGLARY	LARCENY	AUTO THEFT	TOTAL
EASTERN KY UNIV	0	0	5	1	7	194	3	210
JEFF COMM COLLEGE	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
KY STATE UNIV	0	0	2	0	4	27	1	34
MOREHEAD UNIV	0	1	0	0	7	147	0	155
MURRAY ST UNIV	0	0	2	0	11	80	0	93
NORTHERN KY UNIV	0	0	0	0	5	110	0	115
UNIV OF KY	0	3	6	1	87	833	16	946
UNIV OF LOUISVILLE	0	2	5	4	19	332	14	376
WESTERN KY UNIV	0	0	1	4	1	204	3	213
TOTAL	0	6	22	10	141	1,929	37	2,145

*The chart above shows Part I offenses which occurred on college and university campuses with security/police departments. Below, Part I offenses are shown for those jurisdictions over 10,000 in population.

JURISDICTION OVER 10,000 POPULATION

JURISDICTION	MURDER	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT	BURGLARY	LARCENY	AUTO THEFT	TOTAL
ASHLAND	0	6	9	68	221	914	49	1,267
BOWLING GREEN	2	34	87	210	657	2,412	172	3,574
COVINGTON	4	27	179	156	805	2,171	192	3,534
DANVILLE	1	4	16	33	145	525	31	755
ELIZABETHTOWN	2	1	21	104	156	917	58	1,259
ERLANGER	0	3	9	9	53	400	29	503
FLORENCE	0	2	29	40	159	1,090	58	1,378
FRANKFORT	3	8	35	41	209	953	75	1,324
FT THOMAS	0	1	0	3	50	136	7	197
GEORGETOWN	0	9	5	53	142	697	39	945
GLASGOW	0	1	0	1	11	21	17	51
HENDERSON	1	18	37	75	327	1,415	94	1,967
HOPKINSVILLE	6	19	75	79	434	1,337	90	2,040
JEFFERSON CO PD	12	98	399	2,237	2,888	7,518	1,101	14,253
JEFFERSONTOWN	0	2	9	1	30	258	13	313
LEXINGTON	14	131	636	1,318	2,978	9,912	944	15,933
LOUISVILLE	50	135	1,592	1,317	4,471	8,800	2,960	19,325
MADISONVILLE	2	6	8	300	155	950	73	1,494
MAYFIELD	1	8	12	25	66	164	14	290
MIDDLESBORO	0	3	4	13	108	572	38	738
MURRAY	0	1	1	19	87	394	26	528
NEWPORT	2	7	38	98	331	1,039	89	1,604
NICHOLASVILLE	0	1	8	17	123	605	58	812
OWENSBORO	3	14	44	43	522	2,400	110	3,136
PADUCAH	3	16	61	180	418	1,637	145	2,460
RADCLIFF	3	10	24	116	190	483	18	844
RICHMOND	1	10	23	53	230	868	92	1,277
SHIVELY	0	6	59	8	172	460	134	839
SOMERSET	1	5	5	40	94	653	32	830
ST MATTHEWS	0	4	24	4	95	687	55	869
WINCHESTER	0	8	2	38	72	598	38	756
TOTALS	111	598	3451	6,699	16,399	50,986	6,851	85,095

CLEARANCE RATES

Clearance rates are the percentages of cases cleared (through arrest or exceptional means) when compared with the total number of offenses reported to or known by the police. As shown in the chart, clearance rates for property crimes are traditionally low. With the exception of robbery, clearance rates for violent crimes are high. High clearance rates for murder, rape, and aggravated assault are attributable to the fact that the perpetrator is known, recognizable, or in some way usually associated with the victim. Low clearance rates for robbery as well as property crimes can be attributed to the difficulty of the victim in identifying the perpetrator.

The right-hand chart depicts the relative clearance rates of property versus violent Part I crimes

The chart below depicts relative clearance rates for each of the seven Part I crimes.

