Council on Crime and Justice

Racial Disparity Initiative

Report to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety

May 2002

Defining the Disparity Project: Offense Report

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY FINDINGS

The Racial Disparity Initiative (RDI) project is an attempt to provide a multi-dimensional view to answer the question of how much of the over-representation of minorities is due to un-equal treatment at different stages of the criminal justice process and how much may be caused by higher rates of criminal behavior. The RDI plan was to ascertain whether the disproportional arrest rates for persons of color are due to a higher rate of offending, law enforcement policies and practices, or both. Analyses of these data would provide approaches to develop action plans to reduce both the disparity and harm caused by crime and fear of crime.

Secondary research published by the Racial Disparity Initiative analyzed data from the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension on adults arrested in 1999 for all of Minnesota's 87 counties. The results were compared to the racial composition of the adult population using data from the 2000 Census. The conclusion of minority over-representation at arrest leads to the question of why this is occurring.

This offense study report describes findings from police records describing the race of individuals in the three roles of arestee, suspect and victim. The hypothesis that higher arrest rates are related to higher offense rates is based on an underlying series of assumptions:

- crime more often happens within the same racial groups;
- under-reporting of crime is more likely within minority communities; and
- the Minneapolis data provided for this report indicates a higher percentage of victims, suspects and arrests within the minority communities.

However, a simplistic interpretation that Blacks and Native Americans commit offenses at a higher rate, which in turn leads to a higher percentage of suspects and a higher percentage of victims is not definitive. Although higher victimization and arrest rates within minority communities may indicate higher offense rates with the communities, this may or may not be true for offenses that are not reported.

OTHER VICTIMIZATION RESEARCH

Victimization surveys show that most offenses are not reported to the police. Across three Minnesota crime victimization surveys and the National Crime Victimization Survey, close to 60 % of crimes are not reported to the police. The percentage of crimes that go unreported is undoubtedly higher when victims don't trust law enforcement agencies. However, national victimization surveys have found that the likelihood of crimes being reported to the police is equal by race.

Another inherent problem in Minnesota Crime Surveys was that the small number of self-described minorities limits extrapolation to the larger community. National victimization surveys with larger sample sizes indicate a higher level of victimization within most minority groups and that most crimes are committed within the same racial groups.

This supposition is supported by National Crime Victimization surveys, which have found higher rates of victimization for non-whites and that offenders in face-to-face personal crimes are more likely to be of the same race. Most crime is intra-racial (Black on Black, White on White) especially for more serious Part I offenses.

Most of the tables from the *1999 Criminal Victimization in the United States* often include Black, White and Other races. For personal crimes per 1,000 persons age 12 and over, Tables 5 and 7 from the 2001 report show a victimization rate of 32.7 for Whites, 42.9 for Blacks, 26 for Other Races, and 35.3 for Hispanics. Less complete detail on other races or ethnicity is available for the perceived race of offender for single- or multiple-offender violent victimizations. For single offenders, 80 % of Black victims of violence reported the offender was Black and 74.5 % of White victims reported the offender was White. The same trend of victims reporting offenders being the same race holds true across crime types such as rape/sexual assault, robbery, and assaults. For multiple-offender crimes of violence, 67.8% of Black victims reported the offenders were all Black while 49.1 % of White Victims reported the offenders were all White.

A Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report on *Violent Victimization and Race; 1993-98* used the National Crime Victimization Survey and also described homicide trends. Twenty-three African Americans, 4 Whites and 3 persons of other races were murdered in the United States in 1998 per 100,000 person in each racial group. Among homicides in which the race of the offender is known, most are intra-racial. From 1976 to 1998, 86 % of white victims were murdered by whites, 94 % of African Americans were murdered by African Americans, and 58 % of victims of other races were murdered by an "other race" person.

Comparisons of victimization survey findings, UCR data from police departments and self-reported offense surveys have been summarized with a consensus forming around higher offense rates for more serious and violent crimes within minority communities.

For example, john powell cited criminologist Alfred Blumstein's estimate that 20-25% of these disparities are unexplainable by differential rates of offending alone. Preliminary Memo on the Status of Black Men and Boys in American Society in the African-American Men Project: Preliminary Report November 2000

Alfred Blumstein concluded that for the most serious crimes, the bulk of disproportionality between black and white incarceration rates is a consequence of higher black involvement in serious crimes." Racial Disproportionality of U.S. Prison Populations Revisited, 64 U. COLO. L. REV. 743, 759 (1993)

Michael Tonry concluded that the primary reason for substantially higher black incarceration rates is higher black involvement in imprisonable crimes. MALIGN NEGLECT 79 (1995)

Robert Sampson and Janet Lauritsen noted that with respect to index crimes, racial differentials in sanctioning reflect racial differentials in offending rates. Racial and Ethnic

Disparities in Crime and Criminal Justice in the United States, in 21 CRIME & JUSTICE 311, 355-56 (Michael Tonry ed., 1997))

Katheryn Russell points out that higher offense rates for blacks are not surprising, given their disproportionate representation in measures of indicators of social marginality, such as unemployment, poverty and non-marriage birth rates, which tend to mirror rates of offending. Katheryn Russel, The Color of Crime, New York, New York University Press (1998) p. 29-30

David Cole, a Georgetown University Law Center Professor, concluded in an essay, " Virtually every criminologist who has addressed the issue concurs that much of the racial disparity in incarceration can be explained by higher offending rates among minorities. At the same time, however, criminologists also concur that some of the disparity cannot be so explained and may well be the result of discrimination. Assessing how much of the disparity is due to discrimination and how much is simply a disparate effect of neutral policies is obviously an important undertaking. But the ultimate point of this essay is to suggest that we move beyond that debate." AS FREEDOM ADVANCES: THE PARADOX OF SEVERITY IN AMERICAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

GOALS AND OBSTACLES FOR THE RDI OFFENSE REPORT

Three approaches were proposed to determine, within racial groups, the incidence of offending behavior to describe the factors contributing to the disparity in arrest, charging and incarceration rates. A victimization survey was expected to capture the frequency of crimes committed against persons. A comprehensive review and analysis of existing data would be used to estimate differences in drug use across racial groups. For crimes against persons and for narcotics arrests resulting from a police stop, data from incident reports on suspects and arrestees would be used to ascertain whether the disparity in arrests reflects any racial differences among suspects. Finally, alternative approaches would be developed to study differences in victimization and offending in other communities.

The FBI's UCR information is adequate for arrests, but does not include race data on reported offenses. Race identification is available in offense reports if the race of the suspect was known and reported by the victim or reporting officer. Existing race data from offense reports is often missing because neither a suspect nor victim can be identified, is not collected, or is not available to the public. Race for an individual may be recorded from observation or self-identification, or may reflect social custom rather than heredity. Moreover, research controlling for factors such as education level, family status, income, housing density and residential mobility has shown that race and ethnicity are not predictive of criminal behavior.

Comparing law enforcement data to crimes not reported is problematic since most offenses are not reported to the police. Determining the percentage of crime not reported to police departments is necessary to put the Minneapolis Police Department's statistics into context. Statewide crime victimization surveys in Minnesota found that 63 % of 1995 victims and 67 % of 1998 victims did not report one or more crimes. The

percentage of crimes that go unreported is undoubtedly higher when victims don't trust law enforcement agencies.

This offense report was intended to compare police incident reports by the race of the suspect and to calculate racial disparities in reported offenses and in cleared offenses. While the numbers of cleared offenses are published in the BCA's annual *Minnesota Crime Information* report, the data is not broken out by race. Conversations with Minneapolis and St. Paul Police Departments indicated that offenses that were later cleared by arrest often do not have the clearance information recorded. In general, contacts with local law enforcement agencies found that some of the victim or suspect data was not collected, or collected in a hit-or-miss fashion. Often offenses that were cleared by an arrest at a later time were not documented since entering the "cleared by arrest" data was seen as "paperwork for statistics" rather than adding value to move the case through the criminal justice system.

Despite these limitations, this report analyzes people arrested, suspects identified in incident reports, and victimization of offending behaviors by race. The following data from Minneapolis Police Department is the best available to describe the racial information collected for arrests, victims and suspects. Other agencies contacted do not have the computer information systems that can provide this type of data. However the Minneapolis Police Department data does not include ethnicity, so data about Hispanics cannot be analyzed independently.

Minneapolis Citywide and Police Precinct Reports on Arrestees, Suspect's And Victim's Race: January 1 To June 30, 2000

A report generated by the Minneapolis Police Department is the most complete available to describe the racial information collected for arrests, victims and suspects during the first half of 2000. The report includes both juveniles and adults, but did not break out Hispanic Ethnicity separately. Although these statistics can be compared to Census data to calculate rates per 100,000 population within racial groups, they cannot portray a single individual's risk of victimization, being a suspect of a crime, or being arrested.

For all crime types, the report documents higher victimization rates for portions of the minority community in Minneapolis; Native Americans and African Americans as a group were about two and a half times more likely to be victims of crimes as Whites. African American were ten times more likely to be suspects and nearly nine times as likely to be arrested. Native Americans were slightly over six times as likely to be suspects and nearly 11 times as likely to be arrested.

At the same time, the 2000 Census showed 68 % of the Minneapolis population was White, Black/African American at 18%, Asian or Pacific Islander at 6 %, and Native American at 2 % of the Minneapolis population**.** Another 8.5% described themselves as members of "Other Race" or "Two or more races". Although Hispanic Ethnicity was not detailed separately by the MPD, 7.6% of Minneapolis's 2000 population was Latino. Translating the victim, suspect and arrestee roles into rates per 100,000 population based on Census counts allows direct comparison across groups for the Minneapolis data.

Crime Involvement Rate per 1,000 Population by Race

	Arrests	Suspects	Victims
White	18	11	34
Black	158	113	84
Native American	199	71	80
All Other Races	31	24	35
Total for categories with known race	49	33	44
Total including unknown race	49	37	55

Ratios can compare rates for racial groups with each other.
Part I and Part II crimes combined

	Arrests	Suspects	Victims
Black to white	8.7	10.0	2.5
Native American to white	10.9	6.3	2.4

Separating the types of crime into Part I and Part II offenses further highlights differences. Once the number of arrests are converted into rates per 1,000 population, between 15 and 16 Blacks and Native Americans are arrested for every white person for the more serious offenses included in the crime index. The ratio of victimization rates also shows the disparity of 4 Blacks and Native Americans for each white victim.

Ratio of Part I Crime Involvement Rate per 1,000 Population

	Arrests	Suspects	Victims
Native to white	15.5	6.5	1.2
Black to white	15.4	13.0	1.8

Ratio of Part II Crime Involvement Rate per 1,000 Population

	Arrests	Suspects	Victims
Native to white	10.6	6.2	4.2
Black to white	8.1	8.1	3.7

CAVEATS FOR MINNEAPOLIS DATA:

The Minneapolis Police Department report has limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the statistics. While the report provides information on the race of individuals involved in reported crime, whether as victims, suspects or arrestees, it represents data collected by a law enforcement agency and may not reflect crime not reported. Furthermore, much of the Part II offense data may result from police priorities and policies resulting from targeting high crime areas. Many of the less serious Part II crime reports, such as narcotics or prostitution, are enforcement driven where an arrest does not necessarily have a corresponding victim or suspect.

Determining the race of individuals who were victims, suspects, or arrestees is often based on the officer's perception of race or self-report. For example, the Minneapolis Police Department records do not have a breakout by ethnicity, which would underestimate the disparity if Latinos were counted as Whites. Although Hispanic breakouts are not available for Minneapolis, 44 % of MN Latinos in 2000 Census also said they were white compared to 39% in Hennepin County.

One individual may be arrested or victimized for different offenses in a given year and would be counted multiple times. This caveat should be kept in mind regarding rates per 1,000 population. Multiple suspects involved in the commission of one offense each would be recorded as well as multiple victims which makes comparisons to individuals or offenses difficult. Finally, not all individuals involved were necessarily Minneapolis residents.

NUMBERS AND PERCENTS: These statistics represent the race of the individuals recorded in the Minneapolis Police Department's CAPRS database for criminal incidents:

- For the first half of the year, 2,257 people were arrested for Part I and 16,567 arrested for Part II offenses. Overall, race was recorded for 99.9 % of people arrested, 87.4 % of suspects and for 79.4 % of victims.
- African Americans make up 22% of Part I crime victims, 58% of suspects and 65% of arrestees. For Part II crimes, African Americans make up 33% of victims, 51% of suspects and 57% of arrests in the first half for 2000.
- Whites made up 46% of victims, 16% of suspects and 15% of arrests for Part I crimes compared 33% of victims, 23% of suspects and 25% of arrests for Part II crimes.
- Native Americans made up 2% of victims, 4% of suspects and 8% of arrests for Part I crimes compared to 6% of victims, 5% of suspects and 9% of arrests for Part II crime.

RATES: Dividing the number of times individuals of a specific race were involved in a criminal incident by the number of people within the same racial group allows direct comparisons. That number is then multiplied by 1,000 for easier interpretation.

- 177 Native Americans were arrested in Minneapolis for Part II offenses for every 1,000 population and 55 were reported to be victims of Part II crime.
- 137 Blacks were arrested in Minneapolis for Part II offenses for every 1,000 population and 48 were reported to be victims of Part II crime.

- 17 Whites were arrested in Minneapolis for Part II offenses for every 1,000 population and 13 were reported to be victims of Part II crime.

POPULATION: The 2000 Census taken during that time showed Whites made up 65.1% of the population and Native Americans 2.2%. Black/African American accounted for 18% of the Minneapolis population although another 8.5% described themselves as members of "Other Race" or "Two or more races".

RATIOS: Allow comparison of two rates to each other. Dividing the Black victimization rate of 48 per thousand by the White victimization rate of 13 per 1,000 by results in a ratio of 3.7 to one.

Ratios for Part I Crime	Arrests	Suspects	Victims
Native to white	15.5	6.5	1.2
Black to white	15.4	13.0	1.8
Ratios for Part II Crime			
Native to white	10.6	6.2	4.2
Black to white	8.1	8.1	3.7

- Native Americans and Blacks have a victimization rate of nearly 4 to one for Part II crimes although the likelihood of reporting crime to the police department may differ.

DEFINITIONS: Under the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program, certain crimes are grouped for reporting. Consistent definitions are adopted so that crime statistics can be compiled in a single classification system and compared over time and location. Eight offenses comprise the Part I or "serious" crimes, while 21 make up Part II crimes. They are defined at the end of this report.

CAVEATS: The data reported by the Minneapolis Police Department does not reflect crime that is not reported by citizens, nor discovered during routine law enforcement activities.

- Race may be defined differently for arrestees, suspects and victims. It could be based on an officer's perception or self-identified by an individual.
- The statistics cannot portray a single individual's risk of victimization, being a suspect of a crime, or being arrested because a person may be entered for more than once, or as have different roles across multiple incidents.
- The report includes both juveniles and adults, but did not break out Hispanic Ethnicity separately. This would underestimate the actual disparity across races if Latinos were classified as Whites.
- Furthermore, some of the Part II offense data may result from police priorities and policies resulting from targeting high crime areas. For example, many of the less serious Part II crime reports, such as for narcotics or prostitution, are enforcement driven where an arrest does not necessarily have a corresponding victim or suspect.

SUMMARY: The report generated by the Minneapolis Police Department is probably the most complete available to describe the racial information collected for arrests, victims and suspects during the first half of 2000. The findings are difficult to interpret across the different perspectives that are included in the Racial Disparity Initiative. This report documents higher rates for the minority community in Minneapolis for victimization, arrests and suspicion of crime. For Part I and Part II crimes combined:

- Native Americans and African Americans as a group were about two and a half times more likely to be victims of crimes as Whites.
- African American were ten times more likely to be suspects and nearly nine times as likely to be arrested.
- Native Americans were slightly over six times as likely to be suspects and nearly 11 times as likely to be arrested.
- Whites accounted for 50% of the victims, but 22% of suspects and 24% of arrestees.

FINE TUNING AND REPLICATING REPORTS: Additional and more recent reports, as well as reports from other agencies may help clarify the causes for the disparities and provide a larger view of the scope of the problem.

- This type of report should be replicated using current data to track trends over time. Similar reports should be requested from other law enforcement agencies for comparisons by jurisdictions.
- Focusing on specific non-victim reported crime types, such as narcotics, disorderly conduct or prostitution will illuminate the highest areas of disparity.
- Deeper analysis on violent crimes such as homicides, aggravated assault or robbery may help define the intra-racial nature of some types of crime.
- Racial demographic census data could provide neighborhood or precinct-based rates.
- List possible interpretations of data and causes of the disparity. Try to link possible interactions with other data findings in this report and real-world experience. For example, multiple arrests of the same individuals without further legal charges may account for a large portion of the disparity.
- An alternative explanation may involve single or multiple arrests for a larger portion of population is arrested, and prosecuted or diverted for "quality of life" crimes. Fights or load arguments that may seem culturally appropriate may not be seen so by people who complain to authorities or officers.
- Further analysis should also determine unrelated counts that could lead to impressions that might not be true. Whites who report stolen cars may be coded as victims, while minorities may be arrested for other Part I crimes may be mistakenly misinterpreted as minorities are victimizing Whites.
- RDI needs to refine how to use information that documents what we already know? Will another study tell us the same thing again? How can short term research findings be used to tell the story more effectively? Then where do we go with this finding/documentation of what we know?
- Empirical and statistical data is not always persuasive in political and subjective levels of argument and decision making. RDI needs to engage key people within the justice system and determine what would be helpful for them to change and systems

evolve over time. President Franklin Roosevelt once said, "You have convinced me that there is a problem, now force me to act differently."

OBSERVATIONS

Over 1,100 Minnesota justice agencies are involved in an effort to integrate information systems, which provides an opportunity to advocate for more detailed and useful information. The CriMNet project has completed SEARCH's Business Services Exchange Points model and documented what type of data is passed to the next stages in the criminal justice process. It is possible to create a flowchart with disposition statistics from 911 to dispatch to incident report to arrest to prosecution to court disposition to sentence served overlaid with statistics available from current system. A systematic examination of discretion used at these information exchange points is possible.

Traditionally, crime reports consist of monthly counts of offenses and arrests for certain offense categories. State and local agencies report these summary data to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. These reports provide little information about the characteristics of crimes, victims, offenders or arrests. The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) is designed to collect and report data about each incident to overcome many of these deficiencies. Compared to Summary UCR, NIBRS collects more details on more categories of crime, including concurrent offenses, weapons, injury, location, property loss and characteristics of the victims, offenders and arrestees. Both Minneapolis and St. Paul Police Departments are interested in moving to NIBRS.

The ideal study will follow criminal cases as they proceed through the criminal justice system from arrest to sentencing. It will examine decisions that affect arrest, bail, pre-trial diversion or dismissal, prosecution, and court dispositions. The goal is to identify what practices contribute to racial disparities, for what type of cases, and with what consequences. Data needs to be obtained from several criminal justice agencies, matched by offender information, analyzed by race, and controlled by criminal history, offense severity, and other relevant factors that regularly affect criminal justice decision. The Racial Disparity Initiative can use this model of discretion to examine when and why a decision is made to forward a case further along the system.

The main finding from this project was the data limitations. These include questions about crime not reported to the police being comparable to what was available. Another issue was the accuracy of available data. For example, if officers filling out offense reports in the Minneapolis database determined race, some Latinos may have been misclassified as white. Finally the level of detail, Part I or Part II crimes, precludes analysis by specific types of offenses. St. Paul Police Department was reluctant to release data that they described as "not reliable". Examination of Crime Incident reports from their records office did not indicate that victim or suspect information was collected.

More recent or an ongoing series of law enforcement agency reports may provide detailed views of offense such as by specific offense type, precinct, neighborhood and time frame. Increased public access to this type of data should help improve data collection practices by holding public agencies accountable for policies and practices.

Ultimately these reports only can describe that portion of crime that is known by or reported to law enforcement agencies.

In the mean time, the Racial Disparities Initiative needs to take actions across multiple fronts to reduce the disparity. This will require small steps to find funding and to determine what solutions work best for specific groups. This requires some form of evaluation of how strategies are selected, how implemented, and impact data to measure effectiveness. Documentation is needed to describe the process and to create lessons for specific problems and system wide application that can be replicated within different populations. Alternative approaches are needed to study differences in victimization and offending in American Indian, Latino, and other communities.

Finally it is important to realize that the total crime picture is influenced by many variables. Valid assessments are only possible through focused attention on the unique conditions affecting each law enforcement jurisdiction. Levels and severity of crime can be shaped by a number of factors, such as:

- Undercounting of offenses in UCR statistics when only the most serious is charged or counted
- Legislative changes defining criminal offenses
- Population density and size, and degree of urbanization
- Stability of the population, including commuters, seasonal residents and other transient types
- Composition of the population in terms of age, sex and race
- Regional educational, familial, economic, recreational and religious characteristics
- Climatic conditions, including seasonal weather variations
- Administrative and investigative efficiency of local law enforcement, including the degree of adherence to crime reporting standards
- Policies of local law enforcement agencies, prosecuting officials and the courts
- Modifications to records procedures, incomplete reporting or changes in a jurisdiction's boundaries
- Public attitudes toward crime, reporting of crime — especially minor offenses — and law enforcement
- Lack of crime reporting due to the perception that law enforcement will be of little help or to fear of embarrassment, threat, blackmail or retaliation for participating in an offense considered against societal norms

Many policy decisions are made based on data collected by law enforcement agencies. Yet this single perspective may provide a one-sided view of crime and justice issues and distort underlying issues where potential solutions may reside.

"Race is not rocket science," notes Christopher Edley in the foreword to America Becoming. "It's harder than rocket science."

Lessons, ideas and feedback from Randall Kennedy's Chapter **Racial Trends in the Administration of Criminal Justice** in ***America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences*****,** Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001. http://books.nap.edu/books/0309068401/html/1.html

Most social scientists as a whole, tend to focus on the effects of deliberate discrimination to the exclusion of equally relevant indirect factors (structural factor or cultural factors). The most distressing aspects of the official response to the problems of inequality and injustice is the lack of public concern and attentiveness.

Not only are Blacks far more likely than Whites to be arrested and punished for crime, they are also more likely to be crime victims. Thus, in comparison to other racial and ethnic groups, Blacks are in greater need of the protection afforded by the justice system and would, therefore, stand to gain most from a justice system that provides effective crime deterrence and expeditious punishment. The current reality is that the ability of the American justice system to provide the protection needed by Blacks is severely compromised by the persistence of racial bias and discrimination on the part of the protectors.

The combination of higher rates of crime and higher levels of police attention produce disproportionate numbers of arrests among some groups. Across race and ethnic groups, concerns about both of these kinds of bias are regularly reported: under-enforcement of laws within a minority community and over-punishment when that community is seen as a threat to the majority. These two kinds of bias can balance each other in simple studies.

These studies of prison disproportionality show that the bulk of the disparity is attributable to factors outside the criminal justice system. That makes it particularly important to address the many other factors that contribute to differential involvement in crime, and particularly the most serious crime. To his credit, nowhere in his essay does Kennedy suggest that currently high rates of homicide, assault, robbery, and property offenses found in many Black communities can be significantly reduced merely through the implementation of the race-neutral justice administration polices he advocates.

Does this mean that groups with high victimization rates also have high offending rates? Yes, but with three crucial caveats. First, it is essential to remember that most crime is committed by whites. Their offending rates may be low, but there are so many of them that they still manage to commit most of the crime. Second, the chances that a young adult has ever committed a violent offense is roughly equal across races. This is what social scientists call the "ever prevalence rate," and it is the percentage of people who, by a certain age, have at least once in his or her lifetime committed a certain act. The "ever

prevalence rate" for committing a violent crime is roughly the same for black and white people. The difference in violent crime rates among these two groups is a function of the greater number of offenses committed each year by those in certain groups and of their persistence in such behavior over time. Third, community conditions seem to be the reason that crime falls so heavily on some groups. The more sophisticated analyses today focus on neighborhoods, and they show us that the differences in victimization and offending rates between groups may have more to do with neighborhood and community conditions than with race itself. Where people live in neighborhoods of concentrated disadvantage, victimization and offending rates are high. When researchers compare similar neighborhoods of different races, the racial differences seem to disappear.

Clearly, race trends in crime and violence are responsive to the same economic, social structural, psychological, and ecological forces that shape other manifestations of racial inequality in the United States. Significant progress toward addressing racial disportionality in crime on justice will depend on progress in these broader social, economic, and political domains. Unfortunately, even as the nation enters a new millennium, these potentially corrective domains also continue to be plagued by problems of racial bias and disparity. The declines in crime over recent years leave us with two important lessons. First, they remind us of the power of neighborhood disadvantage, for as stark as the black/white differences are, they disappear when researchers control for housing conditions. Second, they remind us of the power these communities have to help themselves. There are some aspects of the drop in crime for which police can claim the credit, and there is plenty of crime reduction for everybody to claim some, but this drop, occurring over 20 years, exceeds the reach of any single program or administration. It is an example of cultural change and communities working to heal themselves.

DEFINITIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CRIME

Part I Offenses reflect information on eight "serious" crime classifications, and it is generally referred to as the "Crime Index" measurement. Part II Offenses are represented by twenty "less serious" crime classifications.

The eight crimes represented in the Part I Offenses include murder, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson. These crimes were chosen because of their uniformity of definition, total volumes, and likelihood of being reported. The crimes of murder, rape, aggravated assault, and robbery are also known as "violent crimes." The crimes of burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson are labeled as "property crimes." The law enforcement agency may become aware of these crimes in several ways; reports of its own officers, citizens complaints, notification from the prosecuting attorney and from information supplied by court officials.

PART I OFFENSES (Serious Crime)

Criminal Homicide - The killing of another person.

a. Murder - Any unlawful killing of a human being in which the element of malice aforethought was present in the murder.
b. Manslaughter - Any unlawful killing of a human being without the element of malice aforethought is counted as manslaughter.
c. Death by Negligence - Any death that occurs because of the negligence of some person other than the victim and that is not in the commission of an unlawful act. These are deaths which police investigation established as primarily caused by gross negligence.

Forcible Rape (does not include Statutory Rape).

a. Rape by Force - The carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will, but excluding statutory rape and other sex offenses.
b. Assault to Rape-Attempts - All assaults and attempts to rape.

Robbery - A robbery is defined as the felonious and forcible taking of property of another against his will by violence or by putting him in fear. This includes all attempts.

a. Armed Robbery-Any Weapon - When any object is so employed as to constitute force or the threat of force, it will be considered a weapon. This would include firearms, knives, clubs, brass knuckles, blackjacks, broken bottles, acid, explosives, etc. Cases involving possible pretended weapons or cases involving weapons not seen by the victim but which the robber claims to have with him should be counted in this category.
b. Strong Arm-No Weapons - This includes muggings and similar offenses where no weapon is used by strong-arm tactics are employed to deprive the victim of his property. This definition is limited to hands, arms, fists, feet, etc. Include all attempts.

Aggravated Assault - An Aggravated Assault is an attempt or offer with unlawful force or violence to do physical injury to another. As a general rule all assaults will be classified and scored in this category. Exclude assaults with intent to rob or rape. Excludes simple assault, assault and battery, fighting, etc. These will be scored in the appropriate category.

a. Gun - Includes all assaults or attempted assaults involving the use of any type of firearm. This includes revolvers, automatic pistols, shotguns, zip guns, pellet guns, etc.
b. Knife or Cutting Instrument - Includes all assaults or attempted assaults involving the use of cutting or stabbing objects such as knives or razors, hatchets, axes, cleavers, scissors, glass, broken bottles, daggers, ice picks, etc.
c. Other Dangerous Weapons - Includes all assaults or attempted assaults when an object other than a gun, knife or cutting instrument is used. This includes clubs, bricks, jack handles, bottles, explosives, acid, lye, poisons, scalding water, and cases of attempted drowning and burning, etc.
d. Hands, Fists, Feet, etc.-Aggravated - Includes all assaults with hands, fists, feet, etc., which could result in an aggravated assault conviction. In order to be classified as aggravated, the victim must suffer great bodily harm.

Burglary - Breaking and Entering - Includes any unlawful entry or attempted forcible entry of any structure to commit a felony or larceny. As a general rule, score as one offense, any unlawful entry or attempted forcible entry of any dwelling, attached structure, public building, shop, factory, storehouse, apartment, house, trailer, warehouse, mill, farm, ship, railroad car, etc. For UCR purposes, breaking and entering with larceny is classified and scored only as breaking and entering. This does not include breaking and entering of motor vehicles. These are scored in the larceny category.

a. Forcible Entry - Includes all offenses where force of any kind is used to unlawfully enter a locked structure such as any of those listed above with intent to steal or commit a felony. This includes entry by use of a master key, celluloid, or other device that leaves no outward mark but is used to open a lock. Concealment inside a building followed by breaking out of the structure should also be scored here.
b. Unlawful Entry-No Force - Includes any unlawful entry when you fail to discover any evidence of forcible entry.
c. Attempted Forcible Entry - Included in this category only when your investigation determines that a forcible entry has been attempted.

Larceny-Theft (does not include Motor Vehicle Theft) - This category includes the unlawful taking of the property of another with intent to deprive him of ownership. This involves all larcenies and thefts resulting from pocket picking, purse snatching, shoplifting, larceny from auto, larceny of auto parts and accessories, bicycle theft, larceny from buildings, and larceny from any coin operated machines. Any theft that is not a robbery or any theft that does not result from a breaking and entering shall be scored here. Excludes embezzlements, unlawful conversions, larceny by bailee, frauds or bad checks. Enter all attempted larcenies. Note: when the true or known value of stolen property is not available, estimates based on accepted police methods of property evaluation should be used for the purposes of Uniform Crime Reporting.

Motor Vehicle Theft - This category includes larceny or attempted larceny of motor vehicles. Includes all thefts and attempted thefts of motor vehicles. This includes all vehicles which can be registered as a motor vehicle in this state. Excludes incidents in which the alleged offender had lawful access to the vehicle as in a family situation or the unauthorized use by others having lawful access to the vehicle such as chauffeur, employee, etc.

Arson - Includes all arrests for violation of state law and municipal ordinances relating to arson and attempted arson. This generally includes any willful or malicious burning of a dwelling, church, college, jail, meeting house, public building, ship or other vessel, motor vehicle, aircraft, contents of building, personal property of another, goods or chattels, crops, trees, fences, gates, grain, vegetable products, lumber, woods, marshes, meadows, etc. A death resulting from arson will be classified as murder and personal injuries resulting would be classified as assaults .

PART II OFFENSES (Less Serious Crime)

Other Assaults - This classification consists of all assaults and attempted assaults which are simple or minor in nature.

Forgery and Counterfeiting - In this case, place all offenses dealing with the making, altering, uttering or possession with intent to defraud, anything false in a semblance of that which is true. Include altering or forging of public or other records, making, altering, forging or counterfeiting coins, plates, banknotes, checks, etc. Possessing or uttering forged or counterfeited instruments, signing the name of another or a fictitious person with intent to defraud and all attempts to commit any of the above acts.

Fraud - This is defined as fraudulent conversion and obtaining money by false pretense. Include bad checks, confidence games, etc., except forgeries and counterfeiting.

Embezzlement - This is the misappropriation or misapplication of money or property entrusted to one's care, custody, or control.

Stolen Property-Buying, Receiving, Possessing -This includes all offenses of buying, receiving, possessing, or concealing stolen property as well as all attempts to commit any of these offenses.

Vandalism-Destruction of Property - This includes all willful or malicious destruction, injury, disfigurement or defacement of any public or private property, real or personal, without the consent of the owner or person having custody or control by cutting, tearing, breaking, marking, painting, drawing, covering with filth or any other such means as may be specified by law.

Weapons - This classification includes violation of weapon laws such as the manufacture, sale, or possession of deadly weapons or silencers, carrying deadly weapons, aliens possessing deadly weapons, and all attempts to commit any of the above offenses.

Prostitution and Commercialized Vice - Include in this class the sex offenses of a commercialized nature such as prostitution, keeping a bawdy house, disorderly house, or house of ill repute, pandering, procuring, transporting or detaining women for immoral purposes, etc., and all attempts to commit any of the above.

Sex Offenses - This includes all sex offenses other than forcible rape, prostitution, and commercialized vice. This encompasses offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like such as adultery and fornication, buggery, incest, indecent exposure, sodomy, carnal abuse (no force), and all attempts to commit any of the above.

Narcotic Drug Laws - This includes all arrests for the violation of state and local ordinances, specifically those relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, manufacturing, and making of narcotic drugs.

Gambling - Includes all charges relating to promoting, permitting, or engaging in gambling.

Offenses Against Family and Children - Includes all charges of non-support, neglect, or abuse of family and children by such acts as desertion, abandonment, or non-support, neglect or abuse of a child, or nonpayment of alimony.
Driving Under the Influence - This classification is limited to driving or operating any vehicle while under the influence of liquor or narcotic drugs.
Liquor Laws - With the exception of drunkenness and driving under the influence, all state or local liquor law violations are placed in this class. Excludes federal violations, includes manufacturing, selling, transporting and furnishing as in maintaining unlawful drinking places. Bootlegging, operating a still, furnishing liquor to a minor and the using of a vehicle for illegal transportation of liquor are included.
Drunkenness - No longer reported under the UCR program in Minnesota. This offense was repealed in Minnesota on July 1, 1971 (MSS 340.96; C 90, S2).
Disorderly Conduct-Disturbing the Peace-This includes all disorderly persons arrested who cannot be classified under Offenses of Criminal Homicide, Forcible Rape, Drunkenness, or Vagrancy.
Vagrancy - This classification indicates arrests for failure of an individual to give a good account of himself, begging, loitering, etc.
All Other Offenses - Include in this class every other state or local offense not included, except traffic. This encompasses abduction and compelling to marry, abortion (death resulting from criminal abortion, according to statutes, is a criminal homicide), bastardy and concealing death of a bastard, bigamy and polygamy, blackmail and extortion, bribery, contempt of court, discrimination and unfair competition, kidnapping, offenses contributing to juvenile delinquency, perjury, possession, repair, manufacturing, etc., of burglary tools, possession or sale of obscene literature and unlawful use, possession, etc., of explosives, etc.
Suspicion - This category is used for unknown incidents when the actual offense has not been determined.
Curfew and Loitering Law Violation (Juvenile) - This area shows offenses relating to local curfew or loitering ordinances, where such laws exist. It is limited to juveniles taken into protective custody who have run away from the reporting jurisdiction.
Runaways (Juveniles) - This classification is limited to juveniles taken into protective custody under provisions of State Statutes.

Source: http://www.dps.state.mn.us/bca/CJIS/Documents/Crime2000/Page-14-004.html

Defining the Disparity Project: Offense Report
Council on Crime and Justice, Racial Disparity Initiative

Index

Offense Report Background……1

Other Victimization Research……...…...…1

Goals and Obstacles for RDI Offense Report……...……...…3

Minneapolis Report: January 1 to June 30, 2000…….……...…4

Recommendations for Minneapolis Reports……...…7

Observations ……...…8

America Becoming……....…11

Crime Definitions ……...……...…13

Appendix 1

Minneapolis Victim, Suspect and Arrestee by Race and Crime Level

Rates per 1,000 Population by Race
Citywide Data Completeness

Citywide Statistics and Percentages
Citywide Rates and Ratios

Minneapolis Victim, Suspect and Arrestee by Race and Crime Level
by Precinct
Charts by Precinct

Minneapolis PD Offense Report Examples