

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CLERY ACT TASK FORCE

REPORT

April 12, 2001

**Prepared by:
Office of the Senior Vice President
Business and Finance
University of California**

April 12, 2001

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
CLERY ACT TASK FORCE
REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
- Press coverage	1
- Department of Education Inquiry & Status	1
- UC Discussions and Formation of Task Force	1
- Summary of Task Force Findings and Recommendations	2
II. <u>METHODS</u>	3
III. <u>BACKGROUND</u>	
- The Clery Act	3
IV. <u>FINDINGS</u>	6
- September Training Session	6
- Department of Education Website	6
- Annual Campus Security Reports	7
- Consultant Finding	8
- Training Sessions	9
- Department of Education Inquiry	10
- Ideas and Recommendations from Campus Discussions	10
V. <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	12
VI. <u>SUMMARY</u>	15
<u>APPENDIX I</u>	Task Force Membership
<u>APPENDIX II</u>	Task Force Materials
<u>APPENDIX III</u>	Campus Reports & Materials
<u>APPENDIX IV</u>	Campus Variations in Techniques
<u>APPENDIX V</u>	Dolores Stafford's Review
<u>APPENDIX VI</u>	Key Areas for Improvement
<u>APPENDIX VII</u>	Training Session Agenda
<u>APPENDIX VIII</u>	Focus Groups

APRIL 12, 2001
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
CLERY ACT TASK FORCE
REPORT

VI. INTRODUCTION

Press coverage

On September 24, 2000 the Sacramento Bee (the Bee) newspaper began a series of articles containing allegations that the University of California underreported crime statistics as required by the Clery Act. Eight articles appeared in the Bee between September 24, 2000 and September 28, 2000. The Bee focused mainly on the Davis, Irvine and Riverside campuses, but also reported on other campuses throughout the system.

In the meantime, on October 2, 2000 S. Daniel Carter, Vice President for Security on Campus, Inc., sent a formal complaint to the Department of Education in which he included excerpts from the September 24th and 25th Sacramento Bee articles. He also included an article from the Los Angeles Times, "Quality of Campus Justice Varies Widely" from May 10, 2000 and a copy of his letter of May 11, 2000 to the Department of Education. On October 5, 2000, Connie and Howard Clery, who Co-Founders of Security on Campus, Inc., wrote to Senator Arlen Specter demanding he insist that the Department of Education enforce the requirements of the Clery Act. They cited the Bee articles as an example of contempt for the law.

Department of Education Inquiry & Status

Carter's letter of October 2, 2000 was acted upon by the Department of Education on October 11, 2000 in a letter to the University of California which initiated a series of discussions between October 2000 and January 2001. On January 12, 2001, the Department formally asked the University to respond to these complaints. The Office of the President, through its Department of Information Resources and Communication is coordinating this response with the campuses.

UC Discussions and Formation of Task Force

The press coverage and nature of the Bee's allegations about the type and frequency of crime they alleged as not reported was taken very seriously. The University determined that further information on campus Clery Act compliance efforts was needed. The University of California is committed to maintaining a safe environment for all members of its community: students, faculty, and staff. Compliance with the Clery Act is a component of our publication and distribution of statistics on many topics and our current

and prospective students, faculty, staff, need to be assured that they have accurate and timely information available to them when making choices about their safety.

The University responded by forming a Clery Act Task Force (Task Force) on September 28, 2000. Since the Department of Education inquiry is intended to determine the validity or invalidity of the Bee allegations and the University is committed to making any corrections needed as a result of this inquiry, the Task Force focused on whether or not campuses of the University of California are in full compliance, whether new or revised procedures are needed to further implement the Clery Act, and on identifying best practices for campuses to follow. Chaired by the Senior Vice President for Business and Finance, membership included representatives from key offices involved with Clery Act compliance: Information Resources and Communications, Police Departments, Student Affairs, Ombudsperson offices, University External Relations, and General Counsel. Membership on the Task Force is listed in Appendix 1. The following presents the methods, findings, and recommendations of the Task Force.

Summary of Task Force Findings and Recommendations

Overall the Task Force found good faith efforts in statistical reporting, and report publications. Through the help of an outside consultant the Task Force determined that good faith efforts were made to report crimes to the community through Clery Act required formats. There was no evidence that campuses deliberately underreported crime. In fact, some campuses over reported crimes. However, since the law's inception there have been multiple interpretations and protracted discussions of compliance requirements both nationally and within the University. As a result, campuses have interpreted compliance requirements differently and there are significant variations in compliance documents, policies, and procedures throughout the system.

Campuses have outstanding crime prevention and safety awareness programs and the University of California has, for many years, focused attention on raising awareness regarding crime on campuses and in surrounding areas, as well as on prevention and on ensuring the availability of adequate and appropriate support services. Specific programs throughout the UC campuses include: crime prevention and safety education classes offered at new student orientations and throughout the school year; self-defense classes; rape/sexual assault programs; e-mail/campus newspaper/residence hall postings of crime watch alerts; websites and brochures on safety and crime prevention; night safety shuttles; escort services; and special emergency telephones throughout the campuses.

In general, the Task Force recommends clearer accountability and direction be established for Clery Act compliance, that campuses follow one set of standard guidelines for compliance activities, that the Office of the President establish a central clearing house and process for timely resolution of Clery Act compliance questions, that each campus appoint a senior executive as the person accountable for Clery Act compliance, and that each campus recognize and allocate the resources necessary to effect full compliance activities. With these measures, the Task Force believes the University of California as a whole will be able to deliver all the necessary components

of compliance activities in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Detailed recommendations are listed under Section V of this report.

VII. METHODS

The Task Force met four times on October 24, 2000, December 4, 2000, January 10, 2001, and April 11, 2001. In preparation for their work an extensive set of materials was compiled for information and review. These materials included present law, regulations, and compliance guidelines, newspaper articles, Department of Education Clery Act Program Reviews at other colleges and universities, current UC campus crime reports, UC campus crime statistics posted on the Department of Education Clery Act website, UC oversight and administrative structure for Clery Act Compliance, best practices from other colleges and universities, and other crime reporting and compliance issues. In addition materials from the past ten years of the Clery Act were made available to the Task Force. A detailed list of materials is provided in Appendix 2.

To assess each campus's compliance efforts, the Task Force outlined a series of tasks:

1. Members of the Task Force discussed compliance issues with the University Police Chiefs, Student Judicial Affairs Officers, Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellors for Administration, and Chancellors at each campus.
2. Staff to the Task Force met, by phone or in person, with each campus to identify all Clery Act Compliance publications, policies, procedures, and statistics. A comprehensive set of policies, procedures, and publications was compiled from all UC campuses (Appendix 3).
3. The Task Force retained the services of an expert in Clery Act compliance rules and techniques, Dolores Stafford, Police Chief at George Washington University. Chief Stafford was hired as a consultant to review compliance activities at three of our campuses, Davis, Irvine and Riverside. Chief Stafford was also retained to conduct training sessions for campus Clery Act compliance.
4. The Task Force held a final meeting on April 11, 2001 to review its findings and approve these recommendations.

VIII. BACKGROUND

The Clery Act

All colleges and universities receiving Title IV funding from the Department of Education (funding in support of various financial aid programs such as the Pell Grant), are required to comply with a variety of laws to maintain institutional eligibility for receipt of these funds. Compliance with the "Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus

Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998,” 20 U.S.C. 1092(f), (the Clery Act), is required under Title IV.

The Clery Act of 1998 replaces a law passed by Congress in 1990 as part of the Higher Education Act, “The Student Right-To-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990,” 20 U.S.C. 1092(f). The Campus Security Act was first introduced during the 101st Congress as House of Representative’s Bill 3344 by Representative Bill Goodling (R-PA) and as Senate Bill 1925 by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA). The goal of the legislation, as stated by Representative Goodling, was “to assist students in making decisions which affect their personal safety...” and “to make sure institutions of higher education provide students, prospective students and faculty the information they need to avoid becoming the victims of campus crime.” The Campus Security Act, renamed the “Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crime Statistics Act of 1998” was renamed in memory of Jeanne Clery, a Lehigh University student who was raped and murdered on campus in 1986. Jeanne Clery’s parents, Howard and Connie, fought for the original law and founded Security on Campus after they discovered that the students at Lehigh had not been told about 38 violent crimes on campus in the three years before their daughter’s murder. President Bush signed the Act on November 8, 1990.

The first Department of Education regulations were issued in 1994 as the Campus Security Act. The October 1, 1998 amendments expanded campus responsibilities for recording crime statistics, the number of people from whom colleges must collect statistics, and revised reporting methods and deadlines. The Department of Education regulations implementing the 1998 amendments to the Clery Act were adopted November 1, 1999, and became effective July 1, 2000.

The 1999 regulations define and clarify reporting obligations for various geographic locations, clarify the responsibilities of counselors, add new categories of crimes to be reported and new policies to be disclosed, clarify how to compile and describe crime statistics, changed the date for disclosure of the annual security report to October 1, and requires the maintenance of a publicly available crime log.

Specifically, these regulations require:

1. Crime statistics must be posted annually on the Department of Education website by the required deadline;
2. Campuses must publish an Annual Campus Security report including crime statistics and information about all aspects of Clery Act compliance as follows:
 - i. Crimes must be reported by the required Clery Act locations (on-campus, in residence halls (a subset of on-campus), non-campus, and public property);
 - ii. Three years of crime statistics must be reported according to the requirements of the Clery Act law pertaining to each year (for October 2000, crimes statistics were required for 1997 and 1998 according to the 1994

regulations; and for 1999 according to the November 1, 1999 regulations). Records to verify these crimes must be kept for seven years¹;

- iii. Reports of crimes from campus and local police as well as from campus security authorities must be included (campuses must make formal requests for information from local police). Campus security authorities include, for example, a dean of students who oversees student housing, a student center, or student extracurricular activities, a coach, residence hall advisor, etc...Licensed mental health counselors and pastors are specifically excluded from reporting requirements;
- iv. Crime statistics must include murder, non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, forcible sex offenses, non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, arson, hate crimes by category of prejudice, and arrests and referrals for campus disciplinary actions for liquor, drug, and weapons violations.
 - Crimes must be classified according to the definitions established by the Clery Act. This means that separate sets of statistics must be maintained to comply with both FBI and Clery Act reporting requirements. For example, some thefts as defined under California State Code, are defined as burglaries under the Clery Act. That is, if a “residence hall is a locked facility where one would need to be authorized to enter that facility and something is taken from someone in that structure, the incident should be classified as a burglary unless it can be shown that the person who took the item was a resident of the building and therefore was in the building “lawfully.” If that cannot be proven, then the incident must be classified as a burglary according to UCR definitions.”²
- v. Statements of institutional security policies as listed in the Clery Act;
- vi. Statements of institutional security programs as listed in the Clery Act;
- vii. Distribution and notice of the Annual Campus Security report to enrolled students, prospective students, current employees, and prospective employees that includes a statement of the security report’s availability, the

¹ Section 668.24 of the Student Assistance General Provisions provides the record keeping requirements for an institution to administer the student financial assistance programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Generally, an institution must retain records for three years. An institution is required to maintain campus security records to document the information it must include in its annual security report, which must include information covering the previous three calendar years. For example, an institution must include campus security information for the 1997 calendar year in its 1998, 1999, and 2000 annual security reports. The report must be distributed annually by October 1. Therefore, records for 1997 must be maintained until October 1, 2003 (seven years).

² Excerpted from Chief Dolores Stafford’s reports on the Davis, Irvine, and Riverside campus, Appendix 5 to this report.

exact electronic address if it is posted on a website, a brief description of its contents, and a statement that a paper copy of the report will be provided upon request;

- viii. Public access to a daily crime log; and
- ix. Timely warnings of crime activities to the community.

IV. FINDINGS

At its first meeting the Task Force discussed the history and complexity of the Clery Act. Since 1990 the law has been subject to multiple interpretations, rulings, and decisions on what to report, from whom to collect crime statistics and the identification of locations from which to report. Between 1994 and 1999 the Department of Education circulated several “Dear Colleague” letters that spoke to a variety of ambiguities in the regulations. The 1999 regulations provided a new benchmark; however, they also added compliance requirements that necessitated a new set of interpretations and rulings. In addition, the Department of Education instituted a website for reporting crime statistics along with a requirement that colleges and universities post their crime statistics on this website by October 12, 2000 (the deadline was extended to October 24, 2000 because of technical difficulties). The website is supposed to provide college and university community members and prospective members with a comparison of crime activity throughout the nation.

September Training Session

On September 18, 2000, the Office of the President, through the department of Information Resources and Communications held a training session for campus police chiefs and issued a guideline titled “Implementing the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act.” This guideline outlined the required contents of the Annual Campus Security Report, distribution and notice of the report, other requirements of the act, definitions of annual crime statistics, required institutional security policies, ongoing requirements, requirements and directions for reporting statistics on the Department of Education website, and samples of reporting techniques from various campuses.

This training also included the expertise of John Reilly, from Ohio State University who shared his Clery Act compliance materials with the group. This training session was instrumental in assisting campuses in accurately reporting crime this past fall.

Department of Education Website

All campuses of the University of California reported crime statistics on the required Department of Education website by the required deadlines. Campuses varied in their ability to report crime statistics for all locations, from local police departments, and from campus security authorities. The website did not allow accurate entries of “not available”

or “not applicable.” As a result, some campuses show zeros where in fact the information was not available or not applicable. Footnotes were used extensively to clearly describe these situations. The Task Force understands that the Department of Education is working on website improvements for the year 2001.

Annual Campus Security Reports

All campuses published an Annual Campus Security report. A complete list is provided in Appendix 3. Some campuses published complete booklets on crime safety that included the Annual Campus Security report, while others published short fliers that contain pieces of the Annual Campus Security report. However, each campus included in their Annual Campus Security report the required crime statistics as they were able to obtain and report them.

Following staff conversations with each campus and review of the Fall 2000 Clery Act Compliance documents and reports, the Task Force was provided with a list of Campus Variations in Techniques for Implementing the Clery Act. This documented nine areas where significantly different approaches and/or philosophies were employed to effect compliance. For instance, when identifying and including crime statistics from non-campus buildings, some campuses included statistics from all off-campus sites with university-related functions such as fraternities and sororities, medical clinics, and University Extension sites. Other campuses did not consider these types of locations to be under the auspices of the University and therefore did not gather or report statistics from these locations. Still other campuses considered these locations to be under the auspices of the University, but were not able to distinguish statistics for these locations from local police department databases that did not give exact addresses or did not distinguish between public and private buildings. A complete list of campus variations is provided in Appendix 4.

Campuses worked hard to prevent sexual assault occurrences and violent crime occurrences. Each campus has extensive sexual assault prevention and victim assistance programs and these are reflected in their specific statements on institutional security policies and programs. Furthermore, there are extensive crime prevention programs that are tailored to each campus such as escort services, building access and security programs, lighting, and grounds and maintenance programs that help to ensure the safety of our campus communities. Not all campuses however, have a full description of the security policies and programs in their Annual Security Report as required by the Clery Act.

The University of California has a single undergraduate application for admission. The application includes a statement on the availability of Annual Campus Security reports. It does not contain a description of what is contained in the Annual Campus Security report, nor does it provide information on exactly where to obtain the report at each campus. Not all applications for graduate school, professional schools, and for employment contain the required notice of Annual Campus Security report availability.

In terms of notifying current students and employees of the availability of this report, some campuses sent postcards and copies of their report to all students and employees, while others posted the notice on their campus website.

Finally, each campus had in place policies and procedures for issuing timely warnings to the community about crimes that are a threat to their safety.

Consultant Findings

As mentioned above, the Task Force retained the services of Chief Dolores Stafford from George Washington University to review the three campuses that were mentioned most frequently in the September newspaper articles. Chief Stafford has been involved in compliance efforts under the Clery Act since the law was first introduced and she is often consulted by the Department of Education during Clery Act rulemaking. Chief Stafford is also active in the IACLEA, the professional association of college and university police, which serves as a nationwide forum for information exchange and training for Clery Act compliance.

Chief Stafford visited the Davis, Irvine, and Riverside campuses on November 30, 2000, December 2, 2000, and December 5, 2000, respectively. She reported her initial findings to the Task Force on December 4, 2000. Her report on all three campuses is provided as Appendix 5 to this report. In each instance Chief Stafford noted that all three campuses had made an earnest attempt to comply with the Clery Act this year. The Irvine and Riverside campuses were out of compliance in previous years, while the Davis campus had been making a concerted effort for the last several years.

All three campuses lacked a full complement of policy statements on security programs. Even though each campus had in place most of the necessary security programs, they did not have descriptions of the policies that guide these programs in their Annual Campus Security Reports.

The UC systemwide application for undergraduate admissions needs to be expanded to provide information about the availability of the security report, a description of its contents, and how to request a copy of the report.

Distribution of the Annual Campus Security report was uneven and inconsistent between these three campuses.

Crime statistics were missing for some branch campus locations such as Bodega Bay Marine Laboratory, the UC Irvine Medical Center, and for some non-campus buildings. Residence hall statistics were not reported separately at each of these campuses.

Chief Stafford found errors in the number of crimes reported but not because of any intent to hide crime. In some instances crimes were over-reported. Errors were the result of incorrect classification of crimes under Clery Act definitions, of being unable to verify all the crimes reported, of having uncertainty about locations from which to report, of

having uncertainty about from whom to collect statistics, and as a result of some typographical errors. She also found some general confusion about reporting DUIs for alcohol and drug offenses. Furthermore, hate crimes were not always reported by category of prejudice.

Chief Stafford found no evidence of intent to not comply with the law, but did find a lack of information and/or clarity of information that prevented each campus from fully complying with the law. Her findings were communicated in draft form to each campus on January 29, 2001, and each campus was asked to review her report and comment. Each campus responded positively to the draft reports and has already implemented actions to correct their compliance programs post haste.

On December 4, 2000 the Task Force recommended that Chief Stafford's initial findings be addressed immediately, including the need for written policies regarding the issuing of timely warnings, corrected notification language and notification procedures, the need for easily accessible records that verify all reported crime statistics and Clery Act compliance efforts, separate reporting for branch or separate campuses, reporting of hate crimes by category of prejudice, reporting statistics by calendar year instead of academic year, clarification of reporting crimes from various geographic locations, and the need for written policies and procedures from all programs mentioned in the Clery Act. Campuses were advised to implement these improvements immediately through a guideline issued by Senior Vice President Mullinix on January 23, 2001, "Key Areas for Improvement of Clery Act Compliance Efforts," (Appendix 6).

Training Sessions

During the course of Chief Stafford's review, several campuses recommended that her detailed information and guidance be made available to all campuses as soon as possible. The Task Force agreed and recommended that the Office of the President hold two in-depth Clery Act Training Sessions with Chief Stafford (one in Northern California and one in Southern California). These sessions were held on March 1st and 2nd, in Northern California, and on March 5th and 6th, in Southern California. Vice Chancellors for Administration and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs at each campus were asked to identify key staff with compliance responsibilities to attend one of the training sessions.

The Northern California session was attended by thirty nine people and the Southern California session was attended by twenty three people. (A copy of the agenda is provided in Attachment 7). At each session Chief Stafford provided an overview of the Clery Act, reviewed practical applications, and provided information about compliance activities nationwide. Focus groups were held to identify issues that require tailoring for California and the University of California (listed in Appendix 8). Chief Stafford provided sample crime statistics collection letters and forms and record keeping formats used at George Washington University.

At each training session University Counsel Steve Drown issued draft UC Clery Act Guidelines for discussion and review. Each group was unanimous in their support of a

standardized set of guidelines, definitions, forms, and processes. Counsel Drown will incorporate the sample crime statistics collection letters and forms and record keeping formats into the UC Clery Act Guidelines.

Department of Education Inquiry

While Chief Stafford did not investigate the specific allegations made by the Sacramento Bee, she reported on December 4, 2000 that her review of the Davis and Irvine campuses did not substantiate the allegations of bad faith or intent to not report crime. Instead she found good faith efforts and very substantial compliance efforts.

The Bee's allegations are being investigated by the Department of Education and Office of the President through the Department of Information Resources and Communications. While the Task Force was not specifically charged with reviewing these allegations, it notes that the results of the inquiry will provide further clarification of reporting requirements that should be incorporated into the UC Clery Act Guidelines as soon as the results are available.

Ideas & Recommendations from police chiefs and campus security authorities

Through conversations with campus police chiefs, campus security authorities, and staff involved in Clery Act compliance, the Task Force learned of a series of ideas and issues that would assist campuses in compliance efforts:

- A systemwide protocol is needed. The Office of the President should be more directive and supportive on all aspects of Clery Act Compliance, including monitoring compliance efforts. A single person with clear responsibility and authority over all necessary offices needs to head this effort, followed by appropriate delegations of authority and responsibility.
- Develop an Office of the President mandated and sanctioned form for collecting information from campus security authorities.
- Develop a UC wide website with uniform reporting for Clery Act reported crime statistics and the Annual Campus Security Reports. This website should link to campus safety and security program websites.
- Place authority and responsibility for reporting in an office outside of the police department with authority to assure compliance efforts by all relevant entities. Police departments are usually the office that is best informed about the requirements to comply with all aspects of the Clery Act. The Police, however, do not have

authority or a clear line of communication to effect changes in admissions applications, employment applications, student judicial affairs offices, or campus security authorities. In some instances this has made it difficult to achieve full compliance. Because of this some campuses recommend that the responsibility for Clery compliance be assigned to a high level administrator (e.g. Provost or Executive Vice Chancellor) who has a clear line of communication to inform necessary offices and the authority to mandate reporting requirements to all necessary offices.

- Clarification is needed on how to report crime for affiliated and/or branch campus locations such as off-campus residence halls, off-campus or distant fraternity or sorority houses, University Extension classrooms, agricultural field stations, and cooperative extension programs.
- The notice on the undergraduate application for admissions should be complete.
- Efforts to comply present a serious staffing issue. Some campuses have not focused sufficient effort and resources on compliance. Staffing is needed on a full-time basis to train, collect data, enter data into various systems, compile statistics, and post them on the web. Information needs to exchange hands, be evaluated and verified. This requires developing relationships with the entire reporting community. Furthermore, the Clery Act changes each year and someone needs to stay abreast of the changing regulations. At one campus it was reported to take 1 to 1 ½ FTE to comply. At another campus it was reported that five people worked almost full-time for five months to comply this past Fall. There is also a significant cost to printing and distributing notice of the Annual Security Report, mailing postcards, e-mails, and printing copies of the Annual Security Report for wide distribution.
- Human Resource Offices need to receive clear guidance to issue appropriate notices in appropriate places, on applications, websites, etc...
- There are several pieces of legislation under consideration by Congress and the State legislature related to registration of sex offenders and fire alarm system reporting requirements. There is also a recently-adopted federal law that requires specific reporting related to registered sex offenders starting in 2002. Campuses would benefit by having all crime related reporting requirements within one set of guidelines.

- There is no clear campus responsibility for notifying faculty when they are offered a job. Campus departments handle the hiring and do not necessarily know how to notice the faculty.

V. TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Compliance is not a simple matter of checking off a list of data, policies, or procedures. It involves interpretation and correct categorization of verified and unverified crimes, collection of information from a wide range of sources both on campus and off campus, determination of the locations of verified and unverified crimes and whether crimes occurred in reportable locations, the development and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, appropriate notice and availability of information to current and prospective students and employees, and accurate reporting of each of these criteria in the appropriate places at the appropriate times. It behooves the University of California to speak with one voice on how to comply with this law. Each campus has worked in good faith and sincerity to interpret the law and design their own compliance techniques. In some cases they have been right, in other cases they have been wrong. It is both inefficient and ineffective to require ten different campuses to address this issue as individual entities.

1. The Task Force's first and foremost recommendation is to make it easier for our campuses to comply with this law. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that one office be established at the Office of the President as the University of California clearing house for Clery Act Compliance. Compliance efforts at the campuses should be monitored and supported by policy and procedure guidelines issued by this office. All questions on Clery Act Compliance should be referred to this office. As needed, staff in this office should consult with campuses, General Counsel, the Department of Education, and other concerned individuals or offices to obtain clear and concise determinations of how the University of California, as a whole, will approach each compliance issue.
2. The Office of the President structure should be echoed on each campus. The Task Force recommends that a single, high-level executive officer, to be designated by the Chancellor, such as the Executive Vice Chancellor, be assigned responsibility for assuring that all Clery Act compliance activities are taking place in a timely and correct way on each campus.
3. It is also clear that compliance requires a substantial amount of time and attention. Each campus should be sure that the appropriate level of resources is assigned to Clery Act Compliance activities.
4. The results of the Department of Education inquiry will provide further clarification of reporting requirements that should be incorporated into the UC Clery Act Guidelines as soon as the results are available.

5. Each campus reviewed by Chief Stafford is working on making the necessary changes to be in complete compliance with the Clery Act by implementing Chief Stafford's recommendations. The Task Force endorses both Chief Stafford's recommendations and these efforts and further recommends that all necessary changes be in place by June 1, 2001.
6. The University of California would be well served by implementing comprehensive UC Clery Act Guidelines for use by all campuses. The Guidelines should incorporate what we have learned from Chief Dolores Stafford's report, the best practices material that she and campuses provided, and input from the campuses. Furthermore, the Guidelines should be kept up-to-date on a timely basis and maintained by the UCOP clearing house. It is recommended that Assistant Vice President Dolgonas and Counsel Drown work with a committee of police chiefs and campus security authorities to prepare a working set of guidelines by June 1, 2001.
7. At the two Clery Act training sessions there was unanimous support for the development of a uniform format for reporting University of California campus crime statistics. The Task Force endorses this idea and recommends that a uniform format be prepared in time for reporting calendar year 2000 crime statistics in all the appropriate places. The format should also become part of the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
8. A crosswalk between the crime definitions of the FBI's Uniform Crime Report, California Penal Code, and Clery Act should be developed and maintained in the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
9. A central UC website on Clery Act Compliance with links to all campus sites should be established and maintained by the UCOP clearing house.
10. The Task Force recommended and acted upon the need for a training and information exchange for all campuses. The Task Force further recommends that an ongoing training program be established that will serve as a communication link, and as a vehicle for individuals throughout the system to become identified trainers and specialists in Clery Act Compliance. These individuals should participate actively in IACLEA and work closely with the Office of the President in an advisory capacity.
11. The University enters into leases, rentals, and purchases of real property as needed to support its academic mission and administrative needs. When new properties become occupied a determination must be made about whether they are or will be frequented by students. If they are frequented by students then they must be included in the Annual Campus Security report. The Task Force recommends therefore, that the UC Clery Act Guidelines include a requirement for all offices responsible for leases, rentals, and real property purchases to notify the campus or UCOP Clery Act Compliance office when entering into any of these transactions.

12. The Clery Act requires that annual crime statistics be verifiable for three years after they are reported in the Annual Campus Security reports. This equates to a seven year records retention requirement (see footnote under Section III.2.ii.) The Task Force recommends that the University of California's Policy and Procedures on Records Retention be amended to include this requirement and that the amended policy be distributed to all Clery Act Compliance offices. This requirement should also be reflected in the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
13. At the present time graduate and professional school applications do not contain the appropriate notice of crime report availability. The Task Force recommends that each graduate and professional school application be modified immediately upon the next printing of each to include the appropriate language as cited in the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
14. At the present time staff employment applications do not contain the appropriate notice of crime report availability. The Task Force recommends that all staff employment applications be modified immediately upon the next printing of each to include the appropriate language as cited in the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
15. Many academic employees are hired without processing a formal application. The Task Force recommends therefore, that appropriate notice about crime reports be provided on a postcard or piece of paper to all academic employees when they are completing their employment paperwork. The notice could be included on other forms if appropriate to the situation. This requirement should also be reflected in the UC Clery Act Guidelines.
16. Several reporting requirements need clarification and the Task Force recommends that clarification of these be assigned post haste to the UCOP clearing house for direction:
 - Each campus conducts a full UNEX program holding classes in a variety of off-campus sites. Clarification on crime reporting requirements for these locations is needed.
 - The University has agricultural field stations and cooperative extension offices throughout the State of California, in each county. The Task Force believes that a limited number of undergraduate and graduate students participate in research studies at some of these sites, depending on the nature of their research projects or supervision by faculty who are conducting research projects at these sites. Clarification on crime reporting requirements for these locations is needed.
 - The Clery Act requires reports of crime incidences from campus security authorities. Campus Security Authorities are people who oversee student and campus activities. This includes deans, coaches, residence hall advisors, etc... Specifically excluded from reporting requirements are licensed counselors,

physicians, and pastors. Federal Regulations do not expressly define the reporting requirements of campus ombudspersons. Confidentiality is a tenet of The Ombudsman Association and a fundamental part of the nature of an Ombudsperson office. The Task Force recognized the need to clarify the University Ombudspersons' reporting requirements and has asked the Office of General Counsel to work on this issue in conjunction with the framers of the UC Clery Act Guidelines, the Berkeley Staff Ombudsperson office, and the Senior Vice President for Business and Finance.

VI. SUMMARY

The Task Force is indebted to the University of California Police Chiefs, campus security authorities, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors for Administration, and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs for their prompt responses and open discussion of this complicated topic. The Task Force is also indebted to Chief Dolores Stafford for her insight and thoughtful guidance in evaluating our current compliance activities and for providing two in-depth training sessions.

The safety of our students, faculty, and staff is of the utmost importance. Each campus has in place very comprehensive crime prevention programs with special emphasis on the prevention of sexual assault and violent crime. Areas of non-compliance are primarily technical in nature and do not detract from the importance and priority of providing clear and comprehensive information on crime and crime prevention to our current and prospective members of the University community.

As stated in the report, clear accountability and direction is instrumental to compliance with the Clery Act. While the Task Force found areas of inconsistent or non-compliance, there were no findings of intent to avoid compliance with the Clery Act. Furthermore, the Task Force and Chief Stafford consistently found good faith efforts to be in full compliance. However, since the law's inception there have been multiple interpretations and protracted discussions of compliance requirements both nationally and within the University. This contributed to a relatively confusing set of guidelines that were different for each campus. The Task Force believes that the March Clery Act training sessions combined with the implementation of the above set of recommendations and the development of the revised set of UC Clery Act guidelines will deliver all the necessary components of compliance activities in the most efficient and effective manner possible.