



Police Accountability Board

Annual Report

June 2016 – June 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Mission of the PAB	1
History and Functions of the PAB	1
PAB Members and Alternates	2
PAB Administrative Advisory Group	3
PAB Membership and Training	3
PAB Meetings	5
Investigation of Cases and PAB Review	6
2016-2017 Trends	9
Cases Reviewed, PAB Findings and Status of Current PAB Cases	10
Policy, Procedure and Training Recommendations	11
Police Chief's Response to Recommendations	12
Summary of PAB Complaints, Cases Reviewed and Findings	13
Appendix	

September 21, 2017

INTRODUCTION

Enclosed is the UC Davis Police Accountability Board's ("PAB") 2016-17 Annual Report. From June 2016 to June 2017, the PAB received eighteen (18) complaints and, consistent with the PAB's procedures, closed seventeen (17) complaints. A complete summary of complaints received by the PAB, cases reviewed and PAB findings can be found in the chart at the end of this report.

MISSION OF THE PAB

Pursuant to direction from former Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi, a Police Accountability Board (PAB) was established in May 2014. The purpose of the PAB is to promote accountability, trust and communication between the University of California, Davis (UCD) community and the UCD Police Department (UCDPD) by independently reviewing and making recommendations regarding investigations of complaints made by members of the campus community and the general public (also referred to as civilian or community member complaints) in a fair and unbiased manner.

HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PAB

After consultation with an independent expert in police oversight and several campus forums, the PAB was established as pilot project in May 2014. Developing a police accountability program for the UC Davis Police Department is one component of a complex process of evaluating, restructuring and healing in response to the November 18, 2011 UC Davis pepper spraying incident. The Reynoso Task Force and the Robinson-Edley Reports, commissioned as a result of this incident, provided the background and context that led to the recommendation of the establishment of a police accountability program for the UCDPD. It was founded to restore trust between the police and the campus community.

The PAB is an independent board composed of students, staff and faculty from the UC Davis community. Working with independent campus investigators from the Office of Compliance and Policy, the PAB is charged with making recommended findings to the Chief of Police based on objective investigations into civilian complaints of misconduct filed against UCDPD officers. These recommendations are considered by the Chief of Police, who may accept, reject or modify the PAB's recommendation(s). The Chief may also take corrective actions based on these recommendations. The PAB also solicits

public input during open meetings, and may submit advisory recommendations to the Chief about UCDPD policies and procedures.

See Appendix for PAB Bylaws and Procedures. *Please note that the PAB Bylaws and Procedures currently are under revision. Updated versions will become available in Fall 2017 on the PAB website at <http://www.pab.ucdavis.edu>.*

PAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

The PAB is an independent board comprised of UC Davis staff, faculty and students.

As of June 2017, PAB members and alternates include:

Academic Senate

David Howitt (member)

Jack Chin (alternate)

UCD Health

Jacob (JP) Eres (member) – Vice Chair

Angela Carrasco (member)

Melissa Bauman (alternate)

Antionette Caruso (alternate)

Associated Students, UC Davis

Joshua Dalavai (member)

Davares Robinson (alternate)

Graduate Student Association

Ralph Washington (member) – Chair

Ken Thomas (alternate)

Staff Assembly

Paul Cody (member)

Peter Blando (alternate)

Student Life

Yajaira Ramirez Sigala (member)

Parteek Singh (alternate)

PAB ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY GROUP

The PAB is supported by the Office of Campus Community Relations and the Office of Compliance and Policy.

PAB Administrative Advisory Group:

Rahim Reed, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor of Campus Community Relations

Interim Chief Jennifer Garcia, UC Davis Police Department

Wendy Lilliedoll, Director of Investigations, Office of Compliance and Policy

Mikael Villalobos, Associate Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Campus Community Relations

Larisa King, Compliance Analyst, Office of Compliance and Policy

Megan Macklin, Program Manager, Office of Campus Community Relations

External Counsel:

Laura Izon, Kronick, Moskowitz, Tiedemann & Girard

PAB MEMBERSHIP AND TRAINING

A. Board Membership

The PAB is comprised of seven (7) members who broadly represent the diversity of the UCD community. The PAB includes:

Two (2) undergraduate students;

One (1) graduate student;

One (1) faculty member;

One (1) staff member; and

Two (2) UCD Health members (who can be students, faculty or staff).

In addition to these seven (7) members, there are seven (7) alternates. Generally, PAB members and alternates serve two- (2) year terms. Some served shorter terms when they were not qualifying representatives of their organization for the entire period of their appointment. In March 2016, the board voted to allow the extension of service terms for up to one additional year if approval is given by a representative's entity.

The following entities nominate individuals for representation on the PAB:

Academic Federation; Academic Senate; Associated Students, UCD; Graduate Student Association; Staff Assembly; Student Life; UCD Health.

Each organization provides at least two (2) nominees. The Associate Executive Vice Chancellor of Campus Community Relations selects one (1) PAB representative and one (1) alternate from the organizations' nominees, which results in seven (7) PAB members and seven (7) alternates. All fourteen (14) representatives participate in training, and each has access to the confidential investigation reports and attends meetings.

After the first year of their term, members will become alternates and alternates will become members, thereby allowing full participation on the PAB during the two-year term. The AEVC of Campus Community Relations will work with the various entities to maintain both a member and an alternate representative and develop a pipeline of candidates in the event that a member or alternate can no longer serve on the PAB.

In order to ensure independence, no member of the PAB can be a current or former UC Davis Police Department employee, or employee of the Offices of the Chancellor and Provost.

B. Training

All PAB members and alternates receive training developed by the Office of Campus Community Relations regarding police procedures, relevant legal issues, impartiality, the confidential nature of police misconduct investigations and discipline and the civilian oversight field.

All PAB members and alternates were required to attend orientation sessions. At the first orientation, PAB members received information from the Office of Campus Community Relations on the history and background of the PAB. At the second orientation, Lieutenant James Barbour from the UCDPD presented on search and seizure, use of force and other police procedures. External counsel, Laura Izon, reviewed the PAB's Bylaws and Procedures at the final orientation.

Each year, the PAB has nominated members to attend the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) annual conference. In September 2017, PAB representative Angela Carrasco attended the NACOLE conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico and afterwards briefed the board on the conference. At least one PAB representative will attend the upcoming NACOLE conference in September 2017 in Spokane, Washington.

PAB MEETINGS

The PAB meets monthly in the event that there is new business or a case to review. Meetings alternate between the UC Davis and UC Davis Health campuses. The PAB also solicits public input by holding regularly scheduled and advertised meetings at least once quarterly, which include time for public comment. These quarterly public meetings are denoted below (*). Additional meetings are scheduled on an as-needed basis.

2016 – 2017 PAB Meetings:

June 15, 2016

July 20, 2016

August 17, 2016

October 19, 2016 – Fall Quarterly Public Meeting, Memorial Union Garrison Room (Davis) & Education Building Room 3225A/B (Sacramento)*

November 9, 2016

December 14, 2016

January 18, 2017

February 15, 2017 – Winter Quarterly Public Meeting, Memorial Union Garrison Room (Davis) & Education Building Room 3103 (Sacramento)*

May 17, 2017 – Spring Quarterly Public Meeting, Memorial Union Garrison Room (Davis) & Education Building Room 3103 (Sacramento)*

A. Number of Decision-Making Meetings:

From June 2016 to June 2017, the board has held nine (9) decision-making meetings. At eight (8) of these meetings, the board reviewed cases resulting in recommended findings to the Chief of Police. The PAB makes recommendations regarding each allegation finding contained in the report, the number of which may vary depending upon the complaint.

B. Attendance for Decision-Making Meetings:

From June 2016 to June 2017, average attendance of voting members at decision-making meetings was 67.8%, and the average attendance of alternates was 47.6%. Average attendance of voting members at meetings where cases were reviewed was 66.3%, and the average attendance of alternates was 43.1%.

C. Public Comment Highlights

Each quarter of the academic year, the board invites public comment and questions at a public meeting. Questions brought to the PAB during public comment included: how the PAB public meetings are promoted; what the PAB's involvement would be in the Chief of Police search; whether protest monitoring occurs on campus; what determines the information and language used in UC Davis crime alerts; how the PAB's work as an independent board is communicated with the campus community; and what role the PAB plays in police training. Members of the public suggested that the PAB attend orientations and meetings of various campus groups in order to introduce the board. Questions about board composition, board procedures, investigation process and complaint process also were raised. PAB members answered questions and advised participants that resource information is available in the PAB Procedures and Bylaws online at <http://www.pab.ucdavis.edu>.

INVESTIGATION OF CASES AND PAB REVIEW

A. Filing a Complaint with the PAB

Complainants have several avenues for filing complaints with the PAB:

- Using the online form at <http://www.pab.ucdavis.edu>
- Email to pab@ucdavis.edu
- Via telephone at (530) 752-6550
- Printing the complaint form and sending it via fax to (530) 752-0853, or via mail to the Office of Compliance and Policy, Attn: Police Accountability Board, UC Davis, Mrak Hall 5th floor, Davis, CA 95616
- In person at the Office of Compliance and Policy, Mrak Hall 5th floor

Complaint forms are available in English, Chinese, Hmong, Spanish, Russian and Vietnamese.

All complaints are received and reviewed by the Office of Compliance and Policy, which is independent from the Police Department. The Office of Compliance and Policy determines whether a complaint is appropriate for investigation (e.g., timely, states sufficient facts, etc.). Complaints that are ineligible for review under PAB procedures are dismissed. The PAB only reviews complaints against UCDPD officers, and not against

other campus community members or personnel employed by other law enforcement agencies. The process can generally take up to 90 calendar days from the time the complaint is received, assigned to an investigator, evidence is gathered and an investigation report is completed. The amount of time however can vary according to factors such as: the number of complainants, witnesses and officers involved in each case; availability of witnesses; and investigator case load.

The investigator prepares an investigation report with factual findings that is provided to the PAB in redacted form to protect the identity of the complainant and involved officer(s).

A current copy of the complaint form is included in the Appendix.

B. Investigation Reports

As noted, the investigator provides a confidential report to the PAB that is redacted and does not identify the individuals involved, nor does it include any complainant demographic information. The Chief of Police receives an unredacted version of the investigation report. Both reports include:

- An Introduction;

- A Summary of Allegations (including applicable policies);

- Evidence Regarding Each Allegation (including comprehensive summaries of interviews or statements and identification of relevant documentary and electronic evidence);

- Conclusions and Findings; and

- Exhibit Listing.

The investigator's conclusions are based upon a preponderance of the evidence. The "preponderance of the evidence" standard is met when the evidence presented during the investigation supports that it is *more likely than not* that the allegations of misconduct occurred as described. The investigation report contains findings regarding each allegation. The possible findings are:

Unfounded – When the investigation discloses that the alleged act(s) did not occur or did not involve department personnel. Complaints that are determined to be frivolous will be treated as unfounded (Code of Civil Procedure section 128.5 and Penal Code section 832.5(c)).

Exonerated – The evidence supports a finding that the alleged acts occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, or proper.

Not Sustained – The evidence is insufficient to support a finding that the alleged conduct occurred or violated department policy or procedure.

Sustained – The evidence supports a finding that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct was improper (e.g., violated department policy or procedure).

C. PAB Review and Recommendation(s)

In closed session, the PAB collectively reviews the investigative report(s) and votes on its recommendation to adopt, amend or reject the investigator's findings. Hard copies of reports, or online access via a password protected website to the reports, are made available prior to the closed session.

The PAB has the authority to direct the investigator to re-open the investigation to pursue additional information requested by the PAB.

In addition to its recommendations with respect to the investigator's findings, the PAB may also recommend a wide spectrum of actions to the Chief of Police, including, for example, modifying policies or training. The PAB however will not recommend a particular level of discipline or a specific corrective action, as only the Chief of Police retains the responsibility for and discretion to impose discipline. The PAB's policy recommendations may result from issues related to a specific complaint investigation or from a general policy review and analysis.

The PAB's recommendations regarding the investigative findings shall be in writing and, through the Office of Compliance and Policy, forwarded to the Chief of Police within one (1) week after the PAB has voted in closed session.

D. Role of Chief of Police and Ultimate Record Keeping

During the course of an investigation, and prior to making a final determination, the Chief of Police may ask for additional investigation. Ultimately, the Chief may adopt all, part or none of the PAB's recommendations and retains full authority, discretion and responsibility regarding the final disposition of the matter, including disciplinary determinations. Within thirty (30) days of the final review and determination by the Chief of Police, written notice of the finding is sent to the complaining party and to the PAB through the Office of Compliance and Policy. This notice shall indicate the findings, but will not disclose the amount of discipline, if any, that is imposed. Upon final

determination, all information and documents related to the underlying complaint shall be consolidated and maintained by the UCDPD.

Any complaining party who is not satisfied with the Chief of Police's ultimate disposition of the complaint may contact the Chief to discuss the matter further.

2016-2017 TRENDS

A. Complaints Filed Per Academic Quarter

From June 2016 to June 2017, eighteen (18) complaints were filed with the PAB. Over thirty-eight percent (38.9%) were filed during Summer 2016, 11.1% during Fall 2016, 33.3% during Winter 2017 and 16.7% during Spring 2017.

B. Complaint Location

Of the total complaints received, 55.6% were filed to the Sacramento UCD Health campus, and 44.4% were filed to the Davis campus.

Of the cases that were investigated and brought to the PAB for review, 83.3% were filed to the Sacramento UCD Health campus, and 16.7% were filed to the Davis campus.

C. Complaint Filing Methods

The most popular method of filing a complaint was emailing the PAB at pab@ucdavis.edu (50.0%), followed by complaints filed via the online form on the PAB website (25.0%), complaints to the Office of Compliance and Policy (12.5%) and complaints to the UC Davis Police Department (12.5%).

D. Complainant Demographics

Complainant demographics are voluntarily provided and are not known to the PAB at any point during case review.

Campus affiliation: Sixty-one percent (61.1%) of complainants were community members, while 16.7% were staff and 16.7% were students. The campus affiliation of 5.6% of complainants was unknown. No complaints were received from UC Davis faculty.

Age: Over five percent (5.6%) of complainants were 24 years old or under, 16.7% were 25-34 years old and 22.2 % were 55 years old or over. No complainants reported being between 35 and 44 years of age, or between 45 and 54 years of age. The age of 55.6% of complainants was unknown.

Gender: Thirty-three percent (33.3%) of complainants identified as male, 27.8% identified as female and the gender of 38.9% of complainants was unknown.

Race/ethnicity: Over twenty-seven percent (27.8%) of complainants identified as Caucasian, 5.6% identified as American, 5.6% identified as African American and 5.6% identified as Indian. The race/ethnicity of 55.6% of complainants was unknown.

E. Allegations

Of the cases that were investigated and brought to the PAB for review, one hundred percent (100.0%) of cases involved allegations of discourtesy by a UC Davis police officer. Fifty percent (50.0%) of cases involved allegations of excessive use of force. Over sixteen percent (16.7%) of cases involved allegations of intimidation. Over sixteen percent (16.7%) of cases involved allegations of discrimination.

In 2016-2017, the PAB received a number of complaints with insufficient information to proceed through investigation after complainants did not respond to requests for additional information or clarification. Additionally, continuing a trend noted in 2015-2016, complaints were received in 2016-2017 that involved issues not related to the PAB's purview of reviewing allegations of police or UCDPD misconduct or infraction of rules, policies or law. These trends suggest that citizens continue to be more aware of the PAB, however important work still needs to be done to clarify the PAB's scope and the complaint and investigation process.

CASES REVIEWED, PAB FINDINGS AND STATUS OF CURRENT PAB CASES

From June 2016 to June 2017, eighteen (18) complaints were submitted to the PAB. The PAB reviewed seventeen (17) cases, five (5) of which were investigated. Twelve (12) cases did not proceed through investigation, either because the PAB received insufficient information¹ to proceed (eight [8] cases), or because they were dismissed² as outside of PAB's purview (four [4] cases).

¹ The Office of Compliance and Policy has not received sufficient information regarding the matter—such as the events alleged or the parties involved—to determine if the matter falls under PAB purview and/or to conduct a reasonable investigation. In such circumstances, if the complainant has provided contact information, Compliance contacts the complainant to request the needed information. If it is provided, the matter will be revisited.

² The information provided by the complainant reflects that the matter does not fall within the PAB purview. For example, the complaint does not allege a violation of police policy or does not address the actions of UCDPD officers. This category also may include circumstances where the complainant expressly requests that the matter not be investigated. (In cases involving allegations of serious violations or multiple allegations against the same officer, the matter may be investigated even if the complainant requests no investigation.)

After reviewing the investigative reports for the five (5) cases that proceeded through investigation, the PAB voted to adopt, amend or reject the investigator's findings. The PAB's findings are summarized in the table at the end of this report.

One (1) case remains under investigation and will be reviewed in Summer 2017.

POLICY, PROCEDURE AND TRAINING RECOMMENDATIONS

The PAB is charged with making recommended findings to the Chief of Police. The PAB however will not recommend a particular level of discipline or a specific corrective action, as the Chief of Police retains the responsibility for and discretion to impose discipline. The PAB's policy recommendations may result from issues related to a specific complaint investigation or from a general policy review and analysis.

From June 2016 to June 2017, the PAB made the following recommendations:

- The PAB recommended the Police Department receive additional training in cultural competence and community policing strategies.
- The board made the recommendation that a use of force analysis be included in original police reports, per *UC Davis Police Department Law Enforcement Services Manual* policy section 300.5. To the extent that additional training would be required to effectuate compliance, the PAB recommended that such training be implemented.
- The PAB requested that the Chief of Police provide an update on the status of a body camera policy.
- Separately, the PAB raised questions to the Chief regarding the use, availability and replacement of body cameras.
- The PAB recommended that there be discussions or further training both within the Police Department and at the Medical Center regarding role clarification of police officers and Medical Center staff.

In 2016-2017, the Chief provided the following responses to the above recommendations:

- In response to the recommendation of additional training in cultural competence and community policing strategies, the Chief noted that peace officers are required by POST (Peace Officer Standards) to pass recurrent perishable skills training, including

communications training, racial profiling, response to persons with mental and developmental disabilities, hate crimes and investigation.

- In response to the questions about body cameras, the Chief noted that the UCDPD is waiting for direction from a forthcoming UC systemwide policy.

All other policy, procedure and training recommendations from 2016-2017 currently are awaiting the Chief's response.

Additionally, the Chief of Police responded to a recommendation made in 2015-2016:

- In response to a recommendation about retaining/storing surveillance footage at the UC Davis Medical Center for a longer period of time, the Chief noted that Medical Center surveillance footage is maintained by the Medical Center administration. The current retention period is 30 days due to storage constraints.

POLICE CHIEF'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The PAB's recommendations regarding the investigative findings are in writing and are forwarded to the Chief of Police after the PAB has voted in closed session. The Chief may adopt all, part or none of the PAB's recommendations and retains full authority, discretion and responsibility regarding the final disposition of the matter, including disciplinary determinations. PAB procedures require the Chief of Police to provide written notice of the finding to the complaining party and the PAB within thirty (30) days of his final review and determination.

From June 2016 to June 2017, the Chief of Police adjudicated five (5) cases in which the PAB recommended findings or made additional suggestions. With respect to these five (5) cases, the Chief accepted the PAB's findings in four (4) of the cases reviewed and disagreed with the PAB's findings in one (1) case. The Chief's responses are summarized in the table at the end of this report.

Police Accountability Board Complaints, June 2016 – June 2017								
Quarter Filed/ Location	Filing Method	Complainant's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity*	Allegations	Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
Summer 2016/ Davis	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • 80 • Male • American 	Issue with road closures	Dismissed ¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2016/ Davis	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Discourtesy. Improper search. Excessive use of force.	Insufficient information ²	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2016/ Sacramento	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • 60 • Male • Caucasian 	Excessive use of force. Officer made a false accusation against complainant.	Investigation complete ³	138 days	75 days	Allegation of excessive use of force was not sustained. Allegation that officer made a false accusation against complainant was exonerated.	Police Chief disagreed with not sustained finding, agreed with exonerated finding.

* Complainant demographics are voluntarily provided and are not known to the PAB at any point during case review.

¹ The information provided by the complainant reflects that the matter does not fall within the PAB purview. For example, the complaint does not allege a violation of police policy or does not address the actions of UCDPD officers. This category also may include circumstances where the complainant expressly requests that the matter not be investigated. (In cases involving allegations of serious violations or multiple allegations against the same officer, the matter may be investigated even if the complainant requests no investigation.)

² The Office of Compliance and Policy has not received sufficient information regarding the matter—such as the events alleged or the parties involved—to determine if the matter falls under PAB purview and/or to conduct a reasonable investigation. In such circumstances, if the complainant has provided contact information, Compliance contacts the complainant to request the needed information. If it is provided, the matter will be revisited.

³ The matter falls within the PAB purview and an investigation has been conducted and completed.

Quarter Filed/ Location	Filing Method	Complainant's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
Summer 2016/ Sacramento	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Excessive use of force	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2016/ Sacramento	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • 26 • Male • African American 	Excessive use of force against two officers. Third officer provided false or misleading information.	Investigation complete	232 days	107 days	Allegation of excessive use of force against first officer was not sustained. Allegation of excessive use of force against second officer was exonerated. Allegation that third officer provided false or misleading information was unfounded.	Yes
Summer 2016/ Sacramento	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Male • Not provided 	Against first officer: Rude, condescending and intimidating behavior; Improper recording. Against second and third officer: Discourtesy; Condescending and arrogant behavior. Against fourth officer: Discourtesy; Discriminatory treatment.	Investigation complete	189 days (From date of first complaint. Individual later raised additional allegations against different officers in different incidents.)	120 days	Allegation against first officer of rude, condescending and intimidating behavior was not sustained. Allegation against first officer of improper recording was exonerated. Allegation against second and third officer of discourtesy was exonerated. Allegation against second and third officer of condescending and arrogant behavior was not sustained. Allegation against fourth officer of discourtesy was not sustained. Allegation against fourth officer of discrimination was not sustained.	Yes

Quarter Filed/ Location	Filing Method	Complainant's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
Summer 2016/ Davis	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student • 28 • Male • Caucasian 	Discourtesy	Investigation complete	151 days	66 days	Not sustained	Yes
Fall 2016/ Davis	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student • 20 • Female • Indian 	Stolen property	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fall 2016/ Sacramento	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Not provided • Female • Not provided 	Repeatedly followed by police personnel	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Winter 2017/ Sacramento	Email to pab@ ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Not provided • Female • Not provided 	Delayed police response	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Winter 2017/ Davis	Online form on PAB website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Computer hacked at UC Davis library	Dismissed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Winter 2017/ Sacramento	Online form on PAB website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • 33 • Female • Caucasian 	Discourtesy against two officers	Investigation complete	153 days	81 days	Both allegations of discourtesy were not sustained	Yes
Winter 2017/ Sacramento	Mailed to Chief of Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Stolen property	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Quarter Filed/ Location	Filing Method	Complainant's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
Winter 2017/ Davis	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Intimidation	Dismissed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Winter 2017/ Davis	Online form on PAB website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • 59 • Male • Caucasian 	Parking ticket	Dismissed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spring 2017/ Sacramento	Civilian complaint to Police Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Not provided • Caucasian 	Excessive use of force. Officers failed to identify why complainant was stopped.	Under investigation ¹	In progress	In progress	In progress	In progress
Spring 2017/ Sacramento	Phone call to Police Department dispatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Assault	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spring 2017/ Davis	Online form on PAB website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • 58 • Female • Not provided 	Discourtesy	Insufficient information	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ The matter falls within the PAB purview and an investigation has been conducted or is ongoing.

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UC Davis PAB Bylaws*	1
UC Davis PAB Code of Ethics	6
UC Davis PAB Procedures*	7
UC Davis PAB Complaint Form	16

* Please note that the PAB Bylaws and Procedures currently are under revision. Updated versions will become available in Fall 2017 on the PAB website at <http://www.pab.ucdavis.edu>.

**BYLAWS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD**

ARTICLE 1 – NAME AND PURPOSE

Pursuant to direction from Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi, a Police Accountability Board (PAB) has been established whose purpose is to promote accountability, trust, and communication between the University of California, Davis (UCD) community and the UCD Police Department (UCDPD) by independently reviewing and making recommendations regarding investigations of complaints made by members of the campus community and the general public (also referred to as civilian complaints) in a fair and unbiased manner.

ARTICLE 2 – QUALIFICATIONS

PAB members and alternates must: (1) commit the necessary time throughout the year for PAB training and meetings; (2) prepare and read the appropriate materials in connection with making recommendations; and (3) maintain ethical standards, including confidentiality. Alternates need not attend meetings or review investigation materials if the PAB member will be in attendance.

ARTICLE 3 – COMPOSITION

The PAB shall be comprised of seven (7) members who broadly represent the diversity of the UCD community. The PAB shall include:

- Two (2) undergraduate students;
- One (1) graduate student;
- One (1) faculty member;
- One (1) staff member; and
- Two (2) health system members (who can be students, faculty or staff).

The following organizations may submit nominations for representation on the PAB:

- Academic Federation
- Academic Senate
- Associated Students of UCD
- Graduate Student Association
- Staff Assembly
- Student Life
- UCD Health System

ARTICLE 4 – NOMINATIONS, SELECTION AND ALTERNATES

The organizations identified in Article 3 may nominate a representative to the PAB, utilizing each organization's respective nomination process. Each organization will provide at least two (2) nominees. The Associate Executive Vice Chancellor (AEVC) of Campus Community Relations will select one (1) PAB representative and one (1) alternate from the organizations' nominees, which will result in seven (7) PAB members and seven (7) alternates. All fourteen

(14) representatives will participate in training and each can have access to the confidential investigation reports and attend meetings.

ARTICLE 5 – TERMS

Generally, the inaugural PAB members and alternates shall serve two- (2) year terms that will expire at the conclusion of this pilot, except in circumstances where the member or alternate will not be a qualifying representative of his or her organization for the entire period of the pilot. For example, a senior graduating in 2014 or a faculty member retiring in early 2015 would not be eligible to serve for the entire two- (2) year term. The AEVC of Campus Community Relations will work with the various organizations to maintain both a member and an alternate representative.

ARTICLE 6 – OFFICERS

At its inaugural meeting, the PAB shall elect one (1) of its members as the Chairperson and one (1) as the Vice-Chairperson (who shall preside only in the Chairperson's absence). Officers shall be elected annually and hold office for one (1) year terms.

ARTICLE 7 – ETHICS

The PAB will be governed by the attached Code of Ethics, which is modeled on the Code of Ethics developed by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).

ARTICLE 8 – REMOVAL

The appointment of any PAB member who has been absent from three (3) consecutive regular or special meetings shall automatically terminate effective on the third such absence.

Any breach of the PAB's Code of Ethics will be cause for review. The AEVC of Campus Community Relations may remove a PAB member or alternate for cause, including transgressions of policy, confidentiality, or ethical standards.

ARTICLE 9 – QUORUM AND VOTING

Five (5) members shall constitute a quorum. Decisions of the PAB shall be made by vote of a majority of the members in attendance provided that a quorum exists. Alternates will only vote in meetings when the PAB member representing his or her organization is absent.

ARTICLE 10 – RECUSAL

PAB members must recuse themselves from a matter when (1) an actual conflict of interest exists; (2) there is an appearance of impropriety; or (3) a member is concerned with whether he or she can participate objectively and in an unbiased manner.

ARTICLE 11 – TRAINING AND CONFIDENTIALITY COMMITMENTS

PAB members and alternates shall receive training developed by the Office of Campus Community Relations regarding police procedures, relevant legal issues, impartiality, the confidential nature of police misconduct investigations and discipline, and the civilian oversight field. PAB members will also have the opportunity to accompany members of the UCDPD on a ride along.

Each member shall execute a confidentiality agreement.

ARTICLE 12 – PAB POWERS AND DUTIES

The PAB will:

- (1) Review relevant UCDPD policies and procedures and all investigation reports submitted regarding complaints made by members of campus community and the general public against the UCDPD. The PAB will not review any complaints filed by UCDPD employees.
- (2) Solicit public input by holding regularly scheduled and advertised meetings at least quarterly, which shall include time for public comment. Additional meetings shall be scheduled on an as-needed basis.
- (3) Run its meetings utilizing Roberts Rules of Order as a guide.
- (4) Review and deliberate in closed session, consistent with applicable law, to protect the confidential nature of the complaints and investigation reports.
- (5) Submit advisory recommendations to the Chief of Police regarding (1) UCDPD policies and procedures and (2) the findings of investigation reports. The Chief of Police, however, retains full and final authority, discretion, and responsibility regarding the ultimate disposition of the matter, including disciplinary determinations and whether to accept, reject or modify the PAB's recommendations.
- (6) Prepare an annual public report for the UCD community and the public as detailed further in Article 13.

ARTICLE 13 – REPORTING

In the interests of transparency and accountability, and in conformity with Penal Code section 832.7, the PAB shall issue an annual, public report detailing summary information and statistical data regarding the number of complaints filed, the type of complaints filed, analysis of trends or patterns, the ultimate disposition of the complaints (sustained, not sustained, exonerated, or unfounded), and the percentage of complaints in which the recommendations of the PAB were either accepted, rejected or modified by the Chief of Police.

ARTICLE 14 – PILOT

The term of this two- (2) year pilot PAB shall sunset on June 30, 2016.

ARTICLE 15 – AMENDMENT

After consultation with the PAB, these bylaws and any amendments or supplements thereto may be adopted, amended, altered, supplemented or repealed by UCD during or at the conclusion of the pilot period.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD
CODE OF ETHICS**

Introduction: Members of civilian oversight groups have a unique role as public servants reviewing law enforcement agencies. The community entrusts us to conduct our work in a professional, fair and impartial manner. We earn this trust through a firm commitment to the public good, our mission, and to the ethical and professional standards described below. The University of California, Davis, Police Accountability Board shall operate in accordance with the following code:

Personal Integrity: Demonstrate the highest standards of personal integrity, commitment to truthfulness, and dedication to building trust by our stakeholders. Avoid conflicts of interest. Conduct ourselves in a fair and impartial manner and recuse ourselves when conflicts of interest arise. Do not accept gifts, gratuities or favors that could compromise our impartiality and independence.

Independent and Thorough Review: Conduct reviews with diligence, an open and questioning mind, integrity, objectivity and fairness, in a timely manner. Test the accuracy and reliability of information from all sources. Review facts and present recommendations without regard to personal beliefs or concern for personal, professional or political consequences.

Transparency and Confidentiality: Conduct reviews openly and transparently and report out. Maintain the confidentiality of information that cannot be disclosed and protect the security of confidential records.

Respectful and Unbiased Treatment: Treat all individuals with dignity and respect, and without preference or discrimination.

Outreach and Relationships with Stakeholders: Pursue open, candid and non-defensive dialogue with stakeholders during public meetings with an eye toward educating and learning from the community.

Agency Self-examination and Commitment to Policy Review: Seek improvement in the effectiveness of our board, the UCDPD, and our relations with the communities we serve. Evaluate and analyze work product. Emphasize policy review and reform that advance UCD law enforcement accountability and performance.

Professional Excellence: Strive to acquire knowledge and understanding of the policies, procedures and practices of the UCDPD. Keep informed of current legal, professional and social issues that affect the UCD community, the UCDPD and our board.

Primary Obligation to the Community: At all times, place our obligation to the community, duty to uphold the law and to the goals and objectives of the board above our personal self-interest.

UC Davis Police Accountability Board Procedures

I. Introduction

It is the intent of the University of California, Davis (UCD) to develop and promote accountability, trust, and communication between the campus community and the UCD Police Department (UCDPD). To that end, UCD has established a pilot Police Accountability Board (PAB) to impartially review investigative reports related to allegations of police misconduct and make recommendations in a timely manner regarding complaints filed by members of the public against the UCDPD. UCD encourages its community and the public to bring forward such complaints. The PAB may also make policy, procedure and training recommendations.

Consistent with Penal Code sections 832.5 *et seq*, UCD has established a procedure to investigate complaints made by the public against the UCDPD and its officers. While the complaint process is detailed in UCDPD's Policy 1020, much of that process is also described in the PAB's Procedures to ensure that PAB members understand the process generally, as well as their specific role. The complaint procedure involves the Office of Compliance who will generally provide administrative support and investigatory personnel, the PAB who will review the investigatory reports and make findings and recommendations to the Chief of the UCDPD, and the Chief who will make the final determination with respect to each complaint. The Chief will ensure cooperation of the UCDPD with all investigations.

The PAB will produce an annual report auditing and identifying summary information and statistical data regarding the number and types of complaints received, analysis of trends or patterns, the disposition of those complaints and the percentage of complaints in which the recommendations of the PAB were either accepted, rejected or modified by the Chief of Police. In addition, the PAB may report on other matters, such as policy, procedure or training recommendations.

II. Police Accountability Board Bylaws

The PAB Bylaws, which are included in the Appendix, govern the following subjects:

- The purpose of the PAB;
- PAB member qualifications;
- Composition of the PAB;
- The nomination, selection and alternate process;
- Terms;
- Officers;
- Ethics;
- Removal of board members;
- Quorum and majority vote;
- Recusal;
- Training and confidentiality commitments;
- Powers and duties;
- Reporting;

- Pilot term; and
- Bylaw amendment.

III. Complaint Intake Procedures

A. Nature of Complaint

UCD students, faculty and staff, as well as members of the general public, have the right to lodge complaints against the UCDPD or its officers if they believe misconduct or infraction of rules, policy or law (e.g., excessive force, false arrest, false imprisonment, abusive language, harassment or discrimination) has occurred. These complaints are referred to as “Personnel Complaints” and are divided into two categories: (1) Member of the Public or Civilian Complaints and (2) Internal Complaints. The Office of Compliance will investigate Member of the Public or Civilian complaints. The PAB will review the investigation reports and findings and make recommendations to the UCDPD Chief.

The Office of Compliance will not investigate Internal Complaints filed by UCDPD officers or other personnel. These complaints will be handled internally by the Professional Standards Unit (PSU). The PAB will not review PSU investigatory reports regarding Internal Complaints. Complaints received regarding another law enforcement agency (e.g., City of Davis Police Department) will be referred to that agency.

B. Filing Locations

A member of the campus community or general public may file a complaint by:

- (1) Accessing and submitting a complaint form online at www.pab.ucdavis.edu;
- (2) Faxing a completed complaint form to one of the fax numbers listed below;
- (3) Calling the UCD Office of Compliance at the telephone number listed below to schedule an appointment; or
- (4) Submitting a completed complaint form to the UCD Police Department at one of the address listed below:

UC Davis Office of Compliance
Chief Compliance Officer
1 Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 752-6550
(530) 752-0853 (FAX)

UC Davis Police Department

Davis Campus
625 Kleiber Hall Drive
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 754-COPS
(530) 752-0176 (FAX)

Sacramento Campus
4200 V Street
Sacramento, CA 95817
(916) 734-2555
(530) 752-0176 (FAX)

A current copy of the complaint form is included in the Appendix of these Procedures.

C. Filing Deadline

The prompt filing of complaints is strongly encouraged, as it provides the best opportunity for thorough and timely investigation. Complaints shall be filed in writing no later than one hundred and eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged misconduct or infraction, except that the filing period shall be tolled when a complainant is incapacitated and unable to file.

D. Complaint Information

The complaint form should include:

- Contact information for the complainant;
- A detailed narrative, including:
 - the nature of the complaint;
 - the timing of the alleged misconduct;
 - any injuries as a result of the alleged misconduct;
 - a description of the alleged misconduct; and
- The signature of the complainant.

The complainant will be provided with a copy of his or her complaint and any statement at the time the complaint is filed. All complaints filed by a member of the public with the UC Davis Police Department (UCDPD) will be forwarded to the UC Davis Office of Compliance within two (2) business days.

E. Anonymous Complaints

Anonymous complaints made by a member of the public will be accepted and may be investigated depending upon the sufficiency of the information provided.

F. Sharing of Complaints

Any complaint received by the UCDPD will be shared with the Office of Compliance for review and processing within two (2) business days. Any complaint received by the Office of Compliance will be shared with the Chief of Police, also within two (2) business days. The Office of Compliance will report at least monthly to the PAB regarding any complaints that have

been received since the previous was report was forwarded to the PAB by the Office of Compliance.

If, through the intake process (or subsequently during the investigation) additional allegations surface that were not contained in the original complaint but relate to the original complaint, the additional allegations being investigated by the Office of Compliance will be forwarded to the Chief of Police.

G. Early Resolution of Complaints

At the time of filing a complaint, when an uninvolved supervisor or the Watch Commander determines that the complainant is satisfied that his or her complaint required nothing more than an explanation regarding the proper implementation of department policy, procedure or law, the complaint shall be labelled "Resolved" and forwarded to the Office of Compliance within two (2) business days. The Office of Compliance will follow-up with the complainant to confirm that he or she is satisfied with the early resolution.

H. Initial Determination and Information Gathering by Chief Compliance Officer

All complaints made by members of the public will be logged by the Chief Compliance Officer or designee. A confidential file will be established for each complaint received. These will be stored in a secure location. The Chief Compliance Officer will evaluate each complaint for information necessary to conduct an investigation and proceed as follows:

- (1) If additional information is needed, the Chief Compliance Officer or designee will request additional information from the complainant to the extent that the identity of the complainant is known.
- (2) If the Chief Compliance Officer determines that the complaint is untimely, there is insufficient information to conduct an investigation, the allegations themselves demonstrate on their face that the acts complained of were proper, or the nature of the complaint is not suitable for investigation and review by the PAB, the Chief Compliance Officer will notify the complainant, the Chief of Police and the PAB of the disposition in writing citing the specific reasons for the determination.
- (3) If the Chief Compliance Officer determines there is sufficient information and cause to investigate, the Chief Compliance Officer will assign the complaint to an investigator to initiate an investigation and notify the complainant, the Chief of Police and the PAB in writing of the complaint's referral to investigation.

IV. Complaint Investigation Procedures

A. General

Whether conducted by the Office of Compliance or an outside investigator jointly selected by the Office of Compliance and the UCDPD Chief of Police, the following procedures

shall govern the investigation process, which include complying with the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights (POBR) at Government Code section 3300 *et seq.* To the extent that there is any inconsistency between these Procedures and POBR, POBR controls. A current copy of the POBR shall be maintained in the Appendix of these Procedures.

1. The Chief of Police will be the investigator's point of contact for purposes of gaining access to UCDPD information, documentation, and personnel. In this role, the Chief will ensure necessary access to officer, information, and documentation needed to conduct a thorough and timely investigation. The investigator will have access to any and all UCDPD information the investigator or the PAB deems relevant to the complaint, including access to the UCDPD's "IA PRO" software and electronic files.
2. The investigation of a complaint shall consist of conducting interviews with the complainant, the subject officer(s), and any witnesses, collecting relevant evidence, including, but not limited to, UCDPD reports and records, photographs, video, and audio records. Interviews with subject officers will be recorded, as will other interviews to the extent that the complainant and witnesses agree. Subject officers may also record the interview and if he or she has been previously interviewed, a copy of that recorded interview shall be provided to the employee prior to any subsequent interview. (Government Code section 3303(g)).
3. Officers shall be provided with reasonable notice prior to being interviewed and interviews of accused peace officers shall be conducted during reasonable hours. (Government Code section 3303(a)).
4. If the peace officer is off duty, he or she will be compensated for the interview time. (Government Code section 3303(a)).
5. No more than two (2) interviewers may ask questions of an accused peace officer. (Government Code section 3303(b)).
6. Prior to any interview, the peace officer will be informed of the nature of the investigation. (Government Code section 3303(c)).
7. All interviews will be for a reasonable period and the peace officer's personal needs will be accommodated during the interview. (Government Code section 3303(d)).
8. No peace officer shall be subjected to offensive or threatening language, nor shall any promises, rewards or other inducements be used to obtain answers. (Government Code § 3303(e)).
9. Peace officers shall be informed of their constitutional rights irrespective of whether the subject officer may be charged with a criminal offense. (Government Code § 3303(h))

10. Peace officers subjected to interviews that could result in punitive action shall have the right to have an uninvolved representative present during the interview. (Government Code § 3303(i)).
11. All employees shall provide complete and truthful responses to questions posed during interviews. Failure to do so will result in discipline, up to and including termination of employment.
12. No peace officer shall be compelled to submit to a polygraph examination, nor shall any refusal to submit to such examination be mentioned in any investigation. (Government Code § 3307).
13. Interviews should be conducted with minimal interference to police operations and in conformity with the POBR. Any documentary evidence received during the investigation by the investigator will be included in the investigative file even if the investigator determines the document later to be irrelevant to the investigation.
14. If there is pending criminal prosecution regarding the same operative facts and circumstances surrounding the complaint, the investigation will be stayed until criminal proceedings are concluded.
15. If an investigation is stayed, all documents and information under UCDPD's control related to the incident in question will be preserved and maintained by the Chief of Police during the pendency of the stay to ensure no evidence is destroyed.
16. Barring mitigating factors, the investigation should be completed and an investigation report submitted to the PAB within ninety (90) days of it being assigned to an investigator, unless an extension is authorized by the Office of Compliance upon a showing of good cause for the delay or legitimate need for additional time to complete the investigation. The Office of Compliance will provide notification of the extension of time to the Chief of Police and the complainant.
17. All investigation reports of complaints made by members of the public shall be considered confidential peace officer personnel files. The contents of such files shall not be revealed to other than involved employee or authorized personnel except pursuant to lawful process.
18. In the event that the alleged accused peace officer or representative knowingly makes a false representation regarding any investigation or discipline publicly, the UCDPD may release factual information concerning the disciplinary investigation. (Penal Code section 832.7(d)).
19. Complaints and any report or finding relating to the complaint shall be retained for a period of at least five (5) years. (Penal Code section 832.5(b)).

20. The Chancellor or the Chief of Police may refer issues to the Office of Compliance for investigation and the PAB for review and recommendation, including issues that arose prior to the formation of the PAB.

B. Investigation Reports and PAB Review Procedures

1. Report Format

The investigator shall provide a confidential report to the PAB that is redacted and does not identify the individuals involved. The Chief of Police will receive an unredacted version of the investigation report. Both reports will include:

- An Introduction;
- A Summary of Allegations (including applicable policies);
- Evidence Regarding Each Allegation (including comprehensive summaries of interviews or statements and identification of relevant documentary and electronic evidence);
- Conclusions and Findings; and
- Exhibit Listing.

2. Findings

The investigator's report, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, should include one or more of the following findings in response to each of the allegations made by the complainant. The "preponderance of the evidence" standard is met when it appears more likely than not the allegations of misconduct occurred as described.

Unfounded – When the investigation discloses that the alleged act(s) did not occur or did not involve department personnel. Complaints that are determined to be frivolous will be treated as unfounded (Code of Civil Procedure section 128.5 and Penal Code section 832.5(c)).

Exonerated - The evidence supports a finding that the alleged acts occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful or proper.

Not Sustained - The evidence is insufficient to support a finding that the alleged conduct occurred or violated department policy or procedure.

Sustained – The evidence supports a finding that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct was improper (e.g., violated department policy or procedure).

3. PAB Review and Recommendation(s)

In closed session, the PAB (both members and alternates in attendance) will collectively review the investigative report(s). PAB members and only alternates in attendance whose organization's PAB member is absent will vote on its recommendations to either adopt, amend, or reject the investigator's findings. Hard copies of reports or on-line access via a password protected website to the reports will be made available prior to the closed session.

The PAB has the authority to direct the investigator to re-open the investigation to pursue additional information requested by the PAB.

In addition to its recommendations with respect to whether the investigator's findings are sustained, the PAB may also recommend a wide spectrum of actions to the Chief of Police, including, for example, modifying policies or training. The PAB, however, will not recommend a particular level of discipline or a specific corrective action, as the Chief of Police retains the responsibility of and discretion to impose discipline. The PAB's policy recommendations may result from issues related to a specific complaint investigation or from a general policy review and analysis.

The PAB's recommendations regarding the investigative findings shall be in writing and, through the Office of Compliance, forwarded to the Chief of Police within one (1) week after the PAB has voted in closed session.

C. Role of Chief of Police and Ultimate Record Keeping

During the course of an investigation, and prior to making a final determination, the Chief of Police may ask for additional investigation. Ultimately, the Chief may adopt all, part, or none of the PAB's recommendations and retains full authority, discretion, and responsibility regarding the final disposition of the matter, including disciplinary determinations. Within thirty (30) days of the final review and determination by the Chief of Police, written notice of the finding will be sent to the complaining party and to the PAB through the Office of Compliance. This notice shall indicate the findings, but will not disclose the amount of discipline, if any, is imposed. The complainant will also be provided with a copy of his or her original complaint if one has not already been provided. Upon final determination, all information and documents related to the underlying complaint shall be consolidated and maintained by the UCDPD.

Any complaining party who is not satisfied with the Chief of Police's ultimate disposition of the complaint may contact the Chief of Police to discuss the matter further.

V. Annual Reporting Procedures

The complaint and PAB review processes are subject to annual audit, review and reporting. The PAB will submit an audit and analysis of complaints directly to the UCDPD

Chief of Police each year. The PAB's annual public report will include the following information:

- (1) Total number of complaints filed;
- (2) Types of complaints filed and analysis of trends or patterns;
- (3) Disposition of complaints (e.g., sustained, not sustained, exonerated, or unfounded);
- (4) Percentage of complaints in which the Chief of Police accepted, rejected or modified the PAB's findings; and
- (5) Policy, procedure and training recommendations.

The PAB's report shall be made available to members of the public at their request and shall be maintained online at www.pab.ucdavis.edu.

PAB Complaint Form*

All submitted complaints are received by the Office of Compliance and Policy

Complainant Information

Last Name

First Name

Mailing address

Primary phone number

Alt. phone number

E-mail address

Age

Gender

Ethnicity

If you received any injuries as a result of this incident, please describe them here:

Incident Narrative

Date of incident

Time of incident

At which UC Davis location did the alleged violation occur?

- UC Davis – main campus
- UC Davis – Medical Center

At or near which location on either the main campus or the Medical Center did the alleged violation occur? _____

Please describe the incident that forms the basis of your complaint. It is important that you include a detailed factual description of the events that gave rise to your complaint*

Allegations: Please check the allegation(s) that you think apply (allegations will ultimately be determined by PAB staff).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discourtesy (abusive or obscene language, failure to provide information, failure to respond) | <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Police Tow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination (prejudicial treatment based on disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, and/or religion) | <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Search (of home, person, or vehicle) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Harassment (consistent, deliberate annoyance through repeated contacts) | <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Seizure (of person, property, or vehicle) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Arrest | <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Use of Force (improper physical contact; use of baton, firearm, handcuffs, mace, pepper spray, etc.); unnecessary display of firearm |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Citation | <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate or Improper Investigation (Failure to investigate or make police report; false or improper police report) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Detention | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Police Procedures (damage to, confiscation of , or failure to return property; failure to identify oneself or no badge visible, and/or making false statements) | |

Police Officer Information

Badge information (if known)

Name of Police Officer (if known)

Gender of police officer:

Identifying characteristics of police officer (if badge number and/or name are not known):

Witness Information

Witness Name

Witness Address (if applicable)

Witness e-mail

Witness phone (if applicable)

Certification

Please check that you have read, understand, and agree to the following statement and sign and date below:

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE A COMPLAINT AGAINST A POLICE OFFICER FOR ANY IMPROPER POLICE CONDUCT. CALIFORNIA LAW REQUIRES THIS AGENCY TO HAVE A PROCEDURE TO INVESTIGATE CITIZENS' COMPLAINTS. YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO A WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROCEDURE. THIS AGENCY MAY FIND AFTER INVESTIGATION THAT THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO WARRANT ACTION ON YOUR COMPLAINT; EVEN IF THAT IS THE CASE, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE THE COMPLAINT AND HAVE IT INVESTIGATED IF YOU BELIEVE AN OFFICER BEHAVED IMPROPERLY. CITIZEN COMPLAINTS AND ANY REPORTS OR FINDINGS RELATING TO COMPLAINTS MUST BE RETAINED BY THIS AGENCY FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS. *

* This complaint form is in accordance with the process set forth under Penal Code Section 832.5

Signature

Date