

UC Davis Police Accountability Board Summary of the 2019-2020 Annual Report

The Police Accountability Board (PAB) is an independent board composed of student, faculty and staff representatives from the UC Davis community. The PAB is the first of its kind, having been the first civilian oversight board established at a major research university. Two functions are central to the PAB's work. First, the PAB independently reviews investigation reports and makes recommendations to the Chief of Police following investigations of complaints from the campus community or general public (also referred to as civilian complaints). Second, the PAB makes recommendations regarding UCDPD policies, procedures, practices and trainings when the PAB identifies possible improvements or blind spots. The PAB is committed to a fair and unbiased approach throughout its work.

In fall 2020, the PAB issued its 2019-2020 annual public report detailing summary information and statistical data regarding the number of complaints filed, the type of complaints filed, analysis of trends and patterns, the ultimate disposition of the complaints (i.e., sustained, not sustained, exonerated or unfounded) and the number of complaints in which the recommendations of the PAB were either accepted, rejected or modified by the Chief of Police. The annual report also includes detailed summaries of the PAB's recommendations along with its questions and comments to the Chief. In addition, the 2019-2020 annual report includes information on the report on the PAB pilot program review, its recommendations, and the proposed implementation plan.

A complete summary from 2019-2020 of inquiries received by the PAB, cases reviewed and PAB findings can be found in the attached chart. From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the PAB received 12 inquiries. Consistent with the PAB's procedures, the PAB closed all 12 inquiries between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020. In addition, the PAB in 2019-2020 closed two inquiries submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period.

Of the 12 inquiries submitted to the PAB from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, two of those inquiries were investigated. The remaining 10 inquiries did not proceed through investigation because:

- They were outside of the PAB's purview (six inquiries)
- The concerned party expressed they did not want the matter to be investigated (one inquiry)
- The allegations were considered in a separate investigation involving the same concerned party (one inquiry)
- The PAB received insufficient information to proceed (one inquiry)
- The complaint cited an incident that occurred beyond 180 days of the incident date¹ (one inquiry).

In addition, between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, the PAB completed its review of the two cases submitted during this period that proceeded through investigation. The PAB in 2019-2020 also closed two cases submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period.

¹ As stated in the PAB's Procedures: "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."

After reviewing the investigative report for the cases that proceeded through investigation, the PAB voted to adopt, amend or reject the investigator's findings and rendered its own findings of unfounded, exonerated, not sustained or sustained for each allegation.

Notable trends in 2019-2020

- Of the four inquiries closed in 2019-2020 that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB:
 - Two of the four cases (50.00%) involved allegations of discourtesy
 - Two of the four cases (50.00%) involved allegations of dishonesty
 - One of the four cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of improper confiscation of property
 - One of the four cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of intimidation
 - One of the four cases (25.00%) case involved an allegation of improper use of force
 - One of the four cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of improper police procedures.

PAB cases often involve multiple allegations.

- Of the 12 inquiries received in 2019-2020, nine (75.00%) were filed to the Davis campus and three (25.00%) were filed to the Sacramento UC Davis Health campus. Of the two 2019-2020 cases that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB, one (50.00%) was filed to the Davis campus and one (50.00%) was filed to the Sacramento Health campus. In addition, of the two cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, one was filed to the Davis campus and one was filed to the Sacramento Health campus.
- Among the inquiries received in 2019-2020, four (33.33%) were filed by community members and three (25.00%) were filed by UC Davis students. The concerned party's campus affiliation in five inquiries (41.67%) was unknown. In addition, among the two cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, one complaint was filed a community member; the other matter was submitted by the Chief of Police. Demographics—including campus affiliation—are voluntarily provided by a concerned party and are not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they are relevant to the allegations (e.g. in a discrimination case). Demographic information, as well as all other questions asked on the Complaint Form, are voluntary.
- In 2019-2020, the PAB continued to receive inquiries with insufficient information to proceed through investigation after concerned parties did not respond to requests for additional information or clarification. Additionally, the PAB received inquiries involving issues not related to the PAB's purview of reviewing allegations of UCDPD misconduct or infraction of rules, policies or law. Inquiries pertaining to issues outside the PAB's purview are referred to the appropriate entity and when possible, the concerned party is notified.

Police Chief's response to PAB findings

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the Chief of Police considered four cases in which the PAB recommended findings or made additional suggestions. With respect to these cases, the Chief agreed with all (100.00%) of the PAB's findings. The Chief's responses are summarized in the table at the end of this report.

Additional PAB recommendations, questions and comments to Police Chief

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the PAB shared several opportunities to engage the Chief of Police in direct dialogue regarding policy or training recommendations previously submitted by the PAB, in addition to questions and comments from PAB representatives and their communities. In reporting the following detailed summaries of the PAB's recommendations along with its questions and comments to the Chief, the PAB aims to increase the transparency of its work and to provide timely follow-up on issues important to the UC Davis and broader communities.

1. July 2019: In addition to its findings, the PAB submitted the following recommendations and questions to the Chief of Police in response to a case reviewed by the board:
 - a. The PAB recommended that the UCDPD provide guidance to officers on how to disengage from a challenging interaction without resorting simply to ignoring the person, as ignoring someone's questions can escalate rather than de-escalate a situation.

Chief's response: The Chief agreed. He responded that UCDPD officers have been provided de-escalation and tactical communication training and will continue to receive more training. The expectation is that officers will attempt de-escalate whenever possible. In some circumstances, after an extended period of time trying to explain, negotiate, and de-escalate disengagement can be effective.

- b. The PAB recommended that the UCDPD provide guidance to officers not to threaten to arrest someone without providing an articulation of the offending or prohibitive behavior.

Chief's response: The Chief agreed. He shared that officers are expected to explain, whenever possible, the reasons behind their actions including the legal justification for enforcement action, and officers should explain consequences to actions that could lead to arrest.

- c. The PAB requested additional information regarding the status of the updated policies and training regarding de-escalation techniques, cultural competency/sensitivity, use of force, mental health issues and implicit bias. What are the names of the specific trainings provided? Has everyone been fully trained? If not, what is the training schedule and when will training be complete?

Chief's response: The Chief shared that the department completed all training recommendations included in the [Report of the University of California](#)

Presidential Task Force on University-wide Policing. Every officer in the department received training in the following:

- Procedural Justice (California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training [POST])
- De-escalation and Tactical Communication (POST & other)
- Mental Health and Crisis Response (POST, California Highway Patrol, UC Davis)
- Implicit Bias (UC Davis)
- Sexual Orientation (JPMA Staff Development Solutions)
- Trauma Informed Interviewing (POST)

The UCDPD will continue to provide this important training. The UCDPD has updated its training and policies on use of force with regards to the Weber Bill requirements. Finally, the UCDPD is working with the UC Davis Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to develop training specifically for the department.

2. October 2019: In addition to its findings, the PAB submitted the following recommendations and questions to the Chief of Police in response to a case reviewed by the board:

- a. The PAB recommended that the Chief establish a policy to provide contact information to the PAB investigators to the fullest extent permissible by law.

Chief's response: The Chief clarified that the UCDPD provides all available contact information to PAB investigators.

- b. The PAB questioned the lawful basis for the UCDPD's initial stop and subsequent detention of a party involved in the case.

Chief's response: Based on the information provided and known to the officers at the time, there was a lawful basis for the stop and detention.

- c. The PAB requested that the Chief consider requiring that the warning, and the exceptions, of California Penal Code § 841 be applied to both arrests and stops carried out by members of the UCDPD. CPC § 841 provides: The person making the arrest must inform the person to be arrested of the intention to arrest him, of the cause of the arrest, and the authority to make it, except when the person making the arrest has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested is actually engaged in the commission of an attempt to commit an offence, or the person to be arrested is pursued immediately after its commission, or after an escape.

Chief's response: The Chief agreed that officers should, whenever practical, advise the person being arrested the reason for the arrest and their authority to make the arrest. The officers told the Arrestee why they were being arrested.

- d. The PAB requested that the Chief evaluate the need for further training, including but not limited to de-escalation, contact/cover officer roles, and expectations for the use of a wrap device.

Chief's response: The Chief responded that the department has made de-escalation a priority in training and policy. He noted that de-escalation training is not a magic cure for every situation, and that de-escalation training is important and must be continuous and on-going. Chief Farrow shared that the UCDPD's next de-escalation training is scheduled in October 2020.

- 3. February 2020: The PAB shared the following feedback and questions from the public with Chief Farrow, which were received during the PAB Winter 2020 public meetings:

- a. A concern was raised about the need for more police patrol on campus at night, especially since Topsy Taxi was suspended. It was suggested that more Safe Ride vans drive around campus at night.

Chief's response: As a result of the rise in crime within the City of Davis, UCDPD has doubled their Safe Rides deployment and have extended the hours of operation.

- b. Someone suggested that UCDPD participate in a "see something, say something" campaign about University policies, especially the campus tobacco-free initiative.

Chief's response: "See something, say something" is promoted in the UCDPD's Active Shooter training and when discussing responding to other crimes in progress. However, the UCDPD does not promote it currently for policy violations that do not require a law enforcement response.

- c. Given the calls to disarm the campus police, it was asked if archery would be an option as an alternative to arming police officers with firearms.

Chief's response: The Chief expressed his appreciation for the creative suggestion but noted that archery is not a viable option for law enforcement.

- d. A PAB representative asked if there would be an opportunity to include information on the board in the Annual Fire and Safety Report.

Chief's response: The Office of Compliance and Policy authors this report, and UCDPD plans to meet with Compliance to discuss this issue as well as others. The Chief will follow up on this matter.

- 4. June 2020: In conversation with the Chief at a closed PAB session, board representatives asked the following questions:

- a. A PAB representative asked if something like the death of George Floyd could happen in the UC Davis Police Department, or if Chief Farrow thinks that the UCDPD is a different type of organization entirely.

Chief's response: The Chief responded that he likes to believe that the UCDPD is an entirely different organization with a different view on police culture and with different training policies and priorities. The UCDPD aims to train their officers to the best of their ability to avoid situations that go far beyond a reasonable use of force. Chief Farrow added that there has not been a single person within the UC Davis Police Department that has not condemned what they saw in Minneapolis. He feels confident that his officers would handle situations in a more professional manner and that the UCDPD has taken steps to train them to do that.

- b. The Chief was asked about plans to release messages to the community.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow referenced his [joint statement with the City of Davis Police Chief in response to George Floyd's death](#) and shared that he is working on a message on restrictive use of force.

- c. A question was asked regarding the UCDPD's involvement during protests, including officers participating or showing up in solidarity.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow shared his recent decision not to send any UCDPD officers to Sacramento when asked to aid in protests occurring there. In response to a comment about how uniformed police officers can agitate and trigger protestors who feel threatened by their presence, Chief Farrow spoke about Student Affairs' response team, which monitors campus protests and accommodates peaceful protest without police presence. Chief Farrow was commended on his decision to withhold sending officers to protests, and it also was suggested that he continue to consider the effect that the presence of uniformed officers has at peaceful protests.

- d. The Chief was asked about the possibility of a UC Davis town hall focused on anti-racism and policing.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow expressed his enthusiasm and willingness to take part. He believes that conversation is important and that there should be ample opportunity for community involvement and testimony. In discussing feedback from the community, Chief Farrow mentioned data from the recent campus satisfaction survey that solicited responses from staff, faculty, and students. The UCDPD's satisfaction rating from staff and faculty was 4.18/5, and was 3.79/5 from students.

5. June 2020: In addition to its findings, the PAB submitted the following recommendations and questions to the Chief of Police in response to a case reviewed by the board:

- a. The PAB asked whether there is a policy guiding the use of interpreters, and wanted to ensure that UCDPD officers are aware of the availability of interpreter services when needed.

Chief's response: The department has a policy for the use of interpreters. Officers can request an interpreter through dispatch via AT&T Language Line. The UCDPD will incorporate a reminder into their next training.

- b. The PAB asked about UCDPD's policies and/or practices regarding interviewing a party in the other party's presence in a case involving alleged domestic violence.

Chief's response: Generally best practice is to separate parties. The Chief agreed to provide refresher training.

- c. The PAB sought information specific to the case reviewed about the process for UCDPD officers to refer a case to the District Attorney's Office.

Chief's response: The decision to send a case to the DA for review resides with the detective sergeant. The detective sergeant reviews all follow-up investigations, additional statements, evidence collected, and supplemental reports. The detective sergeant consults with the District Attorney, Detectives, and the victim when making a decision.

- d. The PAB asked Chief Farrow to consider retraining on UCDPD policy 320.9, "Standards for Arrests."

Chief's response: Based on their investigation the officers did not believe they had probable cause to make an arrest in this incident.

Public comment highlights

Each quarter of the academic year, the board invites public comment and questions at a public meeting. Topics brought to the PAB during public comment in 2019-2020 addressed:

- Overview of the PAB's charge as a complaint review and advisory board
- PAB history
- Types of PAB inquiries and complaints
- Independence of the PAB from the Police Department
- Process for investigating and reviewing complaints, and investigator's access to evidence
- Process for adjudicating decisions made by the PAB and possible outcomes, including disciplinary action
- PAB representatives as unpaid volunteer positions
- Student involvement on the PAB
- Civilian oversight in municipalities
- Civilian oversight agencies as a model for improving police-community relations
- PAB public meeting format

- PAB marketing and communications.

The following were raised by the public as suggestions or concerns and subsequently were shared with the Chief of Police.

- A concern was raised about the need for more police patrol on campus at night, especially since Topsy Taxi was suspended. It was suggested that more Safe Ride vans drive around campus at night.
- Someone suggested that the UCDPD participate in a “see something, say something” campaign about University policies, especially the campus tobacco-free initiative.
- Given calls to disarm the campus police, it was asked if archery would be an option as an alternative to arming police officers with firearms.
- A PAB representative asked if there would be an opportunity to include information on the board in the Annual Fire and Safety Report.

PAB pilot program review and recommendations

In 2018-2019, the PAB Administrative Advisory Group, led by the Vice Chancellor’s Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, completed a review of the PAB’s four-year pilot program from 2014 to 2018. The review was informed by a campus-wide survey and feedback from campus and community constituents, along with the recommendations made by the [Report of the University of California Presidential Task Force on University-wide Policing](#). The resulting report on the PAB pilot program review was submitted to UC Davis Chancellor Gary May in June 2019 and included 10 recommendations to guide the work of the board moving forward. Chancellor May expressed his support of the report’s recommendations and asked for a proposed implementation plan, which was submitted in April 2020. Below is a summary of the report on the PAB pilot program review, its recommendations, and the proposed plan for implementing those recommendations.

Key Insights from the PAB Pilot Program Review

As a part of the PAB pilot program review, the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion launched a campus-wide survey to assess what value the PAB brings to UC Davis, and how the PAB can better serve the campus community. A review of the survey data generated the following considerations for the role and functions that the PAB should play on our campus moving forward:

- Safety and protection, especially from displays of police force, are of great concern on our campus.
- An independent civilian police oversight board that holds police accountable by the community they serve is beneficial for UC Davis. The diverse perspectives of our campus constituents are valuable in advocating against bias and in voicing the concerns of marginalized and underrepresented communities.
- Our campus sees transparency, fairness, and communication as important factors in improving trust and strengthening the relationship between the Police Department and the campus community. The community wants to be an involved partner in this process.

- The PAB adds value in addressing current campus and community concerns related to policing, including racism, bias, use of force, and de-escalation techniques and training. On the other hand, some respondents questioned the need for a PAB when, in their opinion, currently there are no pressing issues that require the PAB's attention.
- Several recommendations urged that the PAB have authority or play a role in determining and enforcing disciplinary actions against non-compliant officers. Without any teeth for enforcing consequences, the PAB in our community's eyes is limited in effectively achieving its mission. Transparency, accountability, and accessibility are important standards not only for the Police Department, but also for the PAB's work as well.
- While many survey respondents advocated for civilian oversight, others questioned whether civilians are adequately equipped to review police conduct and policies. Some suggested that board membership include some (or only) retired police officers. However, far more respondents indicated that the "police should not police the police."

Recommendations and Proposal for Implementation

1. **RECOMMENDATION 1:** The advisory arm of the PAB's charge—wherein the board may submit advisory recommendations to the Police Chief about UCDPD policies and procedures—should be emphasized as a cornerstone of the PAB's work.
 - a. The PAB will continue to engage in policy review related to civilian complaints of misconduct in violation of UCDPD policy and as appropriate, will identify opportunities to clarify or revise policies named in PAB complaints.
 - b. A formal process, in consultation with the Chief of Police, will be instituted wherein the PAB can proactively review and provide feedback on UCDPD policies and procedures, especially during the creation of new policy.
 - c. The PAB will continue to play a strong advisory role regarding police training requirements.
 - d. The UCDPD will continue to include and consult with representatives from the PAB and PAB Administrative Advisory Group during hiring.
2. **RECOMMENDATION 2:** The PAB's role as a mediator between the campus and community and the Police Department needs to be further developed.
 - a. PAB representatives will be required to give regular updates on the PAB, at minimum on an annual basis, to their constituent groups/entities. These updates should include information on all recommendations in this implementation plan.
 - b. The PAB will sponsor an event, at minimum on an annual basis, to promote police-community relationship building.
 - c. The PAB will consult with the UCDPD on their community engagement practices.

- d. The PAB Annual Report will continue to include detailed information about policy, procedure, practice, and training recommendations from the PAB to the Chief of Police, along with the Chief's responses.
3. **RECOMMENDATION 3:** Mediation and restorative justice are areas where the PAB can grow.
- a. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will research the viability of a mediation option for complaints submitted to the board.
 - b. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will include potential opportunities for restorative practices when researching mediation options for the board.
 - c. The PAB encourages campus colleagues engaged directly in restorative justice to address issues of policing in their work with UC Davis constituents and stakeholders.
 - d. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will institute the following options for incorporating early resolution practices into the PAB complaint process when concerned parties express that they do not want to file a formal complaint:
 - i. As an alternative to filing a formal complaint, concerned parties would be invited to write a letter to the PAB expressing their concern/complaint. The PAB would review the letter in closed session, draft questions and recommendations to the Police Chief and hold regular meetings with the Chief to discuss his responses.

The PAB Administrative Advisory Group needs to discuss whether it would be possible to later share some information on the outcome of the concern/complaint with the concerned party, and how to share the outcome in the PAB Annual Report.
 - ii. As an alternative to filing a formal complaint, concerned parties would be invited to meet directly with the Chief of Police to discuss their concerns.
 - e. When notified of the disposition of their inquiry, PAB concerned parties will continue to receive contact information for the Chief of Police should they wish to follow up.
 - f. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group recommends including information in the PAB Annual Report that specifies when the board made a recommendation to the Chief of Police in response to an inquiry or letter submitted to the board. The report will continue to include the Chief's responses to all recommendations.
4. **RECOMMENDATION 4:** The PAB complaint history of officers named in PAB complaints should continue to remain confidential during the PAB review process.
5. **RECOMMENDATION 5:** The PAB should continue its current role and not play a role in determining or enforcing disciplinary consequences for police officers.
- a. The Chief of Police will retain sole authority in determining and enforcing discipline when a civilian complaint is sustained against an officer.

6. **RECOMMENDATION 6:** Improved PAB outreach and marketing efforts are necessary.
 - a. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group requests sustained funding for a Student Assistant in the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, whose responsibilities, in part, would support with PAB communications, especially with social media and digital marketing.
7. **RECOMMENDATION 7:** The Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion should continue to plan trainings and ongoing education in order to familiarize the PAB with police policy and procedures, and with current issues relevant to the board's work as a campus civilian oversight board.
 - a. The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will continue to plan trainings and ongoing education opportunities for the PAB.
 - b. The PAB will provide increased opportunities for board representatives and members of the Administrative Advisory Group to attend trainings offered by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).
 - c. The PAB will continue to leverage opportunities to consult with PAB Administrative Advisory Group members and the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion to provide proactive department-wide trainings for UCDPD. This effort currently is underway. PAB representatives will be invited to attend these trainings when appropriate, and other opportunities for the PAB to train alongside UCDPD personnel will continue to be explored.
8. **RECOMMENDATION 8:** Our campus community, especially our students, may have questions about bias among PAB representatives during case review. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group should continue to relay that demographics and identifying information are not known to the PAB at any point during case review, except when demographics may be relevant to the complaint, e.g., a complaint of discrimination.
 - a. Both PAB representatives and members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group will share the responsibility of communicating with the entities represented on the PAB and with campus constituents the practices related to confidentiality and anonymity during PAB case review.
9. **RECOMMENDATION 9:** The PAB Administrative Advisory Group should widely share information about the process for nominating and selecting PAB representatives.
 - a. Both PAB representatives and members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group will share the responsibility of communicating with the entities represented on the PAB and with campus constituents the practices related to nominating and selecting representatives to the PAB.
10. **RECOMMENDATION 10:** It is recommended that the PAB undergo periodic program review to assess its effectiveness in achieving its mission, and to review its charge.

- a. The PAB will undergo substantial program review every five years, with the next review taking place in 2023.
- b. Funding for PAB program reviews should include a temporary part-time contract in the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion for a campus colleague with expertise in survey administration, and a budget for incentives for survey participation.

Additional information at pab.ucdavis.edu

The PAB website contains the PAB's Bylaws and Procedures, meeting dates, members and information on filing a complaint—including an online Complaint Form—and the complaint review and investigation processes. Also included is an online Feedback/Suggestion Form for raising questions or issues to the PAB's attention. The full 2019-2020 Annual Report is available on the PAB website.

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020								
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Concerned Party's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity*	Allegations	Case Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome (Allegation & Disposition)	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19-072 • 2/26/19¹ • Sacramento 	Online Complaint Form & email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community member • Not provided • Woman • Black 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourtesy count 1 • Discourtesy count 2 • Improper use of force • Discourtesy count 3 	Investigation complete ² – closed 8/15/19	171 days	143 days ³	Formal Investigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourtesy count 1: not sustained • Discourtesy count 2: sustained • Improper use of force: unfounded • Discourtesy count 3: exonerated 	All findings accepted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19-076 • 5/6/19⁴ • Davis 	Letter to Director of Investigations from Chief of Police ⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • N/A • N/A • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improper use of force • Discourteous, disrespectful or discriminatory treatment count 1 • Discourteous, disrespectful or discriminatory treatment count 2 • Profane and derogatory comments • Conduct unbecoming 	Investigation complete – closed 11/20/19	199 days	124 days ⁶	Formal Investigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improper use of force: exonerated • Discourteous, disrespectful or discriminatory conduct count 1: exonerated • Discourteous, disrespectful or discriminatory conduct count 2: sustained • Profane and derogatory comments: sustained • Conduct unbecoming: sustained 	All findings accepted

* Demographics of all concerned parties are provided voluntarily and are not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they are relevant to the allegations (e.g. in a discrimination case).

¹ Because this inquiry was submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period, it also was included in the 2018-2019 PAB Annual Report. The PAB completed its review of the inquiry during the 2019-2020 reporting period.

² The matter falls within the PAB purview and an investigation has been conducted and completed.

³ The original investigator assigned to this investigation left the Office of Compliance and Policy, so the investigation had to be re-assigned. The concerned party scheduled but did not appear for two interviews, also contributing to the delay in this matter. The investigation was completed within ninety days of the charge to the investigator who completed the review.

⁴ Because this inquiry was submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period, it also was included in the 2018-2019 PAB Annual Report. The PAB completed its review of the inquiry during the 2019-2020 reporting period.

⁵ On May 6, 2019, an incident at the UC Davis Bookstore resulting in UC Davis police officers using force in order to affect an arrest. The Chief of Police formally requested that the Office of Compliance and Policy launch an independent investigation into the incident.

⁶ After consultation with the PAB and in line with PAB procedures, the Office of Compliance and Policy identified an external police practices expert to contract with as a co-investigator. Due to contracting issues outside of the PAB's, Compliance's and UCDPD's control, the start of investigative interviews in this matter were delayed, although documents were collected during this period.

Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Concerned Party's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Case Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome (Allegations & Disposition)	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
•19-077 •9/4/19 •Davis	Online Feedback Form	•Student •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Police vehicle failure to yield in roundabout	Closed ⁸ in accord with concerned party's preference	N/A	N/A	In accord with the concerned party's preferences, the PAB detailed their concern to the UCDPD and asked about UCDPD driving policies. UCDPD's response was provided to the concerned party.	N/A
•19-078 •9/11/19 •Sacramento	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	•Community member •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	•Improper confiscation of property •Dishonesty	Investigation complete – closed 3/12/20	184 days	102 days	Formal Investigation •Improper confiscation of property: unfounded •Dishonesty: unfounded	All findings accepted
•19-079 •9/29/19 •Davis	Online Feedback Form	•Not provided •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Noise complaint at off-campus location	Closed – lack of jurisdiction	N/A	N/A	Referred to City of Davis Police Department	N/A
•19-080 •10/30/19 •Sacramento	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	•Community member •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Failure to provide badge number	Considered with Case #19-078 (related matter involving same complainant and different officer)	N/A	N/A	The investigator assigned to Case #19-078 reviewed body camera audio that established that the accused officer identified their badge number upon the concerned party's requests, so new formal investigation was not charged	N/A
•19-081 •11/8/19 •Davis	Online Complaint Form	•Student •26 •Woman •Not provided	•Discourtesy •Intimidation •Improper use of force	Closed – lack of jurisdiction	N/A	N/A	Reported beyond 180 days of incident ⁹ , referred to UCDPD	N/A

⁸ The information provided by the concerned party reflects that the matter does not fall within the PAB purview. For example, the inquiry 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 concerned party 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 concerned party requests no investigation.)

⁹ This inquiry referred to an incident that occurred approximately six years ago by the concerned party's calculation. As stated in the PAB's Procedures: "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."

Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Concerned Party's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Case Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome (Allegations & Disposition)	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
•20-082 •1/12/20 •Davis	Online Feedback Form	•Community member •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Allegations unclear	Closed – insufficient information	N/A	N/A	The concerned party alleged circumstances involving individuals and off-campus properties with unclear links to UCDPD. The PAB unsuccessfully attempted to contact the concerned party.	N/A
•20-083 •1/30/20 •Davis	Online Complaint Form	•Community member •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Intimidation by UC Davis security officer	Closed – referred to security supervisor	N/A	N/A	The PAB worked with staff to arrange for the concerned party to pick up property that they had left at the University	N/A
•20-084 •2/25/20 •Davis	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu, online Complaint Form, phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	•Student •Not provided •Not provided •Chinese	•Discourtesy •Dishonesty •Improper police procedures	Investigation complete – closed 6/30/20	127 days	79 days	Formal Investigation •Discourtesy 1: exonerated •Discourtesy 2: exonerated •Discourtesy 3: not sustained •Dishonesty: exonerated •Improper police procedures: unfounded	All findings accepted
•20-085 •4/27/20 •Davis	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	•Not provided •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Unsatisfactory response following report of a theft	Closed in accord with concerned party's preference	N/A	N/A	The concerned party elected to write a statement about their experience, which was shared with and reviewed by the PAB and the Police Chief	N/A
•20-086 •6/2/20 •Campus location not identified	Online Feedback Form	•Not provided •Not provided •Not provided •Not provided	Inquiry into UCDPD practices for responding to protests and for protecting vulnerable communities	Closed – feedback provided to UCDPD	N/A	N/A	The concerned party did not provide contact information. Feedback was shared with UCDPD.	N/A

Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Concerned Party's Campus Affiliation, Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity	Allegations	Case Status	Report Date to Close	Investigation Charge Date to Completion	Outcome (Allegations & Disposition)	Outcome Accepted by Police Chief
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-087 • 6/11/20 • Sacramento 	Online Feedback Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided 	Discourtesy by UCDPD non-uniformed staff during Live Scan appointment	Closed – lack of jurisdiction, feedback provided to UCDPD	N/A	N/A	The PAB shared the concerned party's feedback with UCDPD, which updated their Live Scan process in response. The PAB provided UCDPD's response to the concerned party.	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-088 • 5/29/20 • Davis 	Complaint submitted to UCDPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not provided • Not provided • Not provided • Chinese American 	Discrimination	Closed – insufficient information ¹⁰	N/A	N/A	The PAB contacted the concerned party and to date has not received a response	N/A

⁵ 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 concerned party has provided contact information, Compliance contacts the concerned party to request the needed information. If it is provided, the matter will be revisited. Compliance also passes along the nature of the inquiry to the PAB and to the Chief of Police with the understanding that additional information could result in an investigation being charged in the future.

