

UCDAVIS

Police Accountability Board

Annual Report

July 2019 – June 2020

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 Inquiries and PAB Review	7
Cases Reviewed, PAB Findings and Status of Current PAB Cases	11
Police Chief's Response to Recommendations	11
2019-2020 Trends	12
Recommendations, Questions and Comments to the Chief of Police	14
PAB Pilot Program Review and Recommendations	19
Table Summary of PAB Inquiries and Findings	24
Appendix	

November 12, 2020

INTRODUCTION

Enclosed is the UC Davis Police Accountability Board's (PAB) 2019-2020 Annual Report. From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the PAB received twelve (12) inquiries. Consistent with the PAB's procedures, the PAB closed twelve (12) of those inquiries between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020. In addition, the PAB in 2019-2020 closed two (2) inquiries submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period. A complete summary of inquiries received by the PAB, cases reviewed and PAB findings can be found in the table at the end of this report.

MISSION OF THE PAB

The Police Accountability Board, which is a civilian oversight committee comprised of diverse campus representatives, was established in 2014 to promote accountability, trust and communication between the University of California, Davis (UCD) community and the UCD Police Department (UCDPD). 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.

HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PAB

After consultation with an independent expert in police oversight and several campus forums, the PAB was established as a 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 that incident, provided the background and context that led to the recommended establishment of a police accountability program for the UCDPD. It was founded to restore trust between the police and the campus community.

See Appendix for PAB Bylaws and Procedures.

PAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

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 submits advisory recommendations to the Chief about UCDPD policies, procedures, practices and trainings.

As of June 30, 2020, PAB members and alternates included:

Academic Federation

Kara Carr (alternate)

Academic Senate

Jack Chin (member) – Chair

Associated Students, UC Davis

Jayse Morris (member)

Maiya De La Rosa (alternate)

Graduate Student Association

Jeremy Prim (member)

Josh Shahryar (alternate)

Staff Assemblies

Eleanor McAuliffe (member)

Lisa Feldmann (alternate)

Student Life

Valencia Scott (member)

Malissia Bordeaux (alternate)

UC Davis Health

Antionette Caruso (member) – Vice Chair

Khoban Kochai (alternate)

Charron Andrus (alternate)

PC How (alternate).

PAB ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY GROUP

The PAB is supported by the Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and the Office of Compliance and Policy.

PAB Administrative Advisory Group:

Rahim Reed, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor, Campus Community Relations, Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Mikael Villalobos, Associate Chief Diversity Officer, Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Megan Macklin, Program Manager, Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Sunjeet Dosanjh, Program Assistant, Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

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

Larisa King, Compliance Analyst, Office of Compliance and Policy

Michael Sweeney, Chief Campus Counsel, Office of Campus Counsel

Joseph Farrow, Chief of Police, UC Davis Police Department

External Counsel:

Laura Izon, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo

PAB MEMBERSHIP AND TRAINING

A. Board Membership

The PAB is comprised of seven (7) members and seven (7) alternates who broadly represent the diversity of the UCD community. The following campus entities nominate individuals for representation on the PAB:

Academic Federation

Academic Senate

Associated Students, UCD

Graduate Student Association

Staff Assemblies

Student Life

Office for Health Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

Recruitment for the PAB is staggered, with seven (7) positions filled each year. This allows for the preservation of institutional knowledge on the board. Each organization provides at least one (1) nominee for each vacancy. When an organization nominates multiple people, the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor (AEVC) of Campus Community Relations selects one (1) PAB representative from that organization's nominees. All fourteen (14) PAB representatives participate in training during the onboarding process. Each has access to the confidential investigation reports and attends meetings.

PAB members include:

- Two (2) undergraduate students

- One (1) graduate student

- One (1) faculty member

- One (1) staff member

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

Generally, PAB members and alternates serve two-year (2) terms. Some served shorter terms when they were not qualifying representatives of their organization for the entire period of their appointment, while others served longer terms if their appointments began mid-year. Nominating entities may re-nominate PAB representatives to multiple terms.

After the first year of their term, members become alternates and alternates become members, thereby allowing full participation on the PAB during the two-year term. The AEVC of Campus Community Relations works with the various entities to maintain both a member and an alternate representative and to 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 or alternate of the PAB can be a current or former UC Davis Police Department employee, or a current employee of Campus Counsel or the Compliance and Policy unit of the Offices of the Chancellor and Provost.

B. Training

All PAB members and alternates were required to attend orientation sessions before joining the board. At the first orientation, PAB members received information from Megan Macklin from the Vice Chancellor's Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion on the history and background of the PAB. At the second orientation, a representative 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.

PAB members and alternates also receive ongoing training regarding police procedures, relevant legal issues, impartiality, the confidential nature of police misconduct investigations and discipline and the civilian oversight field. In 2019-2020, PAB

representatives who chose to participate attended the following trainings organized by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE):

- NACOLE Academic Symposium (March 2020)
- Impact of COVID-19 on Oversight Bodies and Strategies to Move Forward (April 2020)
- Mediators' Perspective on Officer-Civilian Mediations (April 2020).

Each year, the PAB nominates representatives to attend the NACOLE annual conference. In September 2019, PAB representatives Malissia Bordeaux and Josh Shahryar, and PAB Administrative Advisory Group member Wendy Lilliedoll, attended the NACOLE conference in Detroit, Michigan and afterwards briefed the board. The 2020 NACOLE annual conference will be offered as a series of webinars, and PAB representatives will have an opportunity to participate virtually. Members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group will present a session entitled “Partnerships in Civilian Oversight of University Police” as a part of the 2020 conference.

PAB MEETINGS

The PAB meets monthly when there is new business or a case to review. In-person meetings alternate between the UC Davis and UC Davis Health campuses; in light of the current COVID-19 pandemic, PAB meetings transitioned to a virtual format via Zoom beginning in March 2020. The PAB also solicits public input by holding regularly scheduled and advertised meetings at least once quarterly during the regular academic year. Public meetings emphasize dialogue with the public and offer opportunities for public comment. These quarterly public meetings are denoted below (*). Additional PAB meetings are scheduled on an as-needed basis.

2019 – 2020 PAB Meetings:

- July 17, 2019
- September 18, 2019
- October 16, 2019 – Fall Quarterly Public Meeting, Memorial Union Garrison Room (UC Davis) & Education Building Room 3103 (UC Davis Health)
- November 20, 2019
- January 15, 2020
- February 19, 2020 – Winter Quarterly Public Meeting, Student Community Center Meeting Room A (UC Davis) & Education Building Room 3103 (UC Davis Health)
- March 18, 2020
- May 20, 2020 – Spring Quarterly Public Meeting, online via Zoom

- June 17, 2020

A. Number of Decision-Making Meetings:

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the board held nine (9) decision-making meetings. At four (4) of these meetings, the board reviewed cases resulting in recommended findings to the Chief of Police. During case review, the PAB makes recommendations regarding each allegation finding contained in the report, the number of which may vary depending upon the complaint.

Public summaries of the PAB's closed meetings are available online at pab.ucdavis.edu/meeting-minutes.

B. Attendance for Decision-Making Meetings:

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, average attendance of voting members at decision-making meetings was 53.97%, and the average attendance of alternates was 58.06%. Average attendance of voting members at meetings where cases were reviewed was 53.57%, and the average attendance of alternates was 70.37%.

C. 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 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.

PAB members advised participants that resource information, including the PAB Procedures, Bylaws and Annual Report, is available online at pab.ucdavis.edu.

The following were raised by the public as suggestions or concerns and subsequently were shared with the Chief of Police. The Chief's responses can be found in the "Recommendations, Questions and Comments to the Chief of Police" section of this report.

- 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.

Full summaries of the PAB Quarterly Public Meetings can be found online at pab.ucdavis.edu/meeting-minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF INQUIRIES AND PAB REVIEW

A. Filing an Inquiry with the PAB

There are several avenues for filing inquiries with the PAB:

- [Online Complaint Form](#) or [online Feedback/Suggestion Form](#)
- Email to pab@ucdavis.edu
- Via telephone at (530) 752-6550
- Print the [Complaint Form](#) or [Feedback/Suggestion Form](#) and send 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
- Prescheduled in person at the Office of Compliance and Policy, Mrak Hall 5th floor¹
- File a complaint to the UC Davis Police Department. The UCDPD forwards all civilian complaints they receive to the PAB.

The [Complaint Form](#) and [Feedback/Suggestion Form](#) are available in English, Chinese, Hmong, Spanish, Russian and Vietnamese. A current copy of the Complaint Form in English is included in the Appendix.

¹ In light of the current COVID-19 pandemic, meetings can be scheduled virtually via Zoom or other online platforms.

The Complaint Form includes fields for the complainant to identify demographic information. Demographic information, as well as all other questions asked on the Complaint Form, are voluntary. Anonymous inquiries can be submitted to the PAB.

All inquiries to the PAB are received and reviewed by the Office of Compliance and Policy, which is independent from the Police Department. In addition to receiving inquiries directly from the concerned party, the Office of Compliance and Policy may receive inquiries forwarded by other campus or community stakeholders. Regardless of the format of an inquiry or method of filing, the Office of Compliance and Policy contacts the concerned party (when contact information is provided) with information regarding the PAB and the PAB investigation process. Considering all available information, the Office of Compliance and Policy determines whether an inquiry is appropriate for investigation (e.g., timely, states sufficient facts, etc.).

If an inquiry is eligible for review, the Office of Compliance and Policy considers whether the concerned party wants a formal investigation or another resolution. In rare cases, a formal investigation may be necessary even if the concerned party would prefer another resolution. However, strong consideration is given to the concerned party's preference if known. To date, the Office of Compliance and Policy has not formally investigated any matters in which the concerned party stated that they did not want a formal investigation.

Inquiries that are ineligible for review under PAB procedures are closed, and the concerned party is informed. For example, the PAB only reviews complaints against UCDPD officers, and not against other campus community members or personnel employed by other law enforcement agencies. Complaints regarding non-UCDPD officers are therefore closed, and the complainant and other agencies are notified where appropriate. The Office of Compliance and Policy can investigate complaints submitted to the PAB against nonsworn UCDPD staff (e.g., front desk staff at the Police Department, security guards, or other employees connected to the Police Department who are not sworn officers) according to its process for reviewing allegations of non-police-specific University policy violations. Complaints against nonsworn UCDPD staff that are submitted to the PAB that do not allege a policy violation (e.g., allegations of discourtesy) are referred to the appropriate manager, who can work with Human Resources to address such management issues. In the event that the Office of Compliance and Policy investigates a matter that involves a UCDPD employee who is not a sworn police officer, the PAB will not be notified of the outcome of the review.

If a matter qualifies for PAB review, a University Investigator from the Office of Compliance and Policy conducts a thorough and impartial review. The investigation process includes talking to the concerned party, the responding officer and relevant witnesses, as well as reviewing evidence such as documents and video footage where it is available. PAB procedures establish that the investigation process will generally be completed within ninety (90) calendar days from the date on which the investigation is charged. If a thorough review requires additional time, the parties are notified. The amount of time required to complete an investigation can vary according to factors such

as the number of parties involved in a case and their availability, availability of witnesses and investigator caseload.

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

The PAB also welcomes inquiries, feedback and suggestions outside of the formal complaint process. These can be submitted using the PAB's online Feedback/Suggestion Form at pab.ucdavis.edu/feedback or in person at the quarterly public meetings. The PAB also may be contacted at pab@ucdavis.edu.

B. Investigation Reports

As noted, the investigator, consistent with governing law that protects identifying information, provides a confidential report to the PAB that is redacted and does not identify the individuals involved, nor does it include any 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

- Exhibit Listing.

The investigator's conclusions are based upon what is known as the "preponderance of the evidence" standard. That 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), votes on its recommendations to adopt, amend or reject the investigator's findings and renders its own findings of whether an allegation is unfounded, exonerated, not sustained or sustained. Online access to the investigative reports via a password-protected website is made available prior to the closed session, and hard copies are distributed and later collected during the closed session when held in-person.

Five (5) members present constitutes a meeting quorum. Decisions of the PAB are made by a vote of a majority of the members in attendance provided that a quorum exists. Alternates participate and vote in meetings when the PAB member representing their entity is absent.

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's policy, procedure or practice recommendations may result from issues related to a specific complaint investigation or from a general policy review and analysis. 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. It is the Chief's responsibility in determining appropriate remediation, corrective action or discipline to review an officer's entire performance and discipline history, taking into consideration both the sustaining of a single PAB complaint, as well as how like circumstances have been treated historically to ensure consistency and non-discriminatory practices.

The PAB's recommendations regarding the investigative findings are issued in writing. The PAB, through the Office of Compliance and Policy, forwards its recommendations 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. The Chief 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 concerned 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 concerned 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. Chief of Police Joseph Farrow can be reached at (530) 752-3113 or jafarrow@ucdavis.edu.

CASES REVIEWED, PAB FINDINGS AND STATUS OF CURRENT PAB CASES

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, twelve (12) inquiries were submitted to the PAB. Two (2) of those inquiries were investigated. The remaining ten (10) inquiries did not proceed through investigation because:

- They were outside of the PAB's purview (six [6] inquiries)
- The concerned party expressed they did not want the matter to be investigated (one [1] inquiry)
- The allegations were considered in a separate investigation involving the same concerned party (one [1] inquiry)
- The PAB received insufficient information to proceed (one [1] inquiry)
- The complaint cited an incident that occurred beyond 180 days of the incident date² (one [1] inquiry).

The PAB completed its review of the two (2) cases that proceeded through investigation between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020. In addition, the PAB in 2019-2020 closed two (2) cases submitted during the 2018-2019 reporting period.

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. The PAB's findings are summarized in the table at the end of this report.

POLICE CHIEF'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the Chief of Police considered four (4) 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.

² 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."

2019-2020 TRENDS

A. Inquiries Filed Per Academic Quarter

From July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, twelve (12) inquiries were filed with the PAB. Two (2) inquiries (16.67%) were filed during Summer 2019, three (3) inquiries (25.00%) were filed during Fall 2019, three (3) inquiries (25.00 %) were filed during Winter 2020 and four (4) inquiries (33.33%) were filed during Spring 2020.

In addition, two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020. The first was filed in Winter 2019, and the second in Spring 2019.

B. Inquiry Location

Of the twelve (12) total inquiries received in 2019-2020, nine (9) (75.00%) were filed to the Davis campus and three (3) (25.00%) were filed to the Sacramento UC Davis Health campus.

Of the two (2) 2019-2020 cases that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB, one (1) (50.00%) was filed to the Davis campus and one (1) (50.00%) was filed to the Sacramento Health campus. In addition, of the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, one (1) was filed to the Davis campus and one (1) was filed to the Sacramento Health campus.

C. Inquiry Filing Methods

The most popular method of filing an inquiry in 2019-2020 was via the online Feedback/Suggestion form on the PAB website (five [5] inquiries, 41.67%), followed by calling the Office of Compliance and Policy (four [4] inquiries, 33.33%) and submitting the online Complaint Form on the PAB website (two [2] inquiries, 16.67%). Other filing methods included emailing the PAB at pab@ucdavis.edu (one [1] inquiry, 8.33%) and submitting a complaint to the UCDPD (one [1] inquiry, 8.33%). A concerned party can submit an inquiry using multiple methods.

In addition, of the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, the first was filed via the online form on PAB website and an email to pab@ucdavis.edu. The other matter was submitted by the Chief of Police to the Director of Investigations in the Office of Compliance and Policy. This final matter was not the subject of a civilian complaint to the PAB. Instead, Police Chief Farrow asked the PAB to engage its typical procedure to review his officers' conduct in a particular incident and to provide recommendations.

D. Demographics

Demographics 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.

Campus affiliation: Among the inquiries received in 2019-2020, four (4) (33.33%) were filed by community members and three (3) (25.00%) were filed by UC Davis students. The concerned party's campus affiliation in five (5) inquiries (41.67%) was unknown. In addition, among the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, one (1) complaint was filed a community member; the other matter was submitted by the Chief of Police.

Age: Among the inquiries received in 2019-2020, one (1) concerned party (8.33%) was between the ages of 25 and 34. The concerned party's age in eleven (11) inquiries (91.67%) was unknown. In addition, among the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, age was not provided in either case.

Gender: Among the inquiries received in 2019-2020, the concerned party in one (1) inquiry (8.33%) identified as a woman. The concerned party's gender in eleven (11) inquiries (91.67%) was unknown. In addition, among the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, the concerned party in one (1) case identified as a woman; gender was not provided in the other matter.

Race/ethnicity: Among the inquiries received in 2019-2020, the concerned party in one (1) inquiry (8.33%) identified as Chinese, and the concerned party in one (1) inquiry (8.33%) identified as Chinese American. The concerned party's race/ethnicity in ten (10) inquiries (83.33%) was unknown. In addition, among the two (2) cases submitted in 2018-2019 that were reviewed by the PAB in 2019-2020, the concerned party in one (1) inquiry identified as Black; race/ethnicity was not provided in the other matter. Concerned parties have the option to indicate more than one race or ethnicity.

E. Allegations

Of the four (4) inquiries closed in 2019-2020 that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB:

- Two (2) of the four (4) cases (50.00%) involved allegations of discourtesy
- Two (2) of the four (4) cases (50.00%) involved allegations of dishonesty
- One (1) of the four (4) cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of improper confiscation of property
- One (1) of the four (4) cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of intimidation
- One (1) of the four (4) cases (25.00%) case involved an allegation of improper use of force
- One (1) of the four (4) cases (25.00%) involved an allegation of improper police procedures.

PAB cases often involve multiple allegations.

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.

RECOMMENDATIONS, QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE

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.

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.

A. 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. The survey generated 365 responses³. The majority of survey respondents identified as staff (70.33%, n=256), followed by students (28.54%, n=104); few responses were logged by faculty (0.82% n=3) and community members/individuals not affiliated with UC Davis (0.27%, n=1). Among the respondents who identified as UC Davis affiliates, nearly three-quarters (74.86%, n=271) identified UC Davis as the campus they work or study at, and over one-quarter (25.14%, n=91) identified UC Davis Health as the campus they work or study at.

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

³ All survey questions were voluntary, and respondents had the option to skip questions.

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."

B. 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.

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 ¹⁰ 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 ¹¹ , referred to UCDPD	N/A

¹⁰ 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.)

¹¹ 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 ¹²	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.

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	17

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

ARTICLE 1 – NAME AND PURPOSE

The Police Accountability Board (PAB) was established in 2014 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. Other than mandatory quarterly meetings, alternates need not attend meetings or review investigation materials if the PAB member will be in attendance.

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE 4 – NOMINATIONS, SELECTION AND ALTERNATES

The entities identified in Article 3 may nominate a representative to the PAB, utilizing each entity's respective nomination process. Each entity 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 entities' nominees, which will result in seven (7) PAB members and seven (7) alternates and maintain the composition identified above. All fourteen (14) representatives will participate in training and each can have access to the confidential investigation reports and attend meetings.

ARTICLE 5 – TERMS

Initially, the inaugural PAB members and alternates served two- (2) year terms. In order to maintain institutional knowledge at the conclusion of the pilot, some members' and alternates' terms were extended, and former alternates were given the opportunity to serve as members. Beginning in 2016, new members and alternates generally serve two (2) year terms except in circumstances where the member or alternate will not be a qualifying representative of his or her entity for the entire term. For example, a senior graduating mid-term or a faculty member retiring mid-term would not be eligible to serve for the entire two- (2) year term. To the extent possible, after the first year of the 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.

ARTICLE 6 – OFFICERS

As needed, 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. Officers, however, may be reelected to serve consecutive 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 physically present shall constitute a meeting 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 participate and vote in meetings when the PAB member representing their entity 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/training and (2) the findings of investigation reports. The PAB may also solicit progress reports from the Chief of Police regarding policy and training recommendations. 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 – AMENDMENT

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

**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.

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

I. Introduction

It is the intent of the University of California, Davis (UCD) to develop and promote accountability, trust, and communication between the Davis and Sacramento campus communities and the UCD Police Department (UCDPD). To that end, UCD established a 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. Through various public forums, the PAB also solicits information and input from the public and its constituent groups. 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 and alternates 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; 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/discrimination, etc.) 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 either 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. The Chancellor or the Chief of Police may also refer issues to the Office of Compliance for investigation and the PAB for review and recommendation.

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. Anonymous complaints should provide as much detail as possible in order to enable appropriate review and investigation.

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. At least monthly, the Office of Compliance will report to the PAB on any complaints that have been received since the previous monthly 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 in person at the Police Department, when an uninvolved supervisor or the Watch Commander determines that the complainant, after discussion of the matter, 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 and access restricted to the Office of Compliance. These files will be stored in a secure location and maintained for at least five (5) years. The Chief Compliance Officer/designee 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/designee will request additional information from the complainant to the extent that the identity of the complainant is known. If the complainant is anonymous and there is insufficient information to warrant conducting an investigation, the Chief Compliance Officer/designee will close the file and no investigation shall be conducted.
- (2) If the Chief Compliance Officer/designee 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/designee will notify the complainant, the Chief of Police and the PAB of the disposition in writing citing the specific reasons for the determining that the complaint will not be investigated.
- (3) If the Chief Compliance Officer/designee determines there is sufficient information and cause to investigate, they 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 officer(s) 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 him or her 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 peace officers 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)).

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 entity'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.

The PAB may also solicit progress reports from the Chief of Police regarding policy and training recommendations.

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. Suggestions to the PAB

For those who do not wish to file a formal complaint, the PAB will also accept, review and track suggestions received on-line via its Suggestion/Awareness Form.

VI. 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., not investigated, 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 pab.ucdavis.edu.

POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD

Complaint Form*

This form is intended for use by those who wish to file a complaint against a UC Davis Police Officer(s) for misconduct and who seek formal investigation of the matter by the Office of Compliance and Policy. If you are not such a complainant and do not seek formal investigation, you may instead want to fill out the PAB's Suggestion/Awareness Form.

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. (If filling out this form by hand, please attach additional pages as necessary.)

Incident Narrative

Date of incident

Time of incident

At which UC Davis location did the alleged violation occur?

- UC Davis – Davis campus
- UCD Health – Medical Center

Where specifically on either the Davis campus or the UCD Health Campus (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.* (If filling out this form by hand, please attach additional pages as necessary.)

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

- Discourtesy (abusive or obscene language, failure to provide information, failure to respond)
- Discrimination (prejudicial treatment based on disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, and/or religion, etc.)
- Harassment (consistent, deliberate annoyance through repeated contacts)
- Improper Police Tow
- Improper Search (of home, person, or vehicle)
- Improper Seizure (of person, property, or vehicle)

Improper Arrest

Improper Use of Force (improper physical contact; use of baton, firearm, handcuffs, mace, pepper spray, etc.); unnecessary display of firearm

Improper Citation

Inadequate or Improper Investigation (Failure to investigate or make police report; false or improper police report)

Improper Detention

Other/Unsure

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 1 Information

Witness Name

Witness Address (if applicable)

Witness e-mail

Witness phone (if applicable)

Witness 2 Information

Witness Name

Witness Address (if applicable)

Witness e-mail

Witness phone (if applicable)

Witness 3 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 A PROCEDURE TO INVESTIGATE CITIZENS' COMPLAINTS. YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO A WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROCEDURE. CITIZEN COMPLAINTS AND ANY REPORTS OR FINDINGS RELATING TO COMPLAINTS MUST BE RETAINED BY THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS.*

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

Signature

Date