

UCDAVIS

Police Accountability Board

Annual Report

July 2023 – June 2024

Published November 6, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Mission of the PAB	2
History and Functions of the PAB	2
PAB Members and Alternates	2
PAB Administrative Advisory Group	4
PAB Membership, Training and Outreach	5
PAB Meetings	8
Investigation of Inquiries and PAB Review	10
Cases Reviewed, PAB Findings and Status of Current PAB Cases	14
Police Chief's Response to Recommendations	14
2023-2024 Trends	15
Recommendations, Questions and Comments to the Chief of Police	16
PAB Program Review by Audit Management and Advisory Services	20
Table Summary of PAB Inquiries and Findings	23
Appendix	

INTRODUCTION

Enclosed is the UC Davis Police Accountability Board's (PAB) 2023-2024 Annual Report. The PAB annual report is prepared by the Office of Campus and Community Relations, a unit in [Diversity, Equity and Inclusion](#). The report is reviewed and approved by the PAB administrative advisory group, board representatives, the UC Davis Police Department (UCDPD) Chief and UC Davis Chancellor prior to publication.

From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, the PAB received twenty-four (24) inquiries. Two (2) of those inquiries were investigated or are under investigation. One (1) of those cases was closed during 2023-2024; one (1) additional case remains under investigation and pending PAB review as of June 30, 2024.

Twenty-two (22) inquiries submitted to the PAB in 2023-2024 did not proceed through investigation because:

- The concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation (fifteen [15] cases). Inquiries pertaining to issues outside the PAB's purview are dismissed, referred to the appropriate entity and, when possible, the reporting party is notified.
- The PAB received insufficient information from the reporting party to determine whether to charge an investigation (five [5] cases).
- In response to an inquiry related to notification of an on-campus incident via the Clery timely warning, the PAB communicated with the reporting party that no Clery timely warning was issued because the UCDPD determined that the subject in that matter was known to the victim, and that there was not an ongoing threat to the campus community at large (one [1] case).
- In response to an inquiry related to the process for requesting police reports from the UCDPD, the UC Davis Office of Compliance and Policy conducted a review of the UCDPD police report submission and printing process, and drafted a process improvement report that was submitted to the PAB and to the UCDPD (one [1] case).

Also in 2023-2024, the PAB completed its investigation and review of one (1) complaint submitted in 2022-2023.

A complete summary of 2023-2024 inquiries received by the PAB, cases reviewed and PAB findings can be found in the table at the end of this report¹.

The [PAB case database](#) includes comprehensive information on all inquiries received by the PAB and is updated at minimum each quarter during the regular academic year.

¹ The table also includes information on the complaint filed during the PAB's 2022-2023 reporting period that was closed during 2023-2024.

MISSION OF THE PAB

The [Police Accountability Board](#) is a civilian oversight board comprised of diverse university representatives that was established in 2014 to promote accountability, trust and communication between the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) community and the UCDPD. Two functions are central to the PAB's work. First, the PAB independently reviews investigation reports and makes recommendations, including factual findings, to the Chief of Police following investigations of complaints from the university community or general public (also referred to as civilian complaints). Second, both over the course of complaint review and in proactive efforts to evaluate UCDPD culture department-wide, the PAB reviews UCDPD policies, procedures, practices and trainings and makes recommendations when the PAB identifies possible improvements. The PAB solicits public input during open meetings. The PAB is committed to a fair and unbiased approach throughout its work.

HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PAB

The PAB was established in May 2014, after consultation with an independent expert in police oversight and several campus forums. Developing a police accountability program for the UCDPD is one component of a complex process of evaluating, restructuring and healing in response to the November 18, 2011 UC Davis pepper spray incident. The [Reynoso Task Force Report](#) and [Robinson-Edley Report](#), 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 UCD police and the campus community.

The PAB and civilian oversight of university police were key components of the 2021 report of the [UC Davis Task Force on Next Generation Reforms to Advance Campus Safety](#) and the 2021 [University of California \(UC\) Community Safety Plan](#). The PAB continues to lead as one of the only active civilian oversight programs for university police nationwide, and serves as the model for institutionalizing civilian oversight across the University of California system. Recommendation 4.1a of the UC Community Safety Plan outlined the following: "Each campus, modeling the UC Davis Police Accountability Board's procedures and policies as minimum standards, will establish an independent, civilian campus police accountability body and procedures to review investigation reports regarding complaints filed against UCPD."

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 UCD Police Department staff. These recommendations are considered by the Chief of Police, who may accept, reject or modify the PAB's findings and

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, 2024, PAB representatives included:

Academic Senate and Academic Federation

Kara Carr (Academic Federation)
Associate Project Scientist and Manager, J. Amorocho Hydraulics Laboratory
Chair, Academic Federation Committee for the James Meyer Distinguished Achievement Award

Daniel Potter (Academic Senate)
Professor and Vice Chair – Teaching and Curriculum, Department of Plant Sciences
Chair, Academic Senate Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction
Member, Campus Judicial Board

Associated Students, UC Davis

Megan Chung
Political Science and Managerial Economics double major, graduating 2024
Commissioner, Academic Affairs Commission, Associated Students, UC Davis

Curtis Chen
Computer Science and Psychology double major, graduating 2026
Interim Senator, Associated Students, UC Davis

Graduate Student Association

Siuoneh Didarloo
PhD student in Psychology, graduating 2027
Graduate Student Representative, Graduate Student Association

James Giller – 2023-2024 PAB Chair
PhD student in Transportation Technology and Policy, graduating 2025

Staff Assemblies

Linda Braak (Davis Chapter)
Director - Customer Care & Planning, Transportation Services

Jacqueline Larripa (Health Chapter)
Physician and Employee Experience Consultant, UC Davis Health Experience Design

Student Life

Alfredo Tool – 2023-2024 PAB Vice Chair
Environmental Engineering major and Climate Science and Policy minor, graduating

2024

Campus Climate and Community Outreach Coordinator, Cross Cultural Center

Ananya Nipane

Sociology major and Political Science minor, graduating 2025

Community Coordinator, LGBTQIA+ Resource Center

UC Davis Health

PC How

Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor, Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Member, Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Faculty Excellence in Diversity

Eleanor McAuliffe

Executive Assistant, Family and Community Medicine

Charleen Singh

Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing

Matthew St. Amant

Community Engagement and Financial Analyst, Office for Health Equity, Diversity and Inclusion/DEI

PAB ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY GROUP

The PAB receives administrative support from the Office of Campus and Community Relations, a unit in [Diversity, Equity and Inclusion](#), and the [Office of Compliance and Policy](#).

PAB Administrative Advisory Group:

Mikael Villalobos, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Campus and Community Relations/Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Megan Macklin, Director of Campus Climate and Inclusion Initiatives, Office of Campus Community and Relations/Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

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

Wendi Delmendo, Chief Compliance Officer, Office of Compliance and Policy

Michael Sweeney, Chief Campus Counsel, Office of Campus Counsel

Additional Administrative Support:

Mariana Galindo-Vega, Program Analyst, Office of Campus and Community Relations/Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Larisa King, Compliance Analyst, Office of Compliance and Policy

External Counsel:

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

PAB MEMBERSHIP, TRAINING AND OUTREACH

A. Board Membership

The PAB is comprised of fourteen (14) representatives—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, UC Davis

Graduate Student Association

Staff Assemblies

Student Life

UC Davis Health (Office for Health Equity, Diversity and Inclusion).

Recruitment for the PAB is staggered, with seven (7) positions typically filled each year. This process allows for the preservation of institutional knowledge on the board. Each organization is asked to provide at least two (2) nominees for each vacancy. When an organization nominates multiple people, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus and Community Relations selects one (1) PAB representative from that organization's nominees. Upon being appointed to the board, PAB members and alternates can attend meetings and participate in business discussions. All fourteen (14) PAB representatives participate in training during the onboarding process and throughout their tenure. Only PAB representatives who have completed all onboarding trainings can access confidential investigation reports and participate in case review.

PAB representatives include:

Four (4) undergraduate students

Two (2) graduate students

Two (2) faculty/academic appointees

Two (2) staff members

Four (4) UCD Health members (who can be students, faculty or staff).

Generally, PAB representatives serve two- (2-) year terms. Some served shorter terms when they were not qualifying representatives of their organization for the entire period of their appointment (e.g., graduated, retired or otherwise no longer associated with

UCD), while others served longer terms if their appointments began mid-year. Nominating entities may re-nominate PAB representatives to multiple terms.

PAB representatives generally join the board as alternates, although they may join as members depending upon the board composition and current 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- (2-) year term. The Director of Campus Climate and Inclusion Initiatives in the Office of Campus and Community Relations works with the various entities to maintain representation and to develop a pipeline of candidates in the event that a representative can no longer serve on the PAB.

In order to ensure independence, no representative of the PAB can be a current or former UCDPD employee, or a current employee of the Office of Campus and Community Relations, the Office of Compliance and Policy or the Office of Campus Counsel.

B. Training

Throughout their service on the board, PAB representatives receive ongoing training and professional development regarding the civilian oversight field, police procedures, relevant legal issues, impartiality, the confidential nature of police misconduct investigations and discipline and current campus and community safety efforts. Continuing education, training and professional development opportunities for the PAB are organized by the Director of Campus Climate and Inclusion Initiatives in the Office of Campus and Community Relations.

All PAB representatives are required to attend three (3) orientation sessions upon joining the board:

- PAB members receive information from the Director of Campus Climate and Inclusion Initiatives in the Office of Campus and Community Relations on the PAB's history, charge, activities, board composition and administrative structure, data and public reporting and current campus and community safety initiatives; this training also provides a primer to civilian oversight.
- PAB external counsel reviews the PAB's Bylaws, Procedures, Code of Ethics and Confidentiality Agreement.
- A representative from the UCDPD presents on Police Department policies, procedures and practices, including search and seizure and use of force.

The PAB invites speakers to present during regularly scheduled board meetings on local programs and initiatives relevant to civilian oversight and campus-community safety at UC Davis. In 2023-2024, the PAB received training via the following presentations during board meetings:

- UCDPD military equipment use policy and annual report, Joseph Farrow, UC Davis Police Department (July 19, 2023)

- Yolo County diversion programs, Jonathan Raven, Yolo County District Attorney's Office, Joseph Gocke, Yolo County Public Defender's Office and Yolo County diversion program participants (September 20, 2023)
- Report on UCDPD online reporting system, Adam Jimenez, UC Davis Office of Compliance and Policy (February 21, 2024)
- Discussion on student and community safety with Tim Jeffries, UC Davis Student Affairs (April 17, 2024)
- University of California police use of force policy, Wendy Lilliedoll, UC Davis Office of Compliance and Policy (May 15, 2024)
- Discussion on recent campus protests and demonstrations with Pablo Reguerin, UC Davis Student Affairs (June 26, 2024).

The PAB holds an institutional membership with the [National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement \(NACOLE\)](#). NACOLE offers trainings, currently including [webinars](#) and an [annual conference](#), that are made available to PAB representatives and staff as part of their continuing education and professional development. In 2023-2024, PAB representatives and staff who volunteered to participate attended the following webinars organized by NACOLE and afterwards briefed the board:

- The Evolution of Use of Force (July 13, 2023)
- Digital Video Evidence: A Brief Introduction (September 28, 2023)
- Group Stages and Dynamics: What to Expect When Working on Boards and Commissions (October 16, 2023)
- Social Media and the World of Online Investigation (November 6, 2023)
- Firearms 101 (February 22, 2024)
- Preventing Police Misconduct: The Value of Background Checks (March 7, 2024)
- Constitutional Police-Community Encounters (June 27, 2024).

In addition, a delegation of PAB representatives and staff attended the November 2023 NACOLE annual conference in Chicago, Illinois and afterwards briefed the board.

Also in November 2023, a delegation of PAB representatives and staff attended the inaugural [University of California community safety conference](#) in Costa Mesa, California and afterwards briefed the board. PAB representatives and staff presented during the following conference sessions:

- Complaint Investigations (November 8, 2023)

- PAB Oversight Panel (November 9, 2023)

C. Outreach and Campus Service

Beginning in 2023, the PAB has engaged the UCDPD around their military equipment use policy and annual report. This includes a presentation from and discussion with the UCDPD at a closed board meeting, and a virtual public town hall hosted by the PAB where UCDPD representatives present on their military equipment and invite public comment, in compliance with [California Assembly Bill 481](#). On August 16, 2023, the PAB hosted a town hall to invite public input on the UCDPD's annual report on military equipment. This town hall took place virtually via Zoom. Representatives from the UCDPD were in attendance to share information about AB 481 and the UCDPD's military equipment use policy and annual report, and they answered questions from members of the public in attendance. More information on AB 481, the UCDPD's military equipment use policy and annual report can be found on the [UCDPD Military Equipment Use Policy page](#). Minutes from the August 16, 2023 town hall can be found on the [PAB meeting minutes page](#).

PAB staff and representatives provide outreach presentations and trainings to UC Davis campus groups and leaders, as well as external groups interested in civilian oversight of university police, including other University of California campuses.

PAB staff and representatives are invited by the UCDPD to participate in hiring panels during the recruitment of both sworn and non-sworn personnel. The PAB provides a community perspective and expertise in civilian oversight during UCDPD recruitments. In 2023-2024, as the UCDPD continued to recruit across its [tiered responses at UC Davis](#), PAB staff participated in interview panels for Community Safety Specialists.

PAB MEETINGS

The PAB meets monthly in closed session when there is new business or a case to review. The PAB meets in person when there is case review; all other meetings are conducted virtually via Zoom. The PAB also solicits public input by holding regularly scheduled and advertised public meetings at least once quarterly during the regular academic year. Public meetings emphasize dialogue with the public and offer opportunities for public comment. PAB public meetings were held virtually via Zoom in 2023-2024. Additional PAB meetings are scheduled on an as-needed basis.

2023 – 2024 PAB Meetings:

- July 19, 2023
- August 16, 2023
- September 20, 2023
- October 18, 2023 – fall quarterly public meeting
- December 20, 2023

- February 21, 2024 – winter quarterly public meeting
- April 17, 2024
- May 15, 2024 – spring quarterly public meeting
- June 26, 2024

A. Number of Meetings:

From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, the board held nine (9) meetings. At two (2) of these meetings, the board reviewed a case 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 allegations contained in the complaint.

Summaries of the PAB's closed meetings are available online on the [PAB meeting minutes page](#).

B. Attendance for Meetings

From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, average attendance of voting members at decision-making meetings was 57.14%, and the average attendance of alternates was 63.49%. In-person attendance of voting members at meetings where cases were reviewed was 41.86%, and the attendance of alternates was 53.57%. At each voting meeting, the requisite quorum was present (i.e., five voting members or their alternates as discussed below).

C. Public Comment Highlights

Each quarter of the academic year, the board invites public comment and questions at a public meeting. Summaries of the PAB's meetings are available online on the [PAB meeting minutes page](#). PAB public meetings include introductions to PAB representatives and staff in attendance and a brief presentation on the PAB's history, charge, board membership and administrative structure and complaint and investigation processes. Questions and comments from members of the public in attendance are welcome throughout the meeting.

Topics, comments and questions brought to the PAB during public meetings in 2023-2024 included:

- What is the timeline for posting summary minutes of PAB meetings?
- What is the PAB's process for responding to questions and inquiries?
- UCDPD presence at PAB public meetings
- Can the UCDPD refuse to provide evidence or records to the PAB during complaint review?
- Processes for disclosing UCDPD military equipment use annual report and policy

- Who writes policy for the UCDPD? How is the PAB involved in UCDPD policy?
- Process for submitting inquiries to the PAB
- PAB meeting procedures
- How does the PAB promote public meetings?
- How does the PAB evaluate trends in complaints and/or cases?

Minutes from the PAB's public meetings can be found on the [PAB meeting minutes page](#).

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 meetings with the Office of Compliance and Policy²
- File a complaint to the UC Davis Police Department. The UCDPD forwards all civilian and non-internally generated complaints they receive to the PAB.

The complaint form and feedback/suggestion form are available in English, Chinese, Hmong, Spanish, Russian and Vietnamese on the [PAB file a complaint page](#). A current copy of the complaint form in English is included in the Appendix.

The complaint form includes fields for the complainant to self-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 as well.

All inquiries to the PAB are received and reviewed by the Office of Compliance and Policy, which is independent from the UCDPD. In addition to receiving inquiries directly from the reporting 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 reporting party (when contact information is provided) with information regarding the PAB and the PAB investigation process. Considering all available information, the Office of

² Meetings can be scheduled virtually via Zoom or other online platforms or in person.

Compliance and Policy determines whether an inquiry is appropriate for investigation (e.g., timely, states sufficient facts, etc.).

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

Inquiries that are ineligible for review under PAB procedures are closed, and the reporting party is informed. For example, the PAB only reviews complaints against UCDPD officers, and not against other campus community members or personnel employed by non-UC Davis law enforcement agencies. Complaints received regarding another law enforcement agency (e.g., City of Davis Police Department) are referred to that agency. Complaints regarding non-UCDPD officers are therefore closed, and the reporting party and other agencies are notified where appropriate. The Office of Compliance and Policy does not investigate internal complaints filed by UCDPD officers or other UCDPD personnel. These complaints are handled internally by the Professional Standards Unit (PSU). The PAB does not review PSU investigatory reports regarding internal complaints.

The Office of Compliance and Policy can investigate complaints submitted to the PAB against nonsworn UCDPD staff (e.g., dispatchers, 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 non-sworn 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 is not notified of the outcome of the review.

If a matter qualifies for PAB review, a University Investigator from the Office of Compliance and Policy (or an agreed upon outside investigator) conducts a thorough and impartial review. The investigation process includes talking to the reporting party, the responding officer(s) 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. Parties are notified if a thorough review requires additional time. 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 reporting 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 feedback/suggestion form](#) 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 and policies that protect 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, unless they are relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case). 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 and violated policy. The investigation report contains findings regarding each allegation. The possible findings are:

Unfounded – 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. Prior to the closed session and to allow sufficient time for review, the PAB receives online access to the investigative reports via a password-protected website. Hard copies are distributed and later collected during the closed session.

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. All alternates may attend meetings and participate in case review discussions. An alternate may 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 enhancing 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 and discretion to impose discipline. It is the Chief's responsibility to determine appropriate remediation, corrective action or discipline in light of 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 reporting party and to the PAB through the Office of Compliance and Policy. This notice shall indicate the findings, but will not disclose the level 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 reporting 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, 2023 to June 30, 2024, twenty-four (24) inquiries were submitted to the PAB. Two (2) of those inquiries were investigated or are under investigation. One (1) of those cases was closed during 2023-2024; one (1) additional case remains under investigation and pending PAB review as of June 30, 2024. The PAB also completed in 2023-2024 its investigation and review of one (1) complaint submitted in 2022-2023. After reviewing the investigative reports for cases that proceeded through investigation, the PAB voted to adopt the investigator's 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.

The [PAB case database](#) includes comprehensive information on all inquiries received by the PAB and is updated at minimum each quarter during the regular academic year.

Twenty-two (22) inquiries submitted in 2023-2024 did not proceed through investigation because:

- The concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation (fifteen [15] cases). Inquiries pertaining to issues outside the PAB's purview are dismissed, referred to the appropriate entity and, when possible, the reporting party is notified.
- The PAB received insufficient information from the reporting party to determine whether to charge an investigation (five [5] cases).
- In response to an inquiry related to notification of an on-campus incident via the Clery timely warning, the PAB communicated with the reporting party that no Clery timely warning was issued because the UCDPD determined that the subject in that matter was known to the victim, and that there was not an ongoing threat to the campus community at large (one [1] case).
- In response to an inquiry related to the process for requesting police reports from the UCDPD, the UC Davis Office of Compliance and Police conducted a review of the UCDPD police report submission and printing process, and drafted a process improvement report that was submitted to the PAB and to the UCDPD (one [1] case).

POLICE CHIEF'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, the Chief of Police considered two (2) cases—one (1) that was submitted in 2023-2024 and one (1) that was submitted in 2022-2023—in which the PAB recommended findings or made additional suggestions. The Chief agreed with

the PAB's findings on all allegations made in these complaints. The Chief's responses are summarized in the table at the end of this report.

The [PAB case database](#) includes comprehensive information on all inquiries received by the PAB and is updated at minimum each quarter during the regular academic year.

2023-2024 TRENDS

A. Inquiries Filed Per Academic Quarter

From July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024, twenty-four (24) inquiries were filed with the PAB. Two (2) inquiries (8.33%) were filed during Summer 2023, seven (7) inquiries (29.17%) were filed in Fall 2023, eight (8) inquiries (33.33%) were filed in Winter 2024, five (5) inquiries (20.83%) were filed in Spring 2024 and two (2) inquiries (8.33%) were filed during Summer 2024.

B. Inquiry Location

Of the twenty-four (24) total inquiries received in 2023-2024, eighteen (18) (75.00%) were filed to the Davis campus and three (3) (12.50%) were filed to the Sacramento Health campus. Three (3) inquiries (12.50%) did not provide information on the filing location.

C. Inquiry Filing Methods

In 2023-2024, thirteen (13) inquiries (54.17%) were made via email to pab@ucdavis.edu, six (6) inquiries (25.00%) were made via the PAB online complaint form, three (3) inquiries (12.50%) were made via phone call to the Office of Compliance and Policy, two (2) inquiries (8.33%) were made via the PAB online feedback/suggestion form, one (1) inquiry (4.17%) was made via fax to UC Davis Campus Counsel, one (1) inquiry (4.17%) was made via the [EthicsPoint](#)³ online form and one (1) inquiry (4.17%) was referred to the PAB by the UCDPD Chief. A reporting party can submit an inquiry using multiple methods as described above.

D. Demographics

Demographics are voluntarily provided by a reporting 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. The demographic information reported in this PAB annual report and the [PAB case database](#) reflect the information self-identified by reporting parties.

Campus affiliation: Among the twenty-four (24) inquiries received in 2023-2024, ten (10) reporting parties (41.67%) self-identified their campus affiliation: four (4) reporting parties (16.67%) self-identified as UC Davis staff, three (3) reporting parties (12.50%) self-identified as community members, two (2) reporting parties (8.33%) self-identified as UC Davis

³ [EthicsPoint](#) is a University of California systemwide platform for reporting suspected misconduct. UC Davis utilizes EthicsPoint to provide a confidential means for reporting suspected misconduct online.

students and one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified as UC Davis faculty. Campus affiliation was not provided by the reporting party in fourteen (14) inquiries (58.33%).

Age: Among the twenty-four (24) inquiries received in 2023-2024, three (3) reporting parties (12.50%) self-identified their age: one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified their age as 52, one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified their age as 59 and one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified their age as 64. The reporting party's age was not provided in twenty-one (21) inquiries (87.50%).

Gender: Among the twenty-four (24) inquiries received in 2023-2024, three (3) reporting parties (12.50%) self-identified their gender: two (2) reporting parties (8.33%) self-identified as male and one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified as female. The reporting party's gender was not provided in twenty-one (21) inquiries (87.50%).

Race/ethnicity: Among the twenty-four (24) inquiries received in 2023-2024, two (2) reporting parties (8.33%) self-identified their race/ethnicity: one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified as Fiji Indian and one (1) reporting party (4.17%) self-identified as White. The reporting party's race/ethnicity was not provided in twenty-two (22) inquiries (91.67%).

E. Allegations

The two (2) inquiries received in 2023-2024 that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB involved the following allegations:

- Reckless driving
- Display of a firearm
- Negligent discharge of a firearm.

PAB cases often involve multiple allegations.

RECOMMENDATIONS, QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE

The PAB, after submitting its recommendations, regularly engages the Chief of Police in direct dialogue regarding case review findings and policy or training recommendations 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 19, 2023: UCDPD Chief Joseph Farrow shared information with the PAB on the UCDPD's military equipment use policy and report. The PAB asked questions and provided feedback on the information presented to inform the public virtual town hall hosted by the PAB on August 16, 2023.

2. October 18, 2023: At his quarterly update with the PAB, the Chief of Police provided updates and engaged the board representatives and staff in discussion around the following topics:
 - a. Development of police accountability boards across the University of California system: Chief Farrow discussed the establishment of police accountability boards across UC campuses. He shared that each campus is at a different stage in their development of a PAB, and that UC Davis is collaborating with sister campuses as their PABs are formed.
 - b. Clery Notices: Chief Farrow discussed the series of Clery Act notices that were shared with campus. The cases are being investigated by the UCDPD.
 - c. UCDPD canine update: Chief Farrow shared that the UCDPD has a new companionship dog for non-emergencies. She will accompany [UCDPD CORE \(Community Outreach and Engagement\) officers](#).

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 (PAB Case #23-124). At the Chief's quarterly update with the PAB, he provided the following responses:

- d. PAB recommendation: The PAB asked the Police Chief for feedback on the practice of recording statements when the UCDPD conducts investigations.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow referred to [UCDPD Policy 444, Body Worn Audio/Video Systems](#), which states that recorders (including body-worn cameras) should be activated in any of the following situations:

- i. All enforcement and investigative contacts including stops and field interview (FI) situations
- ii. Traffic stops including, but not limited to, traffic violations, stranded motorist assistance and all crime interdiction stops
- iii. Self-initiated activity in which a member would normally notify the Communications Center
- iv. Any other contact that becomes adversarial after the initial contact in a situation that would not otherwise require recording.

The Chief identified that deferring to officer judgment in circumstances that do not fall within UCDPD Policy 444 allows appropriate flexibility given the diversity of other interactions officers may have.

- e. PAB recommendation: The PAB asked about the closing letters sent to complainants at the conclusion of formal PAB investigations.

Chief's response: The Chief shared no objections to the PAB viewing redacted closing letters.

3. February 21, 2024: At his quarterly update with the PAB, the Chief of Police provided updates and engaged the board representatives and staff in discussion around the following topics:
 - a. [California Senate Bill 960](#) update: This legislation allows anyone legally authorized to work in the United States to become a peace officer in the state of California, regardless of citizenship status. Chief Farrow discussed the legislative process, the guidelines and procedures developed and impact on the UCDPD since the law went into effect in January 2023.
 - b. UCDPD comfort canines: Chief Farrow provided information on the two comfort canines who are part of the UCDPD. He shared that the UCDPD is the first agency in the country to respond to certain calls for service with comfort canines, and that the program has been successful.
 - c. UCDPD staffing update: Chief Farrow shared that all vacancies at the UCDPD had been filled. He reflected on the diversity of UCDPD employees, and noted that the UCDPD has voluntarily signed onto the [30 by 30 initiative](#), with the goal to increase the representation of women at the UCDPD to 30% by 2030.
 - d. Discussion of questions raised at the February 21, 2024 PAB quarterly public meeting: The Chief of Police heard and provided answers to questions asked during the PAB's recent public meeting. The Chief's responses were shared by the PAB via email to members of the public who attended the PAB public meeting.
 - i. UCDPD presence at PAB public meetings

Chief Farrow noted that UCDPD staff usually do not participate in PAB public meetings. There have been occasions when UCDPD staff have been invited to participate in a portion of PAB public meetings to share information and answer questions during times when there might be public interest in direct dialogue with police leadership.
 - ii. Can the UCDPD refuse to provide evidence or records to the PAB during complaint review?

Chief Farrow shared instances in which UCDPD policy does not require evidence or records to be shared, for example, cases that have not been investigated by the PAB or confidential information as specified by California law. If there were questions about availability

of evidence or records, the PAB can submit an inquiry to the UCDPD and the UCDPD will respond.

- iii. Processes for disclosing UCDPD military equipment use annual report and policy

Chief Farrow shared that the August 16, 2023 virtual town hall hosted by the PAB on the UCDPD's military equipment did not involve approval by the PAB of the UCDPD's equipment requests. The town hall was a public meeting required by [California Assembly Bill 481](#) wherein the UCDPD disclosed information to the community about their military equipment use policy and annual report and responded to public comment and questions.

- iv. Who writes policy for the UCDPD? How is the PAB involved in UCDPD policy?

Chief Farrow shared that relevant law determines police policy, and the PAB provides recommendations on a department level to the UCDPD.

4. May 15, 2024: At his quarterly update with the PAB, the Chief of Police provided updates and engaged the board representatives on the following topics:
 - a. Encampments across University of California campuses: Chief Farrow shared general information on encampments at other UC campuses, and detailed the roles of the UCDPD and other campus units with respect to the PULP (Popular University for the Liberation of Palestine) encampment at UC Davis. Chief Farrow answered questions from the PAB and shared information regarding law enforcement mutual aid, de-escalation protocol and the lead role of the Student Expression Response Team/UC Davis Student Affairs and protocol for rescheduling or relocating events that were impacted by the encampment.
 - b. Chief Farrow shared information about a recent suicide that took place on campus.
5. August 21, 2024⁴: 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 (PAB Case #24-143):

⁴ While this PAB meeting occurred outside the 2023-2024 reporting period, the discussion is included in this annual report because it pertains to a case reviewed by the PAB in 2023-2024.

- a. PAB recommendation: The PAB noted it did not appear the supervisor of the responding officer named in the complaint understood the case's relevant traffic policy/law.
- b. PAB recommendation: The PAB recommended refresher training on the appropriate rules of engagement in emergency and non-emergency call situations, underscoring the importance of the safety of people over property.
- c. PAB recommendation: The PAB suggested training regarding how to interface effectively and with a high level of accuracy, courtesy and sensitivity with the public who calls into the Police Department.

UCDPD Captain Mark Brunet, as the Police Chief's designee, provided the following responses:

Chief's response: Chief Farrow concurred with all recommendations. The PAB was updated that the UCDPD in response to the PAB's recommendations provided trainings on relevant traffic policy/law and on handling inquiries made to the UCDPD.

In conversation with the PAB, Capt. Brunet noted that the UCDPD is working to reinforce safe driving, including in officers' annual driving training and in the department's annual policy review. He emphasized the importance of responding professionally when someone calls out a mistake made by Police Department personnel. Capt. Brunet noted that an individual can call the Police Department to discuss an incident with a sergeant. Capt. Brunet also emphasized the importance of working towards a department culture where mistakes can be seen as learning opportunities.

Full summaries of the PAB's meetings with the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee are included in the meeting minutes available online on the [PAB meeting minutes page](#).

PAB PROGRAM REVIEW BY AUDIT MANAGEMENT AND ADVISORY SERVICES

In 2020, the [UC Davis Task Force on Next Generation Reforms to Advance Campus Safety](#) was charged with assessing how the UCDPD could evolve. As outlined in the [task force report](#), one of the recommendations urged UC Davis leadership to hire a consultant external to the PAB to review the role and scope of UC Davis' civilian oversight program. [UC Davis Audit Management and Advisory Services](#) was engaged to conduct this external consultant review.

The Task Force highlighted three (3) areas for review of the PAB:

1. Whether the PAB is receiving sufficient information from the Office of Compliance and Policy investigators to make informed findings and recommendations regarding complaints of police misconduct

2. Whether the PAB's role in the disposition of complaints should be expanded beyond making a recommendation and to include authority to make the final determination over accepting or rejecting the investigators' findings
3. Should the PAB have more of a role in police discipline, such as making a recommendation to the Chief of Police regarding proposed discipline in cases of substantiated misconduct.

Audit Management and Advisory Services conducted a review of the PAB that evaluated processes and systems in place to ensure that the PAB is meeting its stated mission statement and charge.

To accomplish these objectives, Audit and Management Advisory Services engaged the PAB administrative advisory group to develop the following questions that would frame the scope of the program review:

1. What information is available to those responsible for reviewing allegations of officer misconduct under the PAB model?
2. How are policy determinations made and reported under the PAB model?
3. What is UC Davis's process for proposing and issuing discipline in cases involving sustained findings of officer misconduct?
4. How does the PAB solicit public input?

AMAS was advised to refer to the [PAB Procedures](#), [PAB annual published reports](#), [case database](#) and [PAB Bylaws](#). In an effort to maintain transparency, all said documentation is readily available on the PAB website.

The review was initiated in spring 2023 and was finalized in fall 2023. To conduct their review, Audit and Management Advisory Services selected at random five (5) diverse cases from the case database published on the PAB website. Four (4) of the five (5) cases resulted in formal investigations into allegations of improper use of force, discourtesy and dishonesty. One (1) case did not reach the level for a formal investigation due to a lack of jurisdiction. The cases span from calendar years 2019-2022 and were tested to gain an understanding of the PAB investigation and case review processes as described in the PAB Procedures:

- Procedure to charge a formal investigation
- Procedure to notify complainant at the onset of the investigation
- Process of compiling then submitting a case report, policy findings, factual findings and exhibit documents for PAB review
- Procedure for PAB closed session vote, determination of allegations and summary of recommendations submitted to the Chief of Police
- Procedure for the Chief of Police's response to findings.

As part of the review process, PAB representatives had an opportunity to provide direct feedback to Audit and Management Advisory Services. A representative from Audit and Management Advisory Services attended a PAB meeting and led a discussion on the review with board representatives; members of the PAB administrative advisory group did not participate in this discussion in order to ensure confidentiality of the feedback provided.

Based on the review of cases selected, Audit and Management Advisory Services determined that the PAB's processes, internal controls and systems in place are functioning in accordance with the PAB Procedures and Bylaws. Their review concluded that the PAB is operating effectively and meeting the PAB's mission statement and charge. Members of the PAB administrative advisory group presented information on the review to the UC Davis Chancellor's Leadership Council in April 2024.

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party ⁷	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{5, 6}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23-124⁷ • 4/17/23 & 4/26/23⁸ • UC Davis 	PAB online complaint form & email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: 31 • Gender: Female • Race/ethnicity: Biracial, Filipino/White 	Inadequate or improper investigation	Closed	<p>Formal investigation: Investigation completed 9/8/23, PAB review 9/20/23</p> <p>PAB's findings⁹:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate or improper investigation count 1: Exonerated 2. Inadequate or improper investigation count 2: Not sustained 3. Inadequate or improper investigation count 3: Not sustained 	All findings accepted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23-129 • 8/17/23 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inquiry related to police staffing that did not specify the UCDPD	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation. Generalized concern about police department staffing nationwide shared with PAB for their consideration.	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23-130 • 9/22/23 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inadequate or improper investigation	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation. Allegations also did not establish a basis to refer to another campus unit or outside agency.	N/A

⁷ Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

⁵ Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

⁶ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

⁷ This complaint was submitted during the PAB's 2022-2023 reporting period. The PAB investigated and completed its review of the case during 2023-2024.

⁸ In an April 26, 2023 email to pab@ucdavis.edu, the concerned party reported that they submitted a complaint to the PAB online complaint portal on April 17, 2023. PAB staff learned that the online complaint portal was down and addressed the outage. The concerned party resubmitted their complaint via email to pab@ucdavis.edu.

⁹ In addition to its findings, the PAB issued additional recommendations, which along with the Chief's responses are included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party [*]	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{10, 11}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
• 23-131 • 10/21/23 • UC Davis	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	• Campus affiliation: Student • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided	Complaint related to Safe Ride	Closed	Insufficient information: The PAB contacted the reporting party and never received a response	N/A
• 23-133 • 11/4/23 • UC Davis	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	• Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided	Complaint related to process for requesting police report from UCDPD	Closed	Office of Compliance and Police conducted a review of the UCDPD police report submission and printing process, and drafted a process improvement report that was submitted to the PAB and to UCDPD	N/A
• 23-134 • 9/27/22 • UC Davis	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	• Campus affiliation: Faculty • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided	Inquiry related to altercation on campus	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation. The PAB responded to the reporting party with information from UCDPD about the reported incident.	N/A
• 23-135 • 11/30/23 • UC Davis Health	PAB online complaint form	• Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: 52 • Gender: Male • Race/ethnicity: White	Reckless driving by UCDPD vehicle	Closed	Insufficient information: The PAB contacted the concerned party and never received a response	N/A

^{*} Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

¹⁰ Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

¹¹ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party [*]	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{12, 13}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23-136 • 11/30/23 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint related to a non-UCDPD UC Davis employee	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation. The PAB responded to the reporting party that the appropriate campus units were aware of the incident.	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23-137 • 12/17/23 • UC Davis Health 	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint related to UC Davis Medical Center staff	Closed	Insufficient information: The PAB contacted the reporting party and never received a response	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-138 • 1/29/24 • Location not provided 	PAB online complaint form & PAB online feedback form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint against individuals not affiliated with UCDPD or UC Davis	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation. The PAB responded to the reporting party with information about the PAB's jurisdiction.	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-139 • 2/9/24 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inquiry related to encampment on campus	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A

^{*} Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

¹² Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

¹³ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party*	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{14, 15}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
• 24-140 • 2/22/24 • UC Davis	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	• Campus affiliation: Student • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided	Inquiry related to light fixture on campus	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
• 24-141 • 2/26/24 • UC Davis Health	PAB online complaint form	• Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: 64 • Gender: Female • Race/ethnicity: Caucasian	Complaint related to incident involving a UC Davis employee not affiliated with UCDPD	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
• 24-142 • 3/4/24 • UC Davis	Fax to Campus Counsel	• Campus affiliation: Community member • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided	Complaint related to police response that also included allegations related to other individuals not affiliated with UCDPD	Closed	Insufficient information: The PAB contacted the reporting party and never received a response	N/A
• 24-143 • 3/13/24 • UC Davis	PAB online complaint form	• Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: 59 • Gender: Male • Race/ethnicity: Fiji Indian	Reckless driving by UCDPD vehicle	Closed	Formal investigation: Investigation completed 6/17/24, PAB review 6/26/24 PAB's findings ¹⁶ : 1. Reckless driving count 1: Sustained 2. Reckless driving count 2: Sustained	All findings accepted

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

¹⁴ Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

¹⁵ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

¹⁶ In addition to its findings, the PAB issued additional recommendations, which along with the Chief's responses are included in the full text of the PAB annual report and in the [PAB case database](#).

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party [*]	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{17, 18}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-144 • 3/20/24 • UC Davis 	PAB online feedback form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inquiry related to notification of on-campus incident via Clery timely warning	Closed	Dismissed: The PAB communicated with the reporting party that no Clery timely warning was issued because UCDPD determined that the subject in that matter was known to the victim, and that there was not an ongoing threat to the campus community at large	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-145 • 3/25/24 • UC Davis 	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Improper citation	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-146 • 4/17/24 • UC Davis 	EthicsPoint online form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Community member • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Reckless driving by UCDPD vehicle	Closed	Insufficient information: The PAB contacted the reporting party and never received a response	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-147 • 4/29/24 • Location not provided 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint related to an individual possibly employed by UC Davis who is not affiliated with UCDPD	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A

^{*} Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

¹⁷ Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

¹⁸ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's additional recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and through the [PAB case database](#).

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party [*]	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{19, 20}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-148 • 5/17/24 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Community member • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inquiry related to a non-UCDPD UC Davis employee	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-149 • 5/20/24 • UC Davis 	Email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Inquiry related to maintenance of City of Davis public spaces	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-150 • 5/24/24²¹ • UC Davis 	Referred by Police Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Display of a firearm 2. Negligent discharge of a firearm 	Open	Pending PAB investigation and review	Pending PAB investigation and review

^{*} Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

¹⁹ Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

²⁰ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's additional recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and through the [PAB case database](#).

²¹ A [5/24/24 UC Davis News article "Campus Police Arrest 3 for Vandalism"](#) stated: "During the detention of one individual, an officer unintentionally discharged a service weapon. No one was injured. Consistent with the UC Davis Police Accountability Board procedures, Police Chief Joe Farrow is referring this matter to the independent Police Accountability Board for review." 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 charge date of this investigation was delayed until 7/1/24.

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024

Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Reporting Party[*]	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome^{22, 23}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-151 • 6/23/24 • UC Davis 	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint related to UCDPD dispatcher	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-152 • 6/26/24²⁴ • UC Davis 	PAB online complaint form, email to pab@ucdavis.edu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Not provided • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Complaint related to a non-UCDPD UC Davis employee	Closed	Dismissed and referred: Concerns did not allege UCDPD sworn officer misconduct or policy violation	N/A

^{*} Demographics of all reporting parties were provided voluntarily and were not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they were relevant to the allegations (e.g., in a discrimination case).

²² Per its Procedures, the PAB shares all inquiries it receives with the UC Davis Police Department. This includes inquiries that are dismissed for any of the following reasons: the reporting party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the reporting party declines investigation, insufficient information, or lack of jurisdiction. PAB Procedures state: "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."

²³ 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 recommending training. A complete record of the PAB's additional recommendations is included in the full text of the PAB annual report and through the [PAB case database](#).

²⁴ Multiple complaints were submitted regarding this matter.

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