

UC Davis Police Accountability Board Summary of the 2020-2021 Annual Report

The Police Accountability Board (PAB) is an independent board composed of student, faculty and staff representatives from the UC Davis community. The PAB continues to be one of the first and only civilian oversight boards at a major research university. Two functions are central to the PAB's work. First, the PAB independently reviews investigation reports and makes recommendations to the Chief of Police following investigations of complaints from the campus community or general public (also referred to as civilian complaints). Second, 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 or blind spots. The PAB is committed to a fair and unbiased approach throughout its work.

In fall 2020, the PAB issued its 2020-2021 annual public report detailing summary information and statistical data regarding the number of complaints filed, the type of complaints filed, analysis of trends and patterns, the ultimate disposition of the complaints (i.e., sustained, not sustained, exonerated or unfounded) and the number of complaints in which the recommendations of the PAB were either accepted, rejected or modified by the Chief of Police. The annual report also includes detailed summaries of the PAB's recommendations along with its questions and comments to the Chief. In addition, the 2020-2021 annual report includes updates on the implementation of recommendations made following PAB pilot program review.

A complete summary from 2020-2021 of inquiries received by the PAB, cases reviewed and PAB findings can be found in the attached chart. From July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021, the PAB received five inquiries. Consistent with the PAB's procedures, the PAB closed all five of those inquiries between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021.

Of the five inquiries submitted to the PAB in 2020-2021, one of those inquiries was investigated. The remaining four inquiries submitted did not proceed through investigation because:

- The concerns did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation and they were dismissed (three cases). Inquiries pertaining to issues outside the PAB's purview are referred to the appropriate entity and when possible, the concerned party is notified.
- In accord with the concerned party's preferences, the PAB connected the concerned party with the Chief for further discussion (one case).

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

Notable Trends in 2020-2021

- Allegations: The one case closed in 2020-2021 that proceeded through the process of investigation and review by the PAB involved the following allegations:
 - Disobedience of a legal order
 - Violation of communicable diseases general order
 - Discourtesy
 - Failure to collect evidence
 - Conduct unbecoming
 - Derogatory language

PAB cases often involve multiple allegations.

- Inquiry location: Among the five inquiries received in 2020-2021, four (80.00%) were filed to the Davis campus and one (20.00%) was filed to the Sacramento UC Davis Health campus.
- Demographics: Demographics are voluntarily provided by a concerned party and are not known to the PAB at any point during case review unless they are relevant to the allegations (e.g. in a discrimination case). Demographic information, as well as all other questions asked on the Complaint Form, are voluntary.
 - Campus Affiliation: Among the five inquiries received in 2020-2021, three (60.00%) were filed by UC Davis staff and two (40.00%) were filed by community members.
 - Gender: Among the five inquiries received in 2020-2021, the concerned party in one inquiry (20.00%) identified as a woman. The concerned party's gender in four inquiries (80.00%) was unknown.
 - Race/ethnicity: Among the five inquiries received in 2020-2021, the concerned party in one inquiry (20.00%) identified as White. The concerned party's race/ethnicity in four inquiries (80.00%) was unknown.

Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings

From July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021, the Chief of Police considered one case in which the PAB recommended findings or made additional suggestions. The Chief agreed with the PAB's findings on all seven allegations made in this complaint.

Additional PAB Recommendations, Questions and Comments to Police Chief

In 2020-2021, the PAB had several opportunities to engage the Chief of Police in direct dialogue regarding policy or training recommendations previously submitted by the PAB, in addition to questions and comments from PAB representatives and their communities.

In reporting the following detailed summaries of the PAB's recommendations along with its questions and comments to the Chief, the PAB aims to increase the transparency of its work and to provide timely follow-up on issues important to the UC Davis and broader communities. Full summaries of the PAB's meetings with the Chief of Police are included in the meeting minutes available online at pab.ucdavis.edu/meeting-minutes.

1. October 2020: During their quarterly update with the Chief, the PAB asked the following questions:

- a. What is the police department doing to take care of the mental health of their officers?

Chief's response: Chief Farrow is a board member and Vice President of the National Alliance of Mental Illness. The UCDPD currently is developing a model for a peer-support program. The department provides counseling and offers their support to officers as much as they can. They have multiple meetings to educate on and encourage officers to utilize these resources.

- b. A question was asked about the officers dealing with the homeless communities on campus. It was recommended that Chief Farrow connect with the homeless outreach coordinator for the City of Davis.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow reiterated that he is open to any help that is available. There is a large homeless population, and he wants the department to be very sensitive to their situations and wants them to be safe, warm, and sheltered.

- c. A question was asked regarding whether the UC Davis Police Department will also serve the new Rancho Cordova administrative offices, and how the off-campus sites and primary care networks and clinics are policed.

Chief's response: Chief Farrow shared that a plan for policing this new site has not yet been finalized. In general, off-campus sites are policed by the cities in which they reside per the agreements that they have with their respective cities. UC Davis Police responds when they are needed or asked.

- d. A question was asked regarding use of force data.

Chief's response: The newly revamped UCDPD website contains data on use of force incidents and complaints. Chief Farrow wants to work with the PAB on how to best report this data, especially to reflect use of force vs. excessive force.

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

- a. The PAB noted that UCDPD officers must be role models exhibiting law abiding behavior, particularly on matters concerning the current public health crisis such as wearing a face covering. The PAB also noted that the power differential between a UCDPD officer and a member of the public makes it difficult for people to ask a police officer to put on their face covering.

Chief's response: The Chief agreed that police officers must always be a role model for the community in which they serve.

- b. The PAB recommended that the Chief review policies and procedures regarding evidence collection. In addition, the PAB recommended that UCDPD officers be trained in communicating those policies and procedures in a respectful manner.

Chief's response: The Chief shared that UCDPD policy on evidence collection cannot cover all evidence that an officer could encounter at a crime scene, and for certain types of evidence, a detective with additional training in this area is required. The Chief noted the importance of effectively communicating and explaining evidence procedures and the limitations of certain types of evidence.

- c. The PAB recommended that the Chief review UCDPD General Order Section 340.5.9 to determine whether a definition of derogatory comments should be included. At a minimum, the PAB recommended that UCDPD officers be trained to not accuse groups of people of certain behaviors.

Chief's response: The Chief shared that UCDPD policy states that use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on duty or in uniform is not acceptable. The Chief emphasized that this type of speech can erode the public's trust, is not professional, and it is not tolerated.

- d. The PAB recommended reiterating to UCDPD officers the support resources that are available to officers.

Chief's response: The Chief shared that UCDPD recently established a peer support team whose members are trained in assisting and supporting coworkers. In 2021 all UCDPD officers are receiving training on wellness, mindfulness, and resiliency.

Public Comment Highlights

Each quarter of the academic year, the board invites public comment and questions at a public meeting. Summaries of the PAB Quarterly Public Meetings can be found online at pab.ucdavis.edu/meeting-minutes.

Topics and questions brought to the PAB during public meetings in 2020-2021 included:

- Student representation on the PAB

- Rationale for holding PAB meetings in closed session
- PAB community outreach and community engagement activities
- How does the PAB interact with the UC Davis Police Department? Does the PAB engage with UCDPD leadership and/or with police officers directly?
- How does the PAB report out on the types of cases you hear? What are the most common complaints raised to the PAB?
- How has attendance been at public meetings with the transition to Zoom?
- Is the PAB reacting and/or responding to the “Cops off Campus” movements currently active throughout the University of California system?
- Police accountability across the University of California system
- Opportunities for enhancing the work of the PAB in order to strengthen and increase effectiveness
- How did the PAB advise and affect change with respect to the reporting structure of Public Security Officers on the UC Davis Health campus?

Update on the PAB Pilot Program Review and Implementation of Recommendations

The 2019-2020 PAB Annual Report included information on the report of the PAB pilot program that was submitted in July 2019, which contained a series of 10 recommendations for the PAB and a proposed plan for implementation. Below is an update on those recommendations and their implementation:

1. **RECOMMENDATION 1:** The advisory arm of the PAB’s charge—wherein the board may submit advisory recommendations to the Police Chief about UCDPD policies and procedures—should be emphasized as a cornerstone of the PAB’s work.
 - a. The PAB will continue to engage in policy review related to civilian complaints of misconduct in violation of UCDPD policy and as appropriate, will identify opportunities to clarify or revise policies named in PAB complaints.

2020-2021 update: In its review of a case that proceeded through formal investigation in 2020-2021, the PAB submitted recommendations and questions on UCDPD policies regarding evidence collection and UCDPD General Order Section 340.5.9 (regarding police officer conduct).

- b. A formal process, in consultation with the Chief of Police, will be instituted wherein the PAB can proactively review and provide feedback on UCDPD policies and procedures, especially during the creation of new policy.

2020-2021 update: In May 2021, the PAB was invited by the UCDPD to review and provide feedback on University of California (UC) system-wide policing and administrative policies (the Gold Book). In June 2021, the PAB also

reviewed and provided feedback on the UC draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. In both cases, the PAB submitted their feedback to the UC Office of the President.

- c. The PAB will continue to play a strong advisory role regarding police training requirements.

2020-2021 update: The PAB continues to advise on training recommendations, most notably in 2020-2021 on the subject of mental health resources for police officers.

- d. The UCDPD will continue to include and consult with representatives from the PAB and PAB Administrative Advisory Group during hiring.

2020-2021 update: The PAB continues to be invited to and participates in the hiring panels for UCDPD officers.

- 2. **RECOMMENDATION 2:** The PAB's role as a mediator between the campus and community and the Police Department needs to be further developed.

- a. PAB representatives will be required to give regular updates on the PAB, at minimum on an annual basis, to their constituent groups/entities. These updates should include information on all recommendations in this implementation plan.

2020-2021 update: The PAB asks all representatives to give regular updates to their constituent groups/entities.

- b. The PAB will sponsor an event, at minimum on an annual basis, to promote police-community relationship building.

2020-2021 update: The PAB, in partnership with the UC Davis Campus Community Book Project, hosted a virtual forum on mental health, law enforcement, and criminal justice titled "Mental Health: Reimagining and Reinventing Our Community Response" on February 6, 2021. The forum featured UCDPD Chief Joseph Farrow and Yolo County Chief Deputy District Attorney Jonathan Raven, and was moderated by Charron Andrus, PAB representative, and Megan Macklin, member of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group. The PAB is planning several events for 2021-2022 aimed at promoting police-community dialogue, shared learning, and relationship building.

- c. The PAB will consult with the UCDPD on their community engagement practices.

2020-2021 update: The Chief of Police provides regular updates to the PAB that include information on the UCDPD's outreach efforts. The PAB continues to advise UCDPD in their outreach to the campus community.

- d. The PAB Annual Report will continue to include detailed information about policy, procedure, practice, and training recommendations from the PAB to the Chief of Police, along with the Chief's responses.

2020-2021 update: In April 2021, the PAB released a public database that includes information on all inquiries received by the PAB since its formation in 2014. The database will be updated periodically as new inquiries are received and as cases move through our pipeline. The PAB database can be accessed at pab.ucdavis.edu/database.

3. **RECOMMENDATION 3:** Mediation and restorative justice are areas where the PAB can grow.

- a. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will research the viability of a mediation option for complaints submitted to the board.

2020-2021 update: In researching options for incorporating mediation and restorative practices (see 3.b. below) into the PAB complaint resolution process, the PAB Administrative Advisory Group determined that mediation would not be the best option to pursue. Both mediation and restorative practice assume parties are willing to engage in a good faith effort throughout the process. However, in mediation, success is measured by both parties reaching an agreement, and the process often involves fact finding to determine who is at fault.

- b. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will include potential opportunities for restorative practices when researching mediation options for the board.

2020-2021 update: The PAB Administrative Advisory Group continues to research options for incorporating restorative practices in the PAB complaint resolution process. In 2020-2021, members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group attended the following trainings on the subject:

- National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice: NACOLE webinar (May 18, 2021)
- Restorative practices and civilian oversight: Mary Louise Frampton, UC Davis School of Law (June 16, 2021).

The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will next engage representatives from the Yolo Conflict Resolution Center and City of Davis Police Accountability Commission to learn about applications of restorative practice in the local community.

- c. The PAB encourages campus colleagues engaged directly in restorative justice to address issues of policing in their work with UC Davis constituents and stakeholders.

2020-2021 update: The PAB Administrative Advisory Group continues to research a structure for this and will leverage connections with colleagues

from the Office of Campus Community Relations who liaise with campus restorative justice practitioners.

- d. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group will institute the following options for incorporating early resolution practices into the PAB complaint process when concerned parties express that they do not want to file a formal complaint:
 - i. As an alternative to filing a formal complaint, concerned parties would be invited to write a letter to the PAB expressing their concern/complaint. The PAB would review the letter in closed session, draft questions and recommendations to the Police Chief and hold regular meetings with the Chief to discuss his responses.

The PAB Administrative Advisory Group needs to discuss whether it would be possible to later share some information on the outcome of the concern/complaint with the concerned party, and how to share the outcome in the PAB Annual Report.

2020-2021 update: This alternative has been integrated into the PAB complaint resolution.

- ii. As an alternative to filing a formal complaint, concerned parties would be invited to meet directly with the Chief of Police to discuss their concerns.

2020-2021 update: This alternative has been integrated into the PAB complaint resolution.

- e. When notified of the disposition of their inquiry, PAB concerned parties will continue to receive contact information for the Chief of Police should they wish to follow up.

2020-2021 update: The PAB continues to provide this information.

- f. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group recommends including information in the PAB Annual Report that specifies when the board made a recommendation to the Chief of Police in response to an inquiry or letter submitted to the board. The report will continue to include the Chief's responses to all recommendations.

2020-2021 update: The PAB Annual Report as well as the PAB database include the PAB's recommendations and the Chief's responses for all inquiries submitted to the board.

- 4. **RECOMMENDATION 4:** The PAB complaint history of officers named in PAB complaints should continue to remain confidential during the PAB review process.

2020-2021 update: The PAB continues to hear feedback from the campus and broader communities on enhanced access to information during case review, including information regarding an officer's PAB complaint history. The PAB

Administrative Advisory Group continues to explore options subject to legal requirements.

5. **RECOMMENDATION 5:** The PAB should continue its current role and not play a role in determining or enforcing disciplinary consequences for police officers.
 - a. The Chief of Police will retain sole authority in determining and enforcing discipline when a civilian complaint is sustained against an officer.

2020-2021 update: The PAB continues to hear feedback from the campus and broader communities on the role of the PAB in determining and/or enforcing disciplinary action. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group subject to legal requirements continues to explore and research the processes of other civilian oversight agencies.

6. **RECOMMENDATION 6:** Improved PAB outreach and marketing efforts are necessary.

2020-2021 update: In line with Recommendation 6 from the Report of the Task Force on Next Generation Reforms to Advance Campus Safety, improved outreach and marketing of the PAB continue to be areas of growth. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group welcomes to opportunity to work with campus partners to communicate the work of the board. In addition, recognizing that peer-to-peer communication, especially on the topic of policing, is an effective strategy, all PAB representatives are asked to give regular updates to their constituent groups/entities. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group regularly presents to campus and community organizations. In 2020-2021, members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group presented to the following:

- UC Davis Chancellor's Leadership Council
 - UC Davis Campus Safety Task Force
 - Yolo County Multi-Cultural Community Council
 - International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies
 - UC Davis Health Staff Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
 - UC Davis Health Principles of Community Employee Resource Group Fair.
- a. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group requests sustained funding for a Student Assistant in the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, whose responsibilities, in part, would support PAB communications, especially social media and digital marketing.

2020-2021 update: The PAB Administrative Advisory Group conducted research into the social media presence of civilian oversight agencies nationwide, and their footprint is relatively small. The PAB Administrative

Advisory Group recommends creating social media accounts for the PAB, and the content published on those accounts should be specific to the work of civilian oversight.

7. **RECOMMENDATION 7:** The Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion should continue to plan trainings and ongoing education in order to familiarize the PAB with police policy and procedures, and with current issues relevant to the board's work as a campus civilian oversight board.

- a. The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will continue to plan trainings and ongoing education opportunities for the PAB.

2020-2021 update: The PAB received the following two trainings:

- UCDPD protocol for mental health crisis calls for service: Joseph Farrow, UC Davis Police Department (February 17, 2021)
- Restorative practices and civilian oversight: Mary Louise Frampton, UC Davis School of Law (June 16, 2021).

- b. The PAB will provide increased opportunities for board representatives and members of the Administrative Advisory Group to attend trainings offered by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).

2020-2021 update: The PAB representatives who chose to participate attended the following trainings organized by NACOLE:

- NACOLE 2020 virtual annual conference (August – October 2020)
- Screening of *Ernie and Joe: Crisis Cops* and Discussion (October 6, 2020)
- Analyzing and Reporting Use of Force Statistics (January 27, 2021)
- Death Anxiety and Police Culture (March 3, 2021)
- National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice (May 18, 2021).

- c. The PAB will continue to leverage opportunities to consult with PAB Administrative Advisory Group members and the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion to provide proactive department-wide trainings for the UCDPD. This effort currently is underway. PAB representatives will be invited to attend these trainings when appropriate, and other opportunities for the PAB to train alongside UCDPD personnel will continue to be explored.

2020-2021 update: The Chief of Police is working with the Office of Campus Community Relations to identify relevant diversity, equity and inclusion topics to be incorporated in police officer training.

8. **RECOMMENDATION 8:** Our campus community, especially our students, may have questions about bias among PAB representatives during case review. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group should continue to relay that demographics and identifying information are not known to the PAB at any point during case review, except when demographics may be relevant to the complaint, e.g., a complaint of discrimination.
- a. Both PAB representatives and members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group will share the responsibility of communicating with the entities represented on the PAB and with campus constituents the practices related to confidentiality and anonymity during PAB case review.

2020-2021 update: All PAB representatives are asked to give regular updates to their constituent groups/entities, which include information on PAB processes. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group regularly presents to campus and community organizations. In 2020-2021, members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group presented to the following:

- UC Davis Chancellor's Leadership Council
- UC Davis Campus Safety Task Force
- Yolo County Multi-Cultural Community Council
- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies
- UC Davis Health Staff Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- UC Davis Health Principles of Community Employee Resource Group Fair.

9. **RECOMMENDATION 9:** The PAB Administrative Advisory Group should widely share information about the process for nominating and selecting PAB representatives.
- a. Both PAB representatives and members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group will share the responsibility of communicating with the entities represented on the PAB and with campus constituents the practices related to nominating and selecting representatives to the PAB.

2020-2021 update: All PAB representatives are asked to give regular updates to their constituent groups/entities, which include information on PAB processes. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group regularly presents to campus and community organizations. In 2020-2021, members of the PAB Administrative Advisory Group presented to the following:

- UC Davis Chancellor's Leadership Council
- UC Davis Campus Safety Task Force
- Yolo County Multi-Cultural Community Council

- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies
- UC Davis Health Staff Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- UC Davis Health Principles of Community Employee Resource Group Fair.

10. **RECOMMENDATION 10:** It is recommended that the PAB undergo periodic program review to assess its effectiveness in achieving its mission, and to review its charge.

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

2020-2021 update: Recommendation 6 from the Report of the Task Force on Next Generation Reforms to Advance Campus Safety recommended that the PAB undergo program review every two years, and that that review should be conducted by an external consultant. In line with practices from civilian oversight agencies nationwide and based on experiences from the 2018 PAB pilot program review, the PAB Administrative Advisory Group recommends that review occur no more frequently than every three to four years. The PAB Administrative Advisory Group also recommends that any outside consultant also work with someone internal to the university who can speak to UC Davis' specific campus context.

Additional Information at pab.ucdavis.edu

The PAB website contains the PAB's Bylaws and Procedures, meeting dates, members and information on filing an inquiry—including an online Complaint Form—and the complaint review and investigation processes. Also included is an online Feedback/Suggestion Form for raising questions or issues to the PAB's attention. The full 2020-2021 Annual Report is available on the PAB website.

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Concerned Party*	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{1, 2}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-089 • 8/14/20 • UC Davis Health 	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Community member • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Discourtesy by UC Davis security officer	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-90 • 9/1/20 • UC Davis 	Email to Police Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disobedience of a legal order 2. Violation of communicable diseases general order 3. Discourtesy 4. Failure to collect evidence 5. Conduct unbecoming count 1 6. Derogatory language 7. Conduct unbecoming count 2 	Closed	Formal Investigation: Investigation completed 12/10/2020, PAB review 12/16/2020 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disobedience of a legal order: Sustained 2. Violation of communicable diseases general order: Sustained 3. Discourtesy: Sustained 4. Failure to collect evidence: Not sustained 5. Conduct unbecoming count 1: Sustained 6. Derogatory language: Exonerated in part, Not sustained in part 7. Conduct unbecoming count 2: Sustained 	All findings accepted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21-091 • 1/12/21 • UC Davis 	Phone call to Office of Compliance and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Community member • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	Concerns about security at off-campus housing complex	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation	N/A

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

¹ 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 concerned party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the concerned 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."

² 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 can be accessed in the full text of the PAB Annual Report and through the PAB database: pab.ucdavis.edu/database.

Police Accountability Board Inquiries, July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021						
Case Number, Date Filed, Location	Filing Method	Demographic Information from Concerned Party*	Allegations	Case Status	Outcome ^{3, 4}	Police Chief's Response to PAB Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21-092 • 1/29/21 • UC Davis 	Email to PAB member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: Not provided • Gender: Not provided • Race/ethnicity: Not provided 	During a LiveScan appointment, concerned party overheard an officer speaking in a disparaging manner	Closed	Dismissed: Concerns did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21-093 • 3/2/21 • UC Davis 	PAB online feedback form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus affiliation: Staff • Age: Not provided • Gender: Woman • Race/ethnicity: White 	Discourtesy	Closed	In accord with the concerned party's preferences, the PAB connected the concerned party with the Chief for further discussion	N/A

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

³ 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 concerned party did not allege UCDPD misconduct or policy violation, the concerned 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."

⁴ 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 can be accessed in the full text of the PAB Annual Report and through the PAB database: pab.ucdavis.edu/database.