

Annual Report of the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department

March 2022

Appointed by the University of Chicago, the Independent Review Committee (IRC) for the Police Department (UCPD) examines complaints of abusive language, dereliction of duty, excessive force, or violation of rights brought against UCPD by members of the University of Chicago (University) community and the public UCPD serves.

Accordingly, the IRC includes members from the community as well as University faculty, staff, and students. This Committee reviews UCPD's internal investigations and then reports its findings and recommendations to the Provost, President, Vice President & General Counsel and the community at large via an annual report posted on UCPD's website. Additional information about the IRC and its mission are available [online](#).

This Annual Report details the IRC's work and analyses regarding complaints against the UCPD for the 2020–2021 academic year.

I. The Complaint Review Process

UCPD is subject to University policies and extensive departmental rules and regulations, called General Orders, stipulating professional police conduct. Decades ago, the University established the IRC to provide serious and thoughtful review of citizen complaints to improve UCPD processes and overall policing. The procedure for filing and investigating such complaints is as follows:

1. A member of the University community or other community member who is dissatisfied with UCPD may call the dispatcher at 773.702.8181 and ask to speak with the Watch Commander or the supervisor on duty, or may make a formal complaint by completing a [Compliments & Complaints Form](#). Students at the University may seek assistance from a representative of the Office of Campus and Student Life by calling 773.702.7770. Community members needing assistance may contact the Office of Civic Engagement at 773.834.8057.
2. Each complaint is assigned to the Director of Professional Accountability for investigation. Once the complainant provides the factual basis of the complaint, the complainant and other relevant concerned parties will have the opportunity to be interviewed by the Director of Professional Accountability in connection with the investigation.
3. After the investigation is completed, the investigation and findings are reviewed by supervisors through the chain of command within UCPD. During the 2020–21 academic year, the Associate Vice President for Safety & Security reviewed every investigation and made the final decision with respect to the investigative findings and any discipline imposed.
4. The complainant receives a written response from the Associate Vice President to explain the findings and any disciplinary action taken as a result of a sustained complaint. The possible findings are:
 - *Unfounded*: The allegations are not factually accurate, or the alleged conduct did not occur.
 - *Exonerated*: The alleged conduct did occur, but it was justified under the circumstances.
 - *Sustained*: The alleged conduct did occur, and it was not justified under the circumstances.
 - *Not Sustained*: The written record of the investigation does not support a determination of whether the alleged conduct occurred. A classification of Not Sustained is used where a case involves conflicting stories that are not clearly resolvable on the basis of evidence presented.
 - *Administratively Closed*: No investigation was completed due to the fact that the complainant: (i) did not sign an affidavit for the investigation to proceed, a State of Illinois requirement during the period under review (except in an instance of alleged serious or criminal violation) or (ii) otherwise failed to cooperate with the investigation.

5. For complaints relating directly or indirectly to issues of excessive force, violation of rights, abusive language, or dereliction of duty, the investigative report is submitted to the IRC for review. The purpose of the IRC and a description can be found at the University's [website](#).
6. As noted above, the IRC annually reports its findings and recommendations to the Provost, President, and Vice President & General Counsel as well as to the public. This report, summarizing all incidents reviewed and recommending changes to policies and procedures, is available to the public via the University's [website](#).

II. Complaint Summaries and IRC Case Reviews

Seventeen complaints were filed against UCPD officers by members of the University community and the public during the 2020–21 academic year. The IRC reviewed 13 that fell within its above-described purview. (See Figure 1.) This report summarizes each case. The Department of Safety & Security's (DSS) determination follows each summary, after which the IRC's evaluation of DSS's determination and investigatory procedures appears. The IRC then provides its analysis or recommendation.

CR 2020-04

Case Summary: The incident followed a minor traffic collision between two vehicles. The complainant waived down the accused officer. A second officer arrived later. It was unclear at first what the complainant wanted the UCPD to do, but eventually both the complainant and the other driver in the collision indicated that they did not want to file a report with the UCPD. The complainant accused the UCPD officer of treating him with disrespect, not taking his complaint seriously, and using sarcasm in their conversation. The investigator did not find evidence to support the complainant's allegations. DSS attempted to follow up with the complainant but did not receive a signed affidavit; therefore, the case was administratively closed.

Allegations: 1) UCPD officer was not fair during his preliminary investigation and did not get the complainant's version of what happened. 2) Officer did not complete a thorough preliminary investigation into the alleged road rage incident.

• **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS deemed all allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *The accused officer turned off his camera temporarily at the complainant's request. IRC members agreed that it would have been helpful to view a recording of that part of the encounter, although some of it was captured in the second officer's bodycam footage.*
- *It is in the UCPD policy that officers can turn off their body-worn cameras at the request of complainants or witnesses. The accused officer's actions in turning off the camera may have been an attempt to defuse the situation. It is at the officer's discretion to grant a request to turn off a body-worn camera. The officer also decides whether to turn the camera on or off when there are conflicting requests about the camera. Officer discretion might be replaced with a more objective policy.*

CR 2020-07

Case Summary: The complainant flagged down the accused UCPD officer driving by him and another person who were in a dispute over property. The accused officer did not stop but instead drove around the block. The complainant conferred with the other person on the scene about the property dispute. The accused UCPD officer returned, said he would be back, and then drove away, possibly to park or turn around. In the few seconds between the time that the accused officer drove off and returned, the complainant and the other party got into a physical altercation, apparently initiated by the complainant. The complainant was arrested. UCPD tried to reach the complainant several times by phone and mail to obtain a signed affidavit, but without success. Therefore, the case was administratively closed. The investigator found all three allegations to be unfounded.

Allegations: 1) A UCPD officer drove away after the complainant flagged him down, which was a violation of

his rights. 2) Officer did not have a name tag on. 3) Officer did not have a body camera on.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS deemed all allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *If the accused officer had stayed at the scene the altercation and subsequent arrest might have been avoided.*
- *Some committee members expressed concerns about unconscious bias. Would the accused officer's actions be different if a white man had flagged him down?*
- *Members expressed concern that the video showed an officer (not the accused officer) arriving after four officers were already on the scene; that officer immediately began shouting at the battery victim, who was on the ground in a pool of his own blood, telling the victim to stay down. Other officers on the scene told that officer that the man on the ground was not under arrest.*

CR 2020-08

Case Summary: The complainant called UCPD from Botany Pond to report a group of people gathered there with no masks and not practicing physical distancing contrary to UChicago COVID-19 safety rules. The complainant asked the accused dispatcher to send an officer, as when the complainant asked the group to put on masks they did not comply. The accused dispatcher told the complainant that an officer was en route. The complainant alleged that the accused dispatcher was rude and would not give an estimated time of arrival (ETA) for the accused officer. The complainant further alleged that he waited 20 minutes for the accused officer's arrival, but the accused officer did not respond to the call.

Allegations: 1) UCPD dispatcher was rude when the complainant called UCPD to request a police response to Botany Pond. 2) Dispatcher would not tell the complainant if an officer would be dispatched to Botany Pond or provide the complainant with an ETA for the officer's arrival. 3) UCPD officer did not respond to Botany Pond to investigate the call for service as requested by the complainant.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS found the allegations 1) sustained; 2) unfounded; 3) unfounded, and the IRC agrees.*
- *The IRC found the recording of the dispatch call to be helpful. The accused dispatcher could have varied her wording, spoken more slowly, and been clearer and kinder in her tone. As dispatchers are often the UCPD's first point of contact with the community, they need to be clear and empathetic to people calling during a crisis, people who are in distress, and people who might not hear well. Members also expressed empathy with dispatchers, whose jobs include considerable psychological demands. Members commended UCPD for taking the issue seriously.*
- *The IRC considered the time lag as a possible issue but acknowledged that it might take some time for officers to get from one area to another.*

CR 2020-09

Case Summary: A situation occurred outside the UCPD area but continued into the complainant's living space within UCPD's jurisdiction. The complainant's relative had a restraining order against a man who the complainant alleged was now stalking her and her daughter after her daughter visited the home of the relative. When the complainant saw a UCPD vehicle in her neighborhood while she was taking an early-morning bike ride, she attempted to stop it to ask advice about what to do/what could be done regarding the alleged stalking. It was not clear what the complainant wanted the accused officer to do. The accused UCPD officer did not immediately stop; the complainant had to flag him down. The complainant alleged that the accused officer was unprofessional and inappropriate in his demeanor and remarks; did not seem to take her complaint seriously; did not take notes until she asked him to do so; and would not give his name when she requested it. The officer did not activate his body-worn camera during the encounter. After the initial incident, the complainant alleged that she saw the accused officer on three separate occasions, and reported that he seemed to be following her. The accused officer apparently did not record the complainant's address information correctly, so the complaint

form did not reach her right away. She did not return a sworn affidavit; therefore, the case was administratively closed.

Allegations: 1) A UCPD officer was unprofessional in the way that he spoke to the complainant. 2) Officer did not take her complaint seriously and was laughing at her as she described it. 3) Officer refused to provide her with his name. 4) Officer did not activate his body-worn camera while talking to her.

• ***IRC Response to Allegation:***

- *DSS found the allegations administratively closed. The IRC agrees.*
- *Members wondered if the complainant dropped the case because she felt intimidated by the accused officer. A question arose about the confidentiality of the complainant and if the officer can learn the identity of the complainant. A lack of confidentiality could deter complainants from continuing in the process.*
- *Members also wondered why the accused officer's body camera was not turned on. The UCPD general order regarding body-worn cameras could be more specific about what is a "response to service." IRC members agreed that sections of the general order could be clearer.*
- *Without corroborating witness testimony or video footage, the committee has no way of knowing if the officer's demeanor and remarks were inappropriate.*

CR 2020-10

Case Summary: The complainant alleged that a UCPD vehicle cut off his truck on a highway, causing him to brake and sound his horn to avoid a collision. There were no UCPD vehicles on the highway that day; however, one was there the day before at approximately the time alleged by the complainant. The complainant, from out of state, did not submit a signed affidavit, so the case was administratively closed.

Allegation: A UCPD vehicle being driven on a highway merged from the center lane into the far-right lane where complainant was driving his truck, causing him to slam on his brakes and sound the air horn to avoid a traffic crash.

• ***IRC Response to Allegation:***

- *DSS found the allegation administratively closed. The IRC agrees.*
- *The company the complainant driver worked for never sent the video footage he promised.*
- *The incident raised questions regarding record keeping. On a sheet with twenty vehicle check-outs committee members saw one legible signature. There was an illegible signature on the sign-out list the day before the complainant alleged that the incident occurred. Further, there was not, as required by UCPD policies, a name and star number listed.*
- *The IRC followed up about record-keeping practices. UCPD explained that a community service worker, not a UCPD officer, checks out vehicles. The check-out policy only covered police officers, but has been revised, effective April 28, 2021, to include all personnel, and to specify that vehicle maintenance records are included in the policy.*

CR 2020-11

Case Summary: A white female complainant was walking her dog, when a black male on the sidewalk nearby, appearing agitated, yelled threats at her, causing her to fear for her safety. A UCPD squad car with two officers drove past, and the complainant tried to flag them down. She walked into the street and yelled to try to get their attention. She alleged that she saw the officer in the front passenger seat turn his head when she called out to the officers, but the UCPD car did not stop.

Allegation: UCPD officers drove by the complainant with their UCPD police vehicle window down. The complainant called out to them. They looked over and kept driving without stopping as a man threatened her.

• ***IRC Response to Allegation:***

- *DSS found the allegation administratively closed, and the IRC agrees, as the complainant did not file a notarized affidavit.*

- *There was no video of the event for the IRC to review.*

CR 2020-12

Case Summary: A UCPD officer in a patrol car allegedly ran a stop sign and almost hit the complainant, who was jogging. The officer did not turn on emergency lights or sirens. The officer was heading toward the area of a recent crime to search for suspects. After filing the initial complaint, the complainant expressed frustration with the process and asked not to be contacted anymore. She expressed negative opinions of the police, and that she felt the process put the onus on the victim/complainant rather than the perpetrator. No video was available.

Allegation: While the complainant was jogging, a UCPD SUV disobeyed a stop sign and made an illegal turn, placing her in danger of being injured.

- ***IRC Response to Allegation:***

- *DSS found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *The case highlighted issues of barriers to filing complaints that emerged in other cases under IRC review. The IRC has raised the burdens of the notary requirement to UCPD, which has clarified that the requirement arose from IL state law (which has since been amended, as discussed below).*

CR 2020-13

Case Summary: A UCPD officer pulled over the complainant for passing a stopped car on the right. The complainant alleged that the driver of the car in front of his had stopped more than once, and seemed to be driving erratically, prompting the complainant to pull around the car to avoid a potential accident. The complainant alleged that the officer approached his car with his hand on his weapon, used unprofessional vernacular, was argumentative, and stopped him because of his race. The complainant further alleged that the sergeant who was called to the scene threatened to take the complainant to jail and did not take his complaint.

Allegations: 1) During a traffic stop, a UCPD officer referred to complainant/driver's girlfriend as his "baby momma". 2) Officer was unprofessional in the manner in which he greeted the complainant, referring to him as "brother" and "man". 3) Officer was unprofessional by arguing and belittling the complainant. 4) A UCPD sergeant told the complainant that he could be taken to jail for a vehicle code violation. 5) Sergeant failed to take a formal complaint from the complainant who reported that the officer profiled him and argued with him during a traffic stop.

- ***IRC Response to Allegation:***

- *DSS found the allegations administratively closed (followed up with an internal investigation), and the IRC agrees though it expressed concerns about the officer's and sergeant's conduct.*
- *Members disagreed with the description in the report of the complainant as "erratic" and the insinuation that the complainant was mentally ill. His demeanor in the video appeared as simply angry at being pulled over and scared that the officer approached his car with his hand on his gun.*
- *Some members asked whether racial profiling and/or unconscious bias may have been a factor in the stop. The incident occurred at a time of particularly high racial tensions in the wake of high-profile cases of police brutality and the police killings of George Floyd and others, and members discussed that UCPD personnel need to be sensitive to the perspective of persons of color in this context, and the importance of rapport-building and de-escalation skills were discussed.*
- *The members of the IRC found the officer's behavior problematic, and appreciated that UCPD transitioned the case to an internal complaint and continued to pursue it. The IRC further appreciated and agreed with the candid assessments in the CSS investigator's reports, including that the accused officer was defiant and sneering. The officer has since resigned.*
- *IRC members opined that intimidation seems to have been the intent of the sergeant's threat to take the complainant to jail.*

CR 2020-14

Case Summary: The complainant was an observer to a UCPD traffic stop of a car that apparently fit the description of a vehicle used in previous incidents where paintballs were shot, something mentioned only in the reports, not heard in the video footage. Officer 1's video started with the officer yelling at the driver repeatedly, with gun drawn, to "get out!" The passenger in the car became upset and expressed feeling threatened. The driver explained that he gave the car to someone who did not properly transfer the title. He then found out that that person did not have a driver's license, so he flew to Minnesota to retrieve the car and was driving it back to Chicago when the person in Minnesota reported it stolen. The driver was apparently still the legal owner of the car. Sergeant 1 listened to the driver, made phone calls, and took over the case. The confusing situation took over an hour for officers to resolve. Sergeant 1 eventually concluded that the matter was a civil case and told the rest of the officers to let the driver go. The case was administratively closed due to a lack of a sworn affidavit.

Allegations: 1) UCPD officers pulled over two men in a car and used unnecessary force, escalating the situation when the officers drew guns on the men. 2) UCPD officers believed the car was stolen but would not listen to the two men who explained that the title had recently been transferred. 3) UCPD officers then searched the car for no reason and continued to search after the two men asked the car not to be searched. 4) UCPD officers held the men for over an hour with no explanation given.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS found the allegation administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *It seemed indicative of the problem exhibited in the previous case that when officer 1 searched the car and found the passenger's identification, the passenger asked if the officer also found his \$5, and officer 1 replied, "I don't need your \$5."*
- *The driver did consent to a search of the car.*
- *Contrary to what the reports indicated, the video did not appear to show the driver "jump out" of the car.*

CR 2020-16

Case Summary: The complainant called UCPD regarding children playing on the ice. The complainant alleged that the officer did not respond to the call, and when the officer did arrive, after the children and their family had already left, the officer was aggressive and inappropriate in his interaction with the complainant.

Allegations: 1) UCPD officer did not respond to the Botany Pond to investigate kids playing on the ice. 2) Officer was aggressive and unprofessional when he spoke with the complainant.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS found the first allegation unfounded and the second allegation sustained. The IRC agrees.*
- *Case files include video of the officer riding to the scene and talking with the family, so it is clear that the officer did respond to the call.*
- *The officer admitted to being frustrated; he claimed to think he had a rapport with the complainant. The DSS investigation recommended a supervisor counsel the officer.*
- *The complainant used accusatory language in his conversation with UCPD. Members expressed appreciation for the high level of professionalism expected of the UCPD officers.*
- *There was no body camera footage of the interaction between the officer and the complainant; the officer said he thought he had turned the camera on, but it did not engage.*

CR 2021-02

Case Summary: On January 9, 2021, the date of the incident under investigation, a shooting spree claimed three lives in the neighborhood. UCPD officers entered the complainant's apartment building in search of the suspected killer. In their search, they detained and handcuffed the complainant without explaining why and

without identifying themselves or reading the complainant his rights. One officer yelled at the complainant with a vulgarity. The officers questioned the complainant and searched his apartment with guns drawn.

Allegations: 1) In the stairwell of his apartment building, several UCPD officers pointed their guns at the complainant and yelled, "put your fucking hands on the wall." 2) The accused officers did not tell the complainant why he was handcuffed or why he was being detained, and they did not read him his rights. 3) The officers walked the complainant to his apartment with their guns drawn, berated the complainant with questions, and searched his room with their guns drawn. 4) The officers did not identify themselves or provide their badge numbers when they stopped the complainant in his apartment building.

• **IRC Response to Allegations:**

- *DSS found allegation 1) for three officers, unfounded; for one officer, sustained; 2) unfounded for all officers; 3) unfounded for all officers; 4) all officers exonerated. The IRC agrees.*
- *The complainant was upset because he had done nothing wrong; he was just in the wrong place at the wrong time.*
- *Regarding allegation 2, officers did not read the complainant his rights, but did not need to do so because the complainant was not under arrest. There was no video footage to support allegation.*
- *It is not a violation of policy for UCPD officers not to identify themselves, as mentioned in allegation 4. The officer who yelled violated the UCPD code of conduct.*
- *Members wondered if there was enough detail in the description of the suspect the accused UCPD officers were searching for, and if it was based primarily on race.*
- *A question arose as to whether, when a UCPD officer does something wrong, is there an obligation for the officer to say, "sorry"? Is there a protocol? An apology might have de-escalated the situation.*

CR 2021-03

Case Summary: The complainant was upset that a UCPD car was apparently in the vicinity at the time that his spouse was victim of a carjacking but did not arrive in time to stop it, that UCPD did not put out a community alert for the stolen vehicle, and that there were no speed bumps on 51st Street to slow the carjackers' getaway.

Allegations: 1) The complainant's spouse was in their car taken at gunpoint, and a UCPD patrol car was nearby observing it happening while doing nothing to prevent the crime. 2) There was no timely UCPD campus-wide alert issued to alert the community that could help to locate the stolen vehicle in time. 3) There were no speed bumps deployed to stop the criminals from leaving the area.

• **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *DSS found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *The complainant discussed the allegations with someone from UCPD, and, being satisfied with the UCPD's response, chose to retract the complaint. The complainant also did not file a signed affidavit. In this case the administrative closure did not give members pause, as in this case the administrative closure meant, "I don't have a complaint anymore."*

CR 2021-05

Case Summary: The complainant was going to retrieve her nephew from a home where she alleged he was being abused. Outside the home she and another person became involved in an altercation in which each was trying to kick the other. The complainant alleges that a UCPD sergeant, trying to break up the fight and take her into custody, grabbed her and threw her to the ground twice. The same sergeant did not arrest the person with whom she was fighting, who was also physically aggressive.

Allegations: 1) A UCPD sergeant grabbed the complainant, picked her up, and slammed her to the ground twice. 2) The accused sergeant arrested the complainant and not the male on scene who was also aggressive and tried to kick the complainant.

- ***IRC Response to Allegations:***

- *DSS found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *While agreeing with the disposition, members asked 1) why, according to the complainant, was a police report not filed; 2) why did the accused UCPD sergeant not take action (such as by contacting DCFS) when the complainant alleged that her nephew was being abused by his father; and 3) what is the UCPD policy on responding to child abuse allegations?*
- *Allegations of child abuse need to be reported to DCFS. Reporting is required if an allegation or suspicion of child abuse is encountered in the context of one's role with the University, which includes anything connected to the University by property or be event. There was no record of the officer making such a report.*
- *The accused sergeant was later reprimanded for not wearing his camera.*

III. IRC General Comments

In the course of its work the IRC brought to UCPD's attention the following issues for consideration and action:

- ***Reducing barriers to reporting complaints***

- Issue: the requirement of a notarized, signed affidavit is a burden for many complainants, especially during the pandemic. The IRC noted an interaction between the COVID-19 pandemic and the complaint process: several cases under review were administratively closed due to a lack of a signed and notarized affidavit. The group suggested that the notary requirement be revisited. Particularly during the pandemic, accommodation should be available if someone cannot safely get to a notary. A sworn affidavit was required by statute for Illinois police officers, however, the Illinois governor issued a notice allowing remote notary services during the pandemic, to end when the state's disaster proclamation ended. IRC members asked UCPD about the possibility of accepting remote notarizations of complaint affidavits.
- Resolution: First, UCPD began including a remote notary option in the list of notaries it distributes to complainants. Then, in August 2021, after a change in Illinois statute, UCPD changed its requirements in keeping with Illinois law, and no longer requires sworn affidavits or sworn statements to complete an investigation. All anonymous complaints will be investigated when there is evidence to support the complaint beyond just the anonymous statement or when the alleged behavior, if sustained, would constitute a violation of state or federal law.

- ***The use of body-worn cameras***

- Issue: Some cases could have benefited from the officers' body-worn cameras being turned on. Video evidence would have helped the IRC understand what took place in situations where UCPD officers were in one-on-one contact with members of the community. The bodycam issue came up more than once in the cases under review. The consensus of the committee was that it is generally helpful to have the cameras on in order to facilitate oversight and review. The committee also appreciated that there are legal and other requirements that govern the use of body-worn cameras, and potential privacy issues.
- Resolution: The committee recommended to UCPD to have the body-worn cameras on more, as their use tends to protect those who act more responsibly during an encounter, and further recommended that, where possible, the bodycam use General Order be clarified to reduce officer discretion.

- ***Record-keeping***

- Issue: Sign-out logs for University vehicles contained illegible signatures or missing signatures.
- Resolution: IRC recommended UCPD maintain better oversight of the fleet log. As previously mentioned, UCPD explained that a community service worker, not a UCPD officer, checks out vehicles. The check-out policy only covered police officers, but has been revised, effective April 28,

2021, to include all personnel, and to specify that vehicle maintenance records are included in the policy.

- ***Protecting complainants from retribution by accused officers***

- Issue: In a case in which an officer allegedly made inappropriate remarks to a community member (later, complainant) who flagged him down asking for help, the community member allegedly later saw the officer several times while she was riding her bike in the neighborhood, and expressed concern that the officer was harassing her. The complainant did not file a signed affidavit; committee members questioned if she was concerned about retribution from the accused officer, and wondered what policies and procedures are in place to prevent officer retribution.
- Resolution: In this particular case, because there was no sworn affidavit and no request for bodycam footage, the officer never knew that the complainant had made a complaint. UCPD informed the committee that an officer will know about a complaint only after a sworn affidavit is received (when sworn affidavits were required); the notification happens at the last step of the process. UCPD does not assure complainants that they will remain anonymous, because they will be known to the officer and the officer's attorney. Retaliation is prohibited, serious misconduct with high penalties including possible termination. IRC asked if UCPD could inform complainants about the retaliation policy.

- ***Communication training for dispatchers***

- Issue: IRC applauded UCPD for providing additional training for the dispatcher in one of the cases the committee read, and asked what training dispatchers typically receive.
- Resolution: UCPD informed the committee that dispatchers are certified by the Association of Police Communication Officers (APCO) and receive training in de-escalation.

- ***Officer anti-bias and implicit bias training***

- Issue: The IRC asked UCPD about anti-bias and implicit bias training for officers. One member suggested that a video the committee viewed in one case could be used as a negative example for training.
- Resolution: UCPD has trainings both for the department and individual officers. The newer trainings are more individualized. UCPD uses videos from other departments for training but would not use UCPD videos internally as it would be bad for morale and the department has no HR authority to share personnel information. The department may use hypothetical scenarios in training. If there is evidence of misconduct UCPD will walk the offending officer through the video and use it as training for that officer.

IV. IRC Analysis of UCPD Complaint Data

A. Since March of 2005, there have been 199 cases of complaint against UCPD. Fifty-one were internal investigations outside the purview of the IRC. The number of complaints under the purview of the IRC totals 148. All of the following are cumulative numbers, not percentages, since March of 2005:

*Gender of complainant*¹:

Female	57
Male	95
Unknown	1

¹ The total number of complainants differs from the total number of citizen complaints because some complaints have more than one complainant. Some complainants also have more than one complaint.

Race of complainant:

Black	99
White	26
Asian	5
Hispanic	1
Unknown	22

Status of complainant:

Community	108
Students	19
Staff/Faculty/Academic Appointee/Postdoctoral Researcher	20
Alumni	5
Unknown	11

Race of the officer²:

Black	103
White	66
Hispanic	16
Asian	2
Unknown	2

Charges³:

Violation of rights	110
Excessive force	45
Abusive language	46
Dereliction of duty ⁴	53
Intimidating conduct	8
Disrespectful/rude behavior	5

Findings⁵:

Not sustained	85
Unfounded	95
Sustained	76
Exonerated	21
Administratively Closed ⁶	63

² Some complaints contain allegations against multiple officers.

³ These figures reflect allegations not cases; that is, a single case may have multiple allegations. These figures represent only the allegations in cases reviewed by the IRC.

⁴ The following have been combined in this category: “failure to serve professionally,” “unprofessional conduct,” “failure to serve,” “bad driving,” and “sleeping on the job.”

⁵ The tabulation of findings includes internal investigations as well as public complaints. The data includes the outcomes of the former but not the charges. Further, some allegations refer to more than one accused officer, resulting in more than one finding.

⁶ “Administratively Closed” includes findings of “Complaint Terminated.”

Officers with multiple complaints:

7 complaints	2 officers
6 complaints	2 officers
5 complaints	5 officers
4 complaints	5 officers
3 complaints	7 officers
2 complaints	20 officers

- B. The complaints tallied here constitute complaints since 2005 against officers who were employed by UCPD for all or part of the period March 7, 2020, through March 7, 2021:

Officers with multiple complaints:

7 complaints	1 officer
6 complaints	2 officers
5 complaints	2 officers
4 complaints	4 officers (one officer is no longer employed by UCPD)
3 complaints	5 officers
2 complaints	8 officers

Members of the IRC 2020–21

Jennifer Nou, *Professor of Law, Law School and IRC Chair*

Erin Adams, *Joseph Regenstein Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and the College*

Ryan Boncamper, *Student in the College*

Jean Decety, *Irving B. Harris Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Psychology and the College*

Richard Flowers, *Community Member*

Ingrid Gould, *Associate Provost and Staff to IRC*

Teresa Kilbane, *Community Member*

Elizabeth Shanin, *Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of Legal Counsel*

Eric Singerman, *Student in the Law School*

Tamara Smith, *Assistant Director and Staff Support*

Belinda Cortez Vazquez, *Associate Dean of Students, Office of Campus and Student Life*

Steven Washington, *Community Member*

Figure 1. Complaints Reviewed by the Independent Review Committee, 2020–21

CR #	Filing, Decision Dates	Complainant Race/Gender	Allegation(s)	DSS Disposition	IRC Disposition
2020-04	03/09/20, 04/22/20	B/M	1: UCPD Officer was not fair during his preliminary investigation and did not get the complainant's version of what happened. 2: UCPD Officer did not complete a thorough preliminary investigation into the alleged road rage incident.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-07	05/28/20, 07/13/20	B/M	1: UCPD officer drove away after the complainant flagged him down which was a violation of his rights. 2: Officer did not have a name tag on. 3: Officer did not have a body camera on.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-08	07/13/20, 08/21/20	W/M	1: UCPD dispatcher was rude when the complainant called UCPD to request a police response to Botany Pond. 2: Dispatcher would not tell the complainant if an officer would be dispatched to Botany Pond or provide the complainant with an ETA for the officer's arrival. 3: UCPD officer did not respond to Botany Pond to investigate the call for service as requested by the complainant.	1. Sustained, 2. Unfounded, 3. Unfounded	agreed
2020-09	07/14/20, 09/24/20	B/F	1. A UCPD officer was unprofessional in the way that he spoke to the complainant. 2. Officer did not take her complaint seriously and laughed at her as she described it. 3. Officer refused to provide her with his name. 4. Officer did not activate his body-worn camera while talking to her.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-10	07/17/20, 09/02/20	Unk/M	1. A UCPD vehicle being driven on 1-57 merged from the center lane into the far right lane where the complainant was driving his truck, causing him to slam on his brakes and sound the air horn to avoid a traffic crash.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-11	08/27/20, 10/19/20	Unk/F	1. UCPD officers drove by the complainant with their UCPD police vehicle window down. She called out to them. They looked over and kept driving without stopping as a man threatened her.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-12	09/01/20, 10/01/20	B/F	1. While the complainant was jogging, a UCPD SUV disobeyed the stop sign and made an illegal turn, putting her in danger of being injured.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-13	09/21/20, 01/07/21	B/M	1. During a traffic stop, a UCPD officer referred to complainant/driver's girlfriend as his "baby momma". 2. Officer was unprofessional in the way he greeted the complainant, referring to him as "brother" and "man". 3. Officer was unprofessional by arguing and belittling the complainant. 4. A UCPD sergeant told the complainant that he could be taken to jail for a vehicle code violation. 5. Sergeant failed to take a formal complaint from the complainant who reported that the officer profiled him and argued with him during a traffic stop.	Administratively closed, followed by internal investigation	agreed
2020-14	11/03/20, 2/08/2021	Unk/M	1. UCPD officers pulled over two men in a car and used unnecessary force in escalating the situation when the officers drew guns on the two men in the car. 2. UCPD believed the car was stolen but would not listen to the two men who explained that the title had recently been transferred. 3. UCPD officers then searched the car for no reason and continued to search after the two men asked the car not to be searched. 4. UCPD officers held the men for over an hour with no explanation given.	Administratively closed	agreed
2020-16	12/26/20, 03/30/21	W/M	1. UCPD officer did not respond to the Botany Pond to investigate kids playing on the ice. 2. Officer was aggressive and unprofessional when he spoke with the complainant.	1. Unfounded 2. Sustained	agreed

2021-02	01/12/21, 03/30/21	W/M	1. In the stairwell of his apartment building, 4 UCPD officers pointed their guns at the complainant and yelled "put your fucking hands on the wall." 2. The officers did not tell the complainant why he was handcuffed or why he was being detained, and they did not read him his rights. 3. The officers walked the complainant to his apartment with their guns drawn, berated the complainant with questions, and searched his room with their guns drawn. 4. The officers did not identify themselves or provide their badge numbers when they stopped the complainant in his apartment building.	1. Officers 1, 2, and 3 – unfounded; Officer 4 – sustained; 2. [all] unfounded; 3. [all] unfounded; 4. [all] exonerated	agreed
2021-03	01/17/21, 03/04/21	W/M	1. The complainant's spouse was in their car taken at gunpoint, and a UCPD patrol car was nearby observing it happening while doing nothing to prevent the crime. 2. There was no timely UCPD campus-wide alert issued to alert the community that could help to locate the stolen vehicle in time. 3. There were no speed bumps deployed to stop the criminals from leaving the area.	Administratively closed [COMPLAINT WITHDRAWN]	agreed
2021-05	01/26/21, 03/04/21	B/F	1. A UCPD sergeant grabbed the complainant, picked her up and slammed her to the ground twice. 2. The sergeant arrested the complainant and not the male on scene who was also aggressive and tried to kick the complainant.	Administratively closed	agreed