

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

November 2011

The purpose of the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD) is to examine complaints against the UCPD involving charges of excessive force, violation of rights, and abusive language. Composed of faculty members, staff, students, and members of the community, the Independent Review Committee (IRC) reviews the internal investigations that UCPD conducts and reports its conclusions and recommendations to the Provost, President, and Vice President for Administration & Chief Financial Officer as well as to the wider community via its annual report, posted online of UCPD's Web site. More information about the IRC and its mission can be found at <http://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/commendations.shtml>.

This report details the committee's work and analyses regarding complaints against the UCPD for the 2010–11 academic year.

## I. The Complaint Review Process

The UCPD operates under strict rules and regulations that provide for professional conduct. The University takes complaints against UCPD seriously. The procedure for investigation is as follows:

1. A member of the University community or a resident of the neighborhood 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 Citizen Complaint Form, available at [http://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/Citizen\\_complaint.pdf](http://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/Citizen_complaint.pdf). Students at the University may seek assistance from a representative of the Office of Campus and Student Life by calling 773-702-8181. Community members needing assistance may contact the Office of Civic Engagement at 773-702-8195.
2. Each complaint is assigned to a UCPD supervisor for investigation. The investigation includes formal interviews of all parties concerned.
3. After the investigation is completed, the investigation and findings are reviewed by supervisors through the chain of command within UCPD. The Associate Vice President for Safety and Security and Chief of Police reviews every investigation and makes the final decision with respect to the investigative findings and any discipline imposed.
4. The complainant will receive a written response from the Associate Vice President & Chief of Police 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; 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 whenever a case involves conflicting stories that are not clearly resolvable on the basis of evidence presented.
5. For complaints relating directly or indirectly to issues of excessive force, violation of rights, or abusive language, the investigative report will be submitted to the IRC for review.
6. As noted above, the committee annually reports its findings and recommendations to the Provost, President, and Vice President for Administration & Chief Financial Officer. This report, summarizing all incidents reviewed and recommending changes to policies and procedures, is made available to the public via the University's website at <http://www.uchicago.edu/about/documents/irc/>.

## II. Complaint Summaries and Review

There were 17 complaints filed against the UCPD during the 2010-11 academic year, 11 of which involved allegations of excessive force, violation of rights, or abusive language and thus were reviewed by the IRC. (See

Figure 1.) Six complaints were outside the IRC's purview—five internal personnel matters and the other external to UCPD.

### III. Committee Case Reviews

In sequence, the IRC summarizes each case; UCPD's determination; and the IRC's evaluation of that determination, the investigatory procedures, and any further analysis or recommendation.

#### CR 2010-07

**Case Summary** The complainant alleged that while he was waiting for a bus in front of the Regenstein Library, the accused UCPD officer shined a spotlight in his face and direction. When the complainant asked the officer for his name and badge number, the officer drove away. Believing that he had been racially profiled, the complainant called UCPD to report the incident and was told that his complaint did not constitute racial profiling and would not be recorded. After waiting several hours, the complainant contacted UCPD again to report his original complaint and UCPD's failure to receive it. The complainant alleged that even this second effort to register a formal complaint left him uncertain that UCPD had pursued his allegations appropriately because he received no information about a resolution.

- **Allegation 1** The complainant alleged that an officer racially profiled him by shining a spotlight in his face to determine his identity and what he was doing. Based on the evidence, UCPD determined that this allegation was Unfounded.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant alleged that the officer failed to provide his name and badge number when requested. UCPD concluded that there was insufficient evidence and ruled this allegation Not Sustained.
- **Allegation 3** The complainant further alleged that the supervisor to whom he reported the above allegations over the telephone failed to process a formal complaint. UCPD's investigation confirmed that the supervisor failed to process a formal complaint, and this allegation was Sustained.
- **Allegation 4** The complainant further alleged that his second attempt to complain to another supervisor failed to result in a formal resolution to his complaints. UCPD determined that this allegation was Sustained.
- **Committee Response** *The committee considers Not Sustained a better finding than Unfounded for the first allegation since it was not possible to determine intent, namely the motivation for shining the spotlight. The IRC concurs with UCPD's findings for the other three allegations.*
- *UCPD's lack of timely investigation hampered recall. The IRC commends the UCPD Deputy Director who, months later, discovered the uninvestigated complaint and pursued it although he himself had not been on the force when the complainant brought the matter to UCPD's attention.*
- *A complaint merits prompt investigation. That is the University policy and obligation. It is not the job of the UCPD employee receiving the complaint to assess the complaint; it is his/her job to receive the complaint and forward it for investigation.*
- *The IRC recommends that for investigations that center on the witnesses' ability to observe or hear, a diagram of the scene be made a part of the file along with adequate discussion of the lighting. Without knowing where the complainant was situated outside the Regenstein relative to the light fixtures, how far*

*the officer's vehicle was from the complainant, which side of the street the officer's vehicle was on, how long the spotlight was used, and so forth, it was not possible to judge if the officer could have legitimately turned his spotlight on the complainant or heard the complainant ask for his name and badge number.*

- *It seemed to the IRC that the investigation unduly focused on the label "racial profiling" instead of focusing on the specifics being alleged. Even if the complaint does not constitute racial profiling narrowly defined, it is still possible that the officer overstepped professional boundaries in his interaction with the complainant.*

#### **CR 2010-09**

**Case Summary** The complainant alleged that when he reported that he had seen a vehicle bump a pole as the driver was entering a parking garage, the UCPD officer did not respond adequately. The officer went to confirm that there was no damage to the pole. A passenger in the car asserted that the pole had never been hit and that the driver, her niece, had simply bumped the curb. The complainant, who frequents the area with his grandson, remained concerned that unsafe drivers might put his grandson at risk.

- **Allegation 1** The complainant alleged that the accused officer treated him rudely and unprofessionally when the complainant informed him of an accident that had just occurred. UCPD's examination of the facts led them to conclude that the allegation was Not Sustained.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant alleged that the officer told the complainant to "mind his own business; it's not your property." UCPD deemed this allegation Not Sustained.
- **Committee Response** *Based on the thorough investigation, which included transcripts of all interviews and follow-up second interviews of some individuals, the IRC concluded that both allegations should have been Unfounded.*

#### **CR 2010-10**

**Case Summary** Two UCPD officers conducted a traffic stop. The complainant alleged that one of the two officers yelled and cursed at him and acted unprofessionally during the stop. The officers reported that the complainant appeared to be intoxicated. The complainant admitted that he had been drinking and acknowledged challenging one of the officers to a boxing match. UCPD investigators made numerous and diverse attempts to contact the complainant, documenting all their efforts. The complainant never responded or signed an affidavit, which prevented UCPD from investigating the complaint.

- **Allegation 1** The complainant alleged that the officer yelled at him and used unspecified profanity during the course of the on-scene investigation. UCPD determined that this allegation was Unfounded.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant further alleged that the officer did not conduct his investigation properly and professionally. UCPD concluded that this second allegation was also Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *The IRC took issue with the finding of Unfounded, which implies that an investigation was conducted and a conclusion reached based on evidence. No Finding or No Investigation Conducted seems more accurate reflection of what occurred.*

#### **CR 2010-11**

**Case Summary** The complainant, an alumnus, was in Crerar Library with his son, who was using a public

computer. His son left the area for a period, and the computer timed him out. Another library patron moved the son's Tupperware container aside and began to use the public computer. When the complainant noticed her, he told her that she was rude to touch someone else's belongings and that his son was using that computer. The encounter with the complainant frightened her. She reported the problem to the desk staff and requested that UCPD be called.

When UCPD arrived, they spoke quietly with the other patron about her concerns. They then approached the complainant and asked to speak with him in the lobby, where they asked for his account of events and his driver's license. He provided his account but declined to produce his driver's license as he believed that he had done nothing wrong. He did produce his alumni ID. It appeared to some of the people involved in this situation that a language barrier prevented the complainant from understanding explanations that were provided to him.

- **Allegation** The complainant alleged that the officers failed to conduct a warranted and impartial investigation when they asked the complainant for his driver's license, which humiliated and embarrassed him. Based on the evidence, UCPD determined that the allegation was Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *The IRC agreed with UCPD's finding in this case.*
- *From the IRC's perspective, the perfunctory letter sent to the complainant reads like a form letter and does not elucidate why UCPD found what it found. As a result, it does not succeed in conveying that UCPD took the complaint seriously.*

## CR 2010-12

**Case Summary** While in the Medical Center for care, the complainant, who had a history of fraught interactions with the medical staff, became agitated and verbally abusive toward a nurse. A physician attempted to intercede, while the nurse, fearing for her safety, sought UCPD's intervention. The officer endeavored to calm the complainant down and, at the request of a Medical Center administrator, informed him that he needed to leave the Medical Center and that he would be banned in the future.

- **Allegation 1** The complainant alleged that the officer raised his voice and verbally abused him when telling him to "shut up." After concluding its investigation, UCPD determined that this allegation was Unfounded.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant also alleged that the officer improperly barred him from coming back to the Medical Center as a result of this incident. UCPD determined that this allegation was Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *Acknowledging the special difficulty posed by compound allegations, which sometimes must be parsed and addressed point by point, the IRC considers Exonerated a better finding than Unfounded for the first allegation. The officer admitted that after trying more standard, polite verbiage, he did tell the very agitated complainant to "shut up," and the complainant complied. Multiple witnesses corroborated the officer's account that he did not raise his voice and that he did not verbally abuse the complainant.*
- *The IRC agrees with the finding on the second allegation. Its role in this situation was to evaluate UCPD's actions in this situation, not the Medical Center's decision to remove a patient and subsequently ban him.*
- *One important fact remains unclear from the investigative file. When interviewing the accused officer, the investigator prematurely narrowed the questions without first allowing the officer to provide a full narrative, leaving it unclear who directed the officer to tell the complainant that he must leave the*

*Medical Center and that he would be banned.*

### **CR 2010-13**

**Case Summary** In this case of disputed facts, the accused officer asserted that he asked the complainant to stop being loud and disruptive in a restaurant while the complaint asserted that the officer directed abusive language at the complainant and threatened to shoot him.

- **Allegation** The complainant alleged that the accused officer used abusive language and threatened to shoot him. UCPD documented its repeated and concerted efforts to engage the complainant's cooperation in signing an affidavit for the complaint and being interviewed. The complainant's lack of follow-through on these matters made it legally impossible for UCPD to investigate the complaint. UCPD therefore classified this allegation as Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *The committee noted the recurring theme of what to do absent the cooperation of the complainant. Unless an allegation is very serious or there is a criminal charge, state law and UCPD's union contract prohibit them from pursuing a complaint register. Unfounded and Not Sustained both imply that an investigation has been conducted and formal conclusions reached. The committee recommends adding No Finding to the list of possible outcomes to designate a complaint that cannot be investigated.*
- *The IRC also recommends that UCPD consider when it might be possible and appropriate to obtain a signed affidavit from a complainant at the time the initial complaint is reported.*

### **CR 2010-14**

**Case Summary** While discussing the findings of the IRC's Review of the 24 February 2010 Incident at the Regenstien Library with UCPD Command Staff in August 2010, the Chief of Police identified an unexamined question (raised by a student in a detailed email to him on 1 March 2010 and highlighted by the IRC Regenstien Review). He initiated an investigation. The unexamined and serious question centered on investigatory integrity. As noted in the IRC's Regenstien Review:

Specifically, the student alleges (1) that officers made no effort to interview witnesses, including herself, at the scene; (2) that UCPD dispatch refused to take her complaint when she called; (3) that a number of student witnesses went to the Young Building to complain and provide statements but were turned away by the UCPD; and (4) that when she and two other students stayed at the Young Building to persist in making complaints, the Sergeant took down their information but did not inform them as to whether a complaint would be filed and what the process would be.

The file does not include the Chief's response, if any, to this complaint. The student was subsequently interviewed—indeed, on the same day she sent the email to the Chief—regarding what she witnessed on February 24. There is, however, no indication in the file that her complaint about the UCPD response to student attempts to complain was ever pursued.

- **Allegation** The complainant alleged that the accused sergeant failed to appropriately investigate allegations of misconduct related to an incident that occurred at the Regenstien Library (Reference C.R. 2010-06) on 24 February 2010. UCPD's investigation into this allegation reached a finding of Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *The IRC considered UCPD's investigation disappointingly limited, reducing to narrow policy questions and clerical errors the serious issues of integrity raised*

*by the student. The investigation, which examined the actions of a single sergeant while the student's allegation pointed to something systemic and institutional, does not respond to the complaint. The investigation did not look into whether students arrived at the police station or called the dispatcher, as the student asserted in her 1 March 2010 email, or pursue who those students were to obtain their first-hand accounts. The investigation also did not address whether members of UCPD discouraged or turned away students seeking to make a complaint. The file rehearses the old policy parameters and details the revised policies. The file contains no letter to the student informing her of the attempt to investigate her allegations or the clarifying changes in policy. In summary, the IRC continues to believe that serious questions raised by the student's complaint have not been adequately investigated or addressed.*

## **CR 2010-17**

**Case Summary** The complainant went to his mother's house in response to her concern about two youths on her back porch. When he arrived, the youths were no longer there but down the street. The complainant approached them and began to inquire why they had been on his mother's property. At this point, a UCPD squad car rolled up. The accused sergeant and his partner had already instructed the youths to leave the area following a report that they'd been throwing stones at cars. The sergeant again directed the youth, whose ranks now included the complainant, to leave the area. The complainant and the sergeant got into a verbal exchange that resulted the accused sergeant physically restraining the complainant.

- **Allegation 1** Complainant alleged that the accused sergeant used and directed profane language toward the complainant during the incident. UCPD's investigation into this allegation resulted in a finding of Not Sustained.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant further alleged that the accused sergeant used a restraining move (a "nelson") that was excessive and unnecessary. After examining the evidence, UCPD found this allegation to be Sustained.
- **Committee Response** *The IRC agreed with UCPD's findings but did not agree with UCPD's reasoning for the Sustained finding in the second allegation. UCPD's analysis implies that a decision not to arrest someone after making physical contact leads inexorably to a finding of Sustained. This is tantamount to saying that if an officer lays hands on someone, that person must be arrested in order to justify the physical contact. Police officers must be able to exercise discretion. It is plausible that someone should not be arrested even if the officer touched him or her. The IRC did, however, agree that the second allegation should be sustained because the sergeant did not avail himself of opportunities to de-escalate the encounter, which could have avoided the need to use physical force.*
- *The IRC noted that there were some apparent leads in this case that were not followed. A man who reportedly complained to the accused sergeant and his partner that kids were damaging his car with rocks had given his business cards to UCPD. The CPD officer who was present for part of the interaction was not interviewed. Canvasses for potential witnesses, including the teens who observed the incident, did not appear to have been conducted.*
- *This incident seemed to pivot on respect and challenge to authority. The accused sergeant wanted his directive to leave the area heeded. The complainant, a man in his mid-20s, did not wish to be treated casually as if he were one of the local teenagers, with whom he was not keeping company. The IRC recommends that UCPD provide its officers with more de-escalation training.*

## CR 2010-18

**Case Summary** The accused officer was off-duty attending a Bears game. The officer and his wife were using tickets that had been reported stolen, prompting U.S. Postal Inspectors to inquire of the accused officer about the provenance of his tickets. The accused officer had, in fact, acquired the tickets properly, the stolen ticket report had been corrected, but the update had not reached the Postal Inspectors. One of the Postal Inspectors alleged that the accused officer used profanity and was uncooperative and rude while they discussed the tickets.

- **Allegation** The complainant alleged that the accused officer, after identifying himself as a police officer, acted in an unprofessional, rude, and uncooperative manner while directing profane language at the complainant and several witnesses during an off-duty incident that occurred at Soldier Field while the complainant was attempting to conduct a ticket mail fraud investigation. UCPD's investigation concluded that the allegation was Not Sustained.
- **Committee Response** *Given evidence presented by the witnesses UCPD interviewed, the IRC concurred with UCPD's finding.*

## CR 2010-20

**Case Summary** In this case of a traffic stop, the complainant alleged that the accused sergeant did not identify himself or explain the reason for the stop.

- **Allegation 1** The complainant alleged that the accused sergeant never identified himself to her. UCPD concluded that this allegation was Not Sustained.
- **Allegation 2** The complainant alleged that the accused sergeant never provided the reason for or the nature of the citizen contact after being repeatedly asked for that information. UCPD determined that this allegation was Not Sustained.
- **Committee Response** *At the time of the traffic stop, it was not UCPD policy to require their personnel to identify themselves upon making a traffic stop, therefore Exonerated seemed to the IRC a better finding for Allegation 1.*
- *The IRC compliments UCPD for using this incident to improve policies and procedures. UCPD review of this complaint prompted it to change its policies to mandate that officers whenever feasible identify themselves upon greeting a citizen in a traffic stop and explain the reasons for the stop. The IRC strongly supports UCPD's revised policy to further the Department's goals of courtesy, service, and procedural justice.*
- *The IRC agrees with UCPD's Not Sustained finding in the second allegation.*
- *UCPD's investigation uncovered that the accused sergeant had violated UCPD policy for traffic stops by failing to activate his squad car's emergency lights. The sergeant was disciplined for this lapse.*

## CR 2010-21

**Case Summary** After alleging that the accused officer was sleeping on the job in the Medical Center, the complainant, a nurse, sent an email declining to sign an affidavit. In her email, the nurse claimed that the accused officer had (1) slept on the job on numerous occasions, (2) regularly behaved in an unprofessional and confrontational manner, and (3) created unsafe conditions in the workplace for staff and patients by behaving in

a disruptive way.

- **Allegation** The complainant alleged that she discovered the accused officer sleeping while on duty in the back room during her shift. Since UCPD was unable to investigate this allegation without a signed affidavit, they classified the allegation as Unfounded.
- **Committee Response** *The investigator made diligent efforts to obtain the cooperation of the complainant, but was unable to do so. The IRC questioned UCPD's conclusion that they could not investigate this matter without a signed affidavit. Recognizing that it is not possible for UCPD to conduct a Complaint Register investigation without a signed affidavit from a citizen except in criminal and very serious matters, it seemed to the IRC that UCPD could and should conduct a personnel inquiry and follow up on the serious allegations of sleeping on the job, fraught interactions with Medical Center staff, and creating unsafe conditions in a clinical care environment.*
- *The IRC further believes that Unfounded is misleading terminology for a finding in an uninvestigated matter. As noted above, the IRC recommends that a new category of finding be created for uninvestigated complaints.*

#### **IV. IRC General Recommendations**

The committee respectfully makes the following recommendations for University and UCPD consideration:

**Improved Investigations** For the past few years, the IRC has urged UCPD to provide better training to a smaller number of investigators in order to improve the quality of the investigations and the maintenance of the investigation files. The newly hired Deputy Chief of professional standards focuses on investigations and brings a lucid, analytical, and consistent approach to investigations. Typically, his questions begin generally, and then increase in specificity after he gives the interviewees the opportunity to relate their account. The careful questions that do not lead an interviewee to a particular response but are designed to get at real facts instill more confidence in the investigation's conclusions. The files themselves have been well organized and complete. Just as UCPD has made a practice of recording complainant demographic data such as race, gender, and age, the IRC suggests that UCPD also incorporate the complainant's status (student, community member, faculty, etc.) on the Summary Digest Form. This is useful information to document and track in a university setting. The IRC also applauds UCPD's agreement to provide complainants, witnesses, and accused officers with a copy of their statements upon request.

**Review of Investigation Procedures** IRC thanks UCPD for adopting many of the committee's earlier recommendations, for example, providing verbatim transcripts of interviews, acknowledging receipt of a complaint, and documenting efforts to contact the complainant to secure a signed affidavit. These are important steps in strengthening UCPD's investigations and, more importantly, the integrity of the results of the investigations.

**Diagram of Scene** In situations such as CR # 2010-07 and last year's CR # 2010-06, when distances between witnesses and/or officers, obstacles and low light conditions that impair vision, and other factors bear consequentially on assessing a case, the IRC suggests that UCPD produce a diagram of the sort that is common following an automobile accident.

**Focusing on Allegations rather than Labels** Capturing the essence of a complainant's allegations, especially if the complainant is angry or emotional, is not easy. Complainants lack familiarity with technical distinctions and definitions in laws and regulations, and may use terms that have a precise, legal meaning in ways that are legally incorrect but typical of common parlance. This reality places UCPD in the important role of interpreting what a complainant wants and intends to convey. A full and complete investigation aimed at improving



UCPD's relationship with the citizens it serves does not get bogged down in technical definitions—Did “racial profiling,” technically speaking, occur?—but examines the crux of the complaint—Did the officer's conduct violate professional standards even if the complainant did not offer a label (or suggested the wrong label) for the conduct? Both 2010-07 and 2010-14 poignantly illustrate this comment.

**New Designation for Uninvestigated Complaints** The IRC recommends that the University create a new category of finding to distinguish a complaint for which the complainant does not sign an affidavit, thus precluding UCPD from investigating the allegations except in the case of a very serious or criminal matter. The current use of Unfounded, which implies that an investigation has occurred and that a conclusion has been reached, is inaccurate.

### **Procedures to Maximize Information Provided by the Complainant**

Given the frequency of complaints in which a complainant later chooses not to cooperate or complete an affidavit, the IRC recommends that UCPD put in place procedures to maximize the information that can be obtained from the complainant at the time of initial contact, when the complainant is most motivated to pursue his or her complaint. For example, can UCPD seek an affidavit from the complainant to support the allegations at the time he or she first complains? Is it possible to conduct a thorough interview of the complainant at the time of the complaint?

**Handling Challenges to Authority** Again this year among the small number of complaints against UCPD are a couple that highlight the inherent power differential between citizens and officers and the importance of training in de-escalation techniques and avoiding stand-offs.

**Communication with Complainants** As noted in last year's IRC report, the committee continues to regard the letters that UCPD sends complainants to be missed opportunities. The IRC recognizes that elaborate detail is not necessary or advisable. The unduly sparse detail and form-letter feel do not convey the seriousness and care that UCPD in fact takes in most of its investigations. The style of communication may matter as much or more than the content.

**Protections against Retaliation for Reporting Misconduct** The IRC believes that it is critical that UCPD have in place strong measures written in UCPD policy to protect officers and civilians who report police misconduct from potential retaliation. The IRC understands that such protections are currently implicit in the UCPD Code of Conduct. However, we recommend that UCPD draft express policies that will provide strong assurance to UCPD officers and community members of affirmative protection from and prohibition of retaliation.

**Revised General Orders** UCPD invited IRC comment on the revised General Orders, the detailed procedures and policies that govern the conduct of UCPD. The IRC appreciated the opportunity and has provided the requested feedback. While the IRC understands why draft policies are not public documents, the IRC hopes that the final versions of UCPD's general orders will become public documents to give citizens full opportunity to see what UCPD expects of its officers and itself.

**Use of Officers' Complaint Histories in Investigations into Allegations of Police Misconduct** The IRC understands that it is UCPD's policy to examine an accused officer's complaint and disciplinary history upon a finding of misconduct as a factor in determining appropriate discipline. The IRC recommends that UCPD examine an accused officer's complaint history as a matter of practice in the course of investigating allegations of misconduct, not only after the investigation has been completed. Just as it is standard practice to pull a suspect's prior arrests in criminal investigations, the IRC understands that the use of prior complaints in police misconduct investigations is a national best practice to identify and address potential patterns of misconduct and evaluate credibility. Prior complaints may also be relevant to issues such as motive, notice, intent, identity, and

absence of mistake.

**Professional Standards Annual Reporting** The IRC applauds UCPD's decision to track statistics related to police misconduct complaints and stops of community members, to analyze such data to address possible patterns of abuse, and to provide summary reports to the public. The IRC welcomes the opportunity to consult with UCPD as it develops a plan to implement these procedures.

**UCPD Response to IRC Recommendations** Members of the University community have requested that UCPD publish a written response to the IRC's annual recommendations to indicate the UCPD's plans. The IRC agrees and recommends that UCPD publish such a response on the web.

## **V. IRC Analysis of UCPD Complaint Data**

Since March of 2005, there have been 65 cases of complaint against UCPD. Nine were internal investigations outside the purview of the IRC. The number of citizen complaints totals 56.

### *Gender of complainant:*

Female	26 <sup>1</sup>
Male	31

### *Race of complainant:*

Black	46
White	6
Asian	1
Unknown	4

### *Status of complainant:*

Community	43
Students	5
Staff	8
Alumni	1

### *Officers with multiple complaints:*

5 complaints	1 officer
3 complaints	1 officer
2 complaints	10 officers

### *Race of the officer:*

Black	38
White	23
Hispanic	6
Unknown	1

---

<sup>1</sup> The total number of complainants is 57 rather than 56 (the total number of citizen complaints) because two complainants were noted with respect to one of the complaints.

## *Charges:*<sup>2</sup>

Violation of rights	33
Excessive force:	20
Abusive language	20
Failure to serve <sup>3</sup>	11
Intimidating conduct	6
Disrespectful behavior	2
Rude behavior	1
Bad driving	1
Sleeping on the job	1

## *Findings:*<sup>4</sup>

Not sustained	46
Unfounded	36
Sustained <sup>5</sup>	28
Exonerated	12
Pending	5
Complaint terminated	4

### **Members of the Committee** (<http://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/commendations.shtml>)

Craig Futterman, *Clinical Professor, Law School and Committee Chair*

Kevin Corlette, *Professor, Department of Mathematics and the College*

Jane Dailey, *Associate Professor, Department of History and the College*

Liz Gardner, *Community member*

Ingrid Gould, *Associate Provost and staff to Committee*

Edward James, *Student in the College*

Cindy Jurisson, *Community member*

Jamie Kalven, *Community member*

Chris Mendez, *Student in the College*

Robert Rush, *Associate General Counsel, Office of Legal Counsel*

Belinda Vazquez, *Assistant Dean of Students, Office of the Vice President and Dean of Students*

Teresa Zhu, *Student in the Harris School of Public Policy Studies*

---

<sup>2</sup> These figures reflect allegations not cases; that is, a single case may have multiple allegations.

<sup>3</sup> The following have been combined in this category: “failure to serve professionally,” “unprofessional conduct,” and “failure to serve.”

<sup>4</sup> The tabulation of findings includes internal investigations as well as citizen complaints. The data includes the outcomes of the former but not the charges.

<sup>5</sup> In most cases where findings of Sustained were made, it is unclear what discipline was imposed. In two instances, it is noted that the officer received a reprimand. In the rest, there is no indication what discipline, if any, was imposed.