INTRODUCTION

Ethic: The members of the University of Maryland Baltimore County Police Department are committed to providing quality service to the community. Agency personnel are expected to always conduct themselves professionally and courteously.

Policy: The agency investigates all allegations of poor service, brutality, or unprofessional conduct on the part of any employee of the agency. This is done to resolve any incidents or perceptions of poor service as well as to comply with the high standards established by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies.

Additionally, agency supervisory and administrative personnel conduct reviews of all the following instances involving agency personnel: Traffic accidents; departmental property losses; and uses of force. Use of force reviews are conducted in each incident where police officers discharge firearms; point firearms; deploy shotguns or rifles from agency vehicles; utilize defensive batons; deploy Oleoresin Capsicum (OC); take actions that result in, or are alleged to have resulted in, injuries or death; apply physical force when conducting police functions; or engage in vehicle pursuits.
INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS

Internal investigations into allegations of police officer misconduct that could lead to disciplinary action, demotion or dismissal, must be conducted in accordance with State law, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS’ BILL OF RIGHTS (LEOBR), Sections 3-101 through 3-112, PUBLIC SAFETY, ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND. The LEOBR does not apply to other, non-sworn, employees of the agency. Agency administrators (rank of lieutenant) would be assigned to conduct all the investigations. All investigations would be reviewed and approved by the Chief of Police.

Alleged violations are investigated and receive one of the following disposition classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfounded</th>
<th>the act(s) did NOT occur, or</th>
<th>did NOT involve members of this agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>investigations failed to discover sufficient evidence to clearly prove violations of directives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td>the alleged act(s) did occur, and</td>
<td>the actions of the officer(s) were justified, lawful and proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>sufficient evidence exists to clearly prove violations of directives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Closure</td>
<td>Complaints concerned matters of law or departmental policy and did not concern the employee’s actions</td>
<td>Complainants could not be contacted or refused to participate in inquiries and no other witnesses or evidence could be located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL CASE SYNOPSIS

Background & Allegations: Non-sworn employee was charged with a misdemeanor crime while off duty.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: None.

Background & Allegations: Sworn employee failed to comply with a written directive.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: None.

Background & Allegations: Sworn employee failed to comply with a written directive.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: None.

Background & Allegations: Sworn employee failed to comply with a written directive.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: None.

Background & Allegations: Non-sworn employee was charged with a felony crime while off duty.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: Employee resigned.

Background & Allegations: Non-sworn employee was charged with his second misdemeanor crime during the year while off duty.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: Employee resigned.

Background & Allegations: Non-sworn employee was charged with a convicted of a felony crime while off duty.
Disposition: Sustained.
Additional information and Comments: Employee resigned.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARD REVIEWS

These reviews are conducted when no clear allegation of misconduct has been made against the officer. It usually involves a citizen who is unhappy with the service they have received and lodge a complaint. These are assigned to administratively ranked officers for review and are initially conducted outside of the guidelines of LEOBR. However if an investigator at any point uncovers information that could lead to formal discipline the Deputy Chief is notified and the review is then reclassified to an internal investigation. Since these reviews are not formal investigations the disposition classification of Internal Affair cases is not applicable.

Serving the UMBC Community with Values
VERITAS-CIVITAS-DIGNITAS
TRUTH-CIVILITY-DIGNITY
INDIVIDUAL CASE SYNOPSIS

**Background & Allegations:** Citizen alleged officer embarrassed a student in front of others.
**Disposition:** Not Sustained.
**Additional Information & Comments:** No clear violation of policy found but officer was counseled.

USE OF FORCE REVIEWS

Reviews are routinely conducted by supervisory and administrative personnel in each incident where police officers discharge firearms; point firearms at persons; deploy shotguns or rifles from an agency vehicles; utilize defensive batons; deploy Oleoresin Capsicum (OC); take actions resulting in, or are alleged to have resulted in, injuries or death; apply physical force when conducting police functions; or engage in **vehicle pursuits**.

INDIVIDUAL CASE SYNOPSIS

**Background:** An officer used his service weapon to fire 3 shots to euthanize and injured deer.
**Findings:** The Use of Force in this incident was appropriate.

No vehicle pursuits in 2015.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS INVOLVING AGENCY PERSONNEL

Supervisory and administrative personnel routinely conduct reviews when employees are involved in traffic accidents.

*In the year 2015, 1 accidents review was conducted. In this instances it was determined the officer could not have prevented the accident.*

DEPARTMENT PROPERTY LOSS

Supervisory and administrative personnel routinely conduct reviews when agency property is lost, stolen, and/or damaged.

**Background & Allegations:** Non-sworn employee failed to properly care for agency issued equipment.
**Disposition:** Sustained.
**Additional information and Comments:** None.