It is the policy of the Cornell University Police to accept all complaints of alleged employee misconduct: to conduct a fair and impartial investigation of the complaint: to determine whether the complaint is valid or invalid: and, where indicated take appropriate action. Law enforcement personnel, like all citizens, are protected by the guarantees of the United States Constitution. However, as law enforcement personnel they are in peculiar and unusual position of public trust and responsibility. The public and the Chief of Cornell University Police have the expectation that employees will give an honest reply to questions which are directly related to the performance of their official duties and/or their fitness to serve in a position of a public trust.

**Definitions**

**Category 1:** A complaint that alleges failure to supply services that meet the expectations of the complainant although laws, policies and procedures have been followed. Another example of a category 1 complaint may allege acts of rudeness, discourtesy, unprofessional conduct, sarcasm directed towards another person, poor attitude, or a rude and insulting demeanor.

**Category 2:** A complaint that alleges misconduct by an employee in failing to follow policies and procedures. Some examples of a Category 2 complaint are insubordination, inattention/neglect to duty, intoxication, and minor V&T laws.

**Category 3:** A complaint that alleges that an employee committed an act that violated the law. An exception to this category is minor Vehicle and Traffic Law violations (said violations will be handles in Category 2).

**Sustained:** The allegation is found to be factual and is substantiated by competent evidence.

**Non Sustained:** Insufficient evidence exists to prove or disprove the allegation.

**Unfounded:** The allegation is nor supported by the facts or is a false allegation.

**Exonerated:** The allegation is factual and did occur, however, the involved employee acted lawfully and properly within the bounds of policy and acceptable conduct.
**Closed:** The current investigation of the allegation is terminated without conclusion. The reason for the closing the case file shall be noted therein.

For the 2009 calendar year, the Cornell University Police conducted a total of eleven internal investigations. This is comparison to twenty-one internal investigations for the 2008 calendar year.

All eleven complaints involved sworn personnel.

Of these eleven complaints, ten were classified as Category I, one classified as Category II and there were no Category III complaints for the year 2009.

Six of these complaints were unfounded, one exonerated, one closed, two non sustained and one was sustained

As a result of these complaints, one officer received a written reprimand.

None of these complaints allege racial profiling, excessive force or sexual harassment.

There does not appear to be any trends, policy or training issues in these complaints. It appears that our department complaint procedure is allowing us to sufficiently document and address all levels of complaints.