

City of  
**SACRAMENTO**  
Police Department

DANIEL HAHN  
Chief of Police

5770 Freeport Blvd., Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95822-3516

(916) 808-0800  
Fax: (916) 808-0818  
www.sacpd.org

October 12, 2020  
IAD2020-031



Officer Angela Lansdale  
5770 Freeport Blvd., Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95822

Officer Lansdale:

This letter is to inform you that you are hereby reprimanded in your position as a Police Officer with the City of Sacramento. This action is based on the following facts:

1. On May 28, 2019, the Sacramento Police Department Field Training Unit was made aware of behavior and statements made by you to your trainees that were not conducive to a positive learning environment for a police officer trainee.
2. On February 17, 2020, Field Training Coordinator Officer Eric Madsen participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:
  - On May 28, 2019, while soliciting feedback from Officer [REDACTED] who was a trainee in the Field Training Officer program, about her experience in the program, she informed Officer Madsen that she did not have a positive experience as your trainee. Officer [REDACTED] advised Officer Madsen that you called her "old" and treated her in a condescending and demeaning manner.
  - On June 26, 2019, Officer [REDACTED] informed Officer Madsen that his time as your trainee was not productive and not conducive to learning. Officer [REDACTED] further stated that you asked if he was [REDACTED], which he found offensive and ended his desire to learn from you.
  - Within a month of speaking to Officer [REDACTED] Officer Madsen had a phone conversation with you and advised you of the complaints from Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Officer Madsen advised you to stop the behavior that caused the complaints from Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], as your tone and delivery were wrong. You thanked Officer Madsen for bringing the matter to your attention before it became a bigger problem.
  - On February 6, 2020, during a face-to-face meeting with yourself, Officer Madsen and Sgt. Echeverria to address the issues cited by your previous trainees, you admitted your interpersonal skills were lacking and you had problems with making a connection to your trainees. Officer Madsen felt both he and Sgt. Echeverria were clear with their instructions that the behavior in question needed to cease.
3. On February 17, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:
  - Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in June 2019.

*The Mission of the Sacramento Police Department is to work in partnership with the Community to protect life and property, solve neighborhood problems, and enhance the quality of life in our City.*

- Officer [REDACTED] described his time as your trainee to be “very difficult” as you fostered a learning environment that was not conducive to learning.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described not wanting to come to work while he was your trainee.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described your tone as “hostile,” and “very unconducive to learning.”
  - After having a report rejected, you asked Officer [REDACTED] if he had [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] described how your remark made him question his ability to be an officer.
  - During his time as a phase 3 trainee with you, you did not allow him to drive the patrol vehicle.
    - i. It is important for a training officer to observe a trainee’s driving ability in both non-emergency and emergency situations, especially during phase 3 as in this phase the trainee is nearing the conclusion of the field training program and should be able to operate at or near the level of a solo officer.
  - Based on his experience with you as a trainee, Officer [REDACTED] did not feel you should be a field training officer.
4. On February 18, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:
- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in November 2019.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described her time as your trainee to be, “very hard” because she felt you spoke to her as if she was a child during her time as your trainee.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described having a hard time going to work every day while she was your trainee.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-370145) wherein you asked for a “competent officer” to assist you in a structure search. Officer [REDACTED] indicated she felt as through your comment inferred that she was an incompetent officer.
  - Officer [REDACTED] indicated her time training with you was, “hostile” due to your treatment toward her and caused her training to regress.
  - Officer [REDACTED] indicated that of the eight training officers she had, you were the “worst” due to the hostile and condescending environment you created while she was your trainee.
5. On February 18, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:
- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in December 2019.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described his time as your trainee to be the most difficult month he had in training because of your treatment towards him as a trainee.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described not wanting to go to work while he was your trainee.
  - Officer [REDACTED] indicated you had a demeaning tone almost every day and created an atmosphere that made it hard to learn.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-402388) wherein he made a mistake upon arriving at the scene of robbery. He felt the way in which you corrected his mistake was demeaning and was an example of how you would, “go like off on like every little thing” and ask him why he didn’t understand.
  - Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-399747) wherein you gave him corrections while he was interviewing a citizen. The tone you used to correct him in front of the citizen made him lose track

of his line of questioning and based on his experience was unlike how other training officers would have handled the correction.

- Officer [REDACTED] indicated his time training with you was not conducive to learning and left him feeling less confident in his abilities.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that of the six training officers he had you were “at the bottom” of the list if asked to rank those six training officers from best to worst and that you should not be a training officer.

6. On February 19, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:

- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in September 2019.
- Officer [REDACTED] described his time as your trainee to be one of the toughest months of his training because it was constantly stressful because of the way you treated him, and he was unable to feel comfortable in the car with you.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated the corrections you gave him, “came off more condescending than helpful.”
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that after the first couple of days training with you, he did not want to come to work, began looking for new jobs, and considered quitting.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated he was so concerned with making mistakes and being belittled by you, he was unable to de-stress in the patrol car and this would in turn cause him to fail when performing basic tasks.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated your training methods caused him to, “shut down” and not absorb information.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that of the ten training officers he had you were, “at the bottom” based upon how you gave him information.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated he felt you should not be a training officer.
- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-290773) wherein you called him a “coward” after it appeared, he was avoiding a call for service and told him you could downgrade him to a Community Service Officer position.

7. On February 19, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:

- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in October 2019.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that while she was your trainee, she hated going to work every day and the most important thing she learned as your trainee was how not to treat people.
- Officer [REDACTED] described your tone and manner of communication when dealing with individuals in the public as sarcastic, which she was often scared that it would cause a situation to escalate to a physical confrontation between officers and the members of the public.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that when she informed you that she had not been able to make a narcotic arrest thus far in her training, which is a task to be completed while in training, you ridiculed her instead of assisting her with the task of making a narcotic arrest.
- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident wherein you observed that her false eyelashes were out of policy. You then reviewed the grooming policy and reprimanded Officer [REDACTED] in front of other

officers and stated, "we don't want to look like those sector 5 girls with big eyelashes," which she believed was a reference to some women in South Sacramento.

- Officer [REDACTED] indicated you had a conversation with her after the eyelash incident wherein she felt you accused her of having a sexual relationship with the field training coordinator in return for preferential treatment.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that of the eight training officers she had, she ranked you, "eighth," did not believe you created a good learning environment and you should not be a training officer.

8. On February 19, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and related the following:

- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in March of 2019.
- Officer [REDACTED] described your general attitude as unpleasant and unhappy with everything.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that you sternly criticized her for mistakes in front of both officers and members of the public.
- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-94290) wherein you sternly corrected her in front of a gun store owner during a call for service.
- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-90012) wherein you sternly corrected her for the way she was speaking to a woman during a call for service. The correction happened in front of other members of the public and officers. Your actions made Officer [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that during her time training with you, you made several comments related to her age [REDACTED]. On one occasion you stated, "Wow, you can actually type fast. Did you learn that on a typewriter?"
- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (19-94425) wherein you made the comment, "a monkey can do this. I don't know why you can't," which she took as an insult.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated she overheard you advising another officer that you did not allow your trainees to participate in on-duty work out time because as a part-time field training officer, you would not get the extra field training officer incentive pay for the hour that your trainee was exercising.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that while she was your trainee, she did not want to come to work for her shift and described the learning environment as, "a step above academy" stressful.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that out of ten training officers she had, you were, "at the bottom" when ranked from best to worst and did not believe you should be a training officer.

9. On February 20, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and relayed the following:

- Officer [REDACTED] was your trainee in January of 2020.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that you instructed him not to respond code 3, emergency lights and siren, to a violent crime in progress (20-27379) and again while responding to an officer's call for assistance who was involved in a foot pursuit (20-33103). A code 3 response was reasonable and within department policy for these types of calls, and your direction caused confusion with Officer [REDACTED] which made him feel less confident. Officer [REDACTED] indicated he believed the confusion over the code 3 policy was detrimental to his training, as he stated a similar situation occurred which required a code 3 response during his shadow phase of training and he did not respond code 3 because of your previous direction. As a result, he was docked points on his evaluation.

- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident (20-28130) wherein you sternly corrected him for failing to locate a knife on a detained subject. The correction happened in front of the detained subject and several other officers and made Officer [REDACTED] feel embarrassed.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that out of nine training officers he had, when ranked from best to worst, he would rank you in the 9<sup>th</sup> position.

10. On February 24, 2020, Officer [REDACTED] participated in a fact-finding interview and related the following in summary:

- Officer [REDACTED] described an incident wherein you asked to inspect her loaded duty handgun while both of you were seated in the front seats of a patrol vehicle. This request made Officer [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable as this did not seem like it was the appropriate place to make such an inspection.
- Officer [REDACTED] indicated that out of six training officers she had, you were at the bottom, when ranking from best to worst, based upon the way you delivered information.

11. During a fact-finding interview conducted on March 26, 2020, you admitted the following:

- You attended a 40-hour POST certified Field Training Officer Course in February 2019. (page 3, lines 111-113)
- You corrected Officer [REDACTED] in front of members of the public and other officers while she was speaking to a woman during a welfare check call for service. (page 6, lines 240-250)
- You complimented Officer [REDACTED] for being proficient at typing and made a reference to a generational difference regarding when Officer [REDACTED] went to school. (pages 18 and 19, lines 777-811)
- You had a conversation with Officer Brierly wherein you advised him that you don't allow your trainees on-duty workout time because as a part time FTO you do not get paid the extra percentage for the time your trainee is in the gym. (page 22, lines 930-934)
- You agreed a new officer could be embarrassed by an FTO pointing out their deficiencies or inexperience in front of members of the public and this can affect the trainee's ability to work through a call, absorb information, learn new skills, and focus on officer safety. (page 38, lines 1642-1659)
- Your training logs contained no record indicating that Officer [REDACTED] was allowed to drive the patrol vehicle while he was your trainee. (pages 48-49, lines 2101-2114)
- Due to deficiencies in his report writing, you asked Officer [REDACTED] if he was [REDACTED]. Your purpose for asking Officer [REDACTED] if he was [REDACTED] was to be aware of [REDACTED] and make accommodations for it. (pages 50-51, lines 2157-2223)
- You had a phone conversation with Officer Madsen wherein he told you that you can't ask people if they have [REDACTED] (page 55, line 2393)
- You had an in-person meeting in February 2020, with Officer Madsen and Sgt. Echeverria wherein they advised you that almost all of your trainees have had issues with you regarding your demeaning or belittling treatment towards them. (pages 57 and 58, lines 2486-2544)
- You told Officer [REDACTED] his actions were, "cowardly" when discussing his performance after a call for service. (pages 63 and 64, lines 2739-2778)
- Due to her false eye lashes, you reviewed the grooming policy with Officer [REDACTED] in the report writing room of a police facility directly after roll call when other officers were in the vicinity.

You further advised Officer [REDACTED] that, “we don’t want to look like those sector 5 girls with the big eye lashes.” When explaining to Officer [REDACTED] why some individuals are allowed to violate the grooming policy and others are not, you referenced “nepotism” and general sexual misconduct in police departments. (pages 69-76, lines 3023-3323)

- While preparing to clear a hotel room, you were aware that Officer [REDACTED] was near you, but were not aware that she was directly behind you, when you yelled her name and stated loudly, “can I get a competent officer that can do a protective sweep.” (pages 83-87, lines 3612-3802)
- While booking a subject at the main jail, you verbally corrected Officer [REDACTED] for her speaking grammar in front of your prisoner and Sacramento Sheriff personnel. (pages 94-96, lines 4119-4168)
- You corrected Officer [REDACTED] in front of a subject he was searching and another officer because he left the patrol car door open, then gave him instruction about laws of arrest and investigative procedures in front of the detained subject. (pages 97-101, lines 4222-4395)
- Even though it was within policy to respond code 3, emergency lights and siren, to a violent crime in progress, you instructed Officer [REDACTED] to not respond code 3. You agreed that the instruction you provided Officer [REDACTED] regarding not responding code 3 to a situation where a code 3 response was within policy could have confused him and caused issues with his development as an officer. (pages 108-111, lines 4695-4851)
- You agreed that the way in which you correct and provide feedback to a trainee can affect their ability or their confidence in handling a call. (pages 127-128, lines 5564-5569)

12. On May 14, 2020, Don Demavivas, the City of Sacramento’s Equal Employment Manager, rendered an opinion that you violated the City’s Equal Opportunity Policy when you asked Officer [REDACTED] if he was [REDACTED]

Your actions in this matter are in violation of the City of Sacramento Civil Service Board Rules and Regulations 12.2. (c) inefficiency in performance of work which results in performance lower than that which is typically expected of a similar employee in a similar position; (o) discourteous treatment of another city employee in a situation where an employment relationship exists at the time of the incident; and (w) any conduct rationally related to employment which impairs, disrupts, or causes discredit to your employment or the public service.

Your actions in this matter are in violation of the Sacramento Police Departments Manual of Orders and the City’s Equal Employment Opportunity policy, which states, in relevant part:

#### **SACRAMENTO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

#### **FIELD TRAINING MANUAL**

#### **07-21-15**

6. FTO responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- a. Directly supervising assigned trainees.
- b. Instructing trainees and evaluating their performance in accordance with the Field Training Manual and directives of the FTU.
- c. Providing training and remediation to trainees. Documenting on the Daily Observation Reports, the approximate amount of time spent on remedial training.
- i. Mentoring and developing trainees.
- k. Identifying training needs.

## **A. QUALIFICATIONS**

c. FTO Officers - Officers wishing to become POST certified as a FTO must go through a nomination and interview process. Officers must meet all of the below listed qualifications:

- e. Above average ability to manage interpersonal relations.
- f. Have the necessary skills to present instructional material.
- g. Willingness to teach and ability to effectively evaluate trainees.
- m. Set a good example for trainees.

## **GENERAL ORDERS G.O 210.04 GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 07-12-17**

### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this order is to establish criteria for the general and professional conduct of Department employees.

### **POLICY**

It shall be the policy of the Sacramento Police Department to ensure exemplary conduct of Department employees, both on and off duty, and in keeping with the standards of the City Charter, Civil Service Rules and Regulations, and established labor agreements.

### **PROCEDURE**

#### **A. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (ALL EMPLOYEES)**

- 1. Employees on or off duty shall:
  - a. Be governed by ordinary and reasonable rules of good conduct and behavior.
  - b. Not commit any act whether negligent, intentional, criminal or otherwise that could bring discredit upon the Department or the City.
- 2. Employees shall:
  - a. Be responsible for establishing and maintaining a high spirit of cooperation and respect for others throughout the Department.
  - b. Treat other employees in the Department, regardless of rank, with respect due to them as fellow employees.
  - c. Properly perform assigned police responsibilities during a scheduled shift. NOTE: Improper performance or failure to perform assigned police responsibilities during a scheduled shift shall be regarded as neglect or dereliction of duty and cause for disciplinary action.
  - d. Not speak slightingly or express humiliating discourtesies or derogatory comments to or engage in any harassing behavior towards any person. Employees should refrain from the use of profanity.

## **G.O 220.04 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY 12-16-02**

### **PURPOSE**

To outline procedures for reporting and investigating discrimination/harassment, equal employment, and sexual harassment complaints.

### **POLICY**

To afford equal employment opportunity to all persons, and to prohibit illegal discrimination, harassment, or sexual harassment.

## **PROCEDURE**

### **A. DEFINITIONS**

#### **1. DISCRIMINATION/HARASSMENT**

- a. "Unlawful employment practice" To limit, fail or refuse to hire, or to discharge any individual in the terms, conditions, compensation or privileges of employment, or to limit, segregate, or classify an employee or applicant for employment, in any way that would deprive, tend to deprive, or adversely affect an individual's opportunity or status because of religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical/mental disability, medical condition, pregnancy, marital status, gender, sexual orientation, or age.
- b. Examples include but are not limited to intentionally excluding an individual from an employment opportunity because of their race or sex, or retaliatory behavior toward an individual for filing or participating in a charge of discrimination or harassment.

### **B. GENERAL**

1. The Department's Equal Employment Opportunity Procedures shall be based on the City of Sacramento's Equal Employment Opportunity Policy Statement, and state and federal laws.
2. The Department's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) goal shall be to hire, train, compensate, assign, and promote all persons on the basis of merit and fitness, without discrimination.
3. This Order shall not prohibit social relationships between employees when the social relationship has no bearing on employment decisions or benefits and it is not in violation of other provisions of this procedure. See also GO 210.07 Nepotism/Conflict of Interest.

### **C. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY REGULATIONS**

All job applicants and employees shall be treated fairly and without discrimination in recruitment, examination, appointment, promotion, transfer, job rotation, training, work assignment, merit increases, overtime, and related employment decisions.

1. It shall not be discriminatory and/or harassment to:
  - a. follow a seniority system as long as it is bonafide and not designed to circumvent or evade this policy.
  - b. select or reject a person based upon a bonafide occupational qualification.
2. Retaliation against an employee for filing or participating in a discrimination or sexual harassment complaint is prohibited.
3. All exempt management personnel and all supervisors shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with discrimination and sexual harassment policies in their work area. Should such problems develop, exempt managers and supervisors shall seek out solutions and ensure these problems are resolved.
4. Employees may be held personally liable for violations of state and federal law.
5. Corrective or disciplinary action shall be initiated against any employee who violates this policy.

## **City of Sacramento Equal Employment Opportunity Policy**

### **1. Policy Statement on Discrimination and Harassment**

The City prohibits all forms of discrimination, including any employment-related action by an employee that adversely affects an applicant or worker and is based on any protected classification identified in this policy, including age, ancestry, color, physical or mental disability, gender, gender expression, gender identity, genetic information, marital status, medical condition, military and veteran status, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, and any other classification protected by law. The City's commitment to equal opportunity and non-discrimination extends to all job applicants, employees, and all aspects of employment, including but not



limited to recruitment, hiring, training, assignment, promotion, compensation, transfer, layoff, reinstatement, benefits, education, and termination, as well as to the provision of reasonable accommodation to qualified persons with disabilities.

Harassment, including sexual harassment, is verbal or physical conduct that demeans or shows hostility or aversion toward an individual based upon that individual's protected class. It has the effect of interfering with an individual's work performance or creating a hostile or abusive work environment.

Conduct that may, under certain circumstances, constitute harassment, can include making derogatory comments, crude and offensive statements or remarks, making slurs or off-color jokes, stereotyping, engaging in threatening acts, displaying indecent gestures, pictures, cartoons, posters or material, making inappropriate physical contact, or using written material or City equipment and/or systems to transmit or receive offensive material, statements or pictures. Such conduct is contrary to City policy and to the City's commitment to a discrimination free work environment.

Retaliation is treating a person differently or engaging in acts of reprisal or intimidation against the person because he/she has engaged in protected activity, filed a charge of discrimination, participated in an investigation or opposed a discriminatory practice. Retaliation will not be tolerated.

#### **4. Additional Policy Statement on Disability Discrimination**

Discrimination on the basis of disability against any applicant or employee who is a qualified individual with a disability by a supervisor, management employee or coworker will not be tolerated. This policy applies to the job application process and all terms and conditions of employment including, but not limited to: recruitment, hiring, training, assignment, promotion, compensation, transfer, layoff reinstatement, benefits, education, termination and also in the provision of City programs, services and activities.

a. Discrimination on the basis of disability includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Limiting, segregating, or classifying a job applicant or employee in a way that may adversely affect opportunities or status because of the applicant's or employee's real, perceived, or history of disability.
3. Using any standards, criteria or method of evaluation which could have the effect of discriminating on the basis of disability.
4. Denying equal jobs or benefits because of a disability or the perception of a disability.
5. Failing to make reasonable accommodations for known physical or mental limitations of an otherwise qualified individual unless it can be shown that the accommodation would impose an undue hardship or create a direct threat.

#### **Definitions: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY POLICY**

##### DISCRIMINATION/HARASSMENT

##### **Discrimination**

Treating, considering or making a distinction in favor of or against an employee, job applicant or group based on their actual or perceived protected status in relation to a decision or the terms and conditions of employment, that is reasonably likely to negatively affect prospects for hire, advancement, promotion or job performance. Discrimination includes treatment that deprives, or tends to deprive, the employee or job applicant of employment opportunities or employment status. It is also discrimination to fail to provide reasonable accommodation to an employee or applicant with a disability unless doing so creates an undue hardship or direct threat.

##### **Protected Group Member**

An individual who falls within a group that is identified in the City Equal Employment Opportunity Policy. Those groups include:

- Physical or Mental Disability - Any physiological disease, disorder or condition, including HIV and AIDS, cosmetic disfigurement or anatomical loss. Also includes any mental or psychological disorder or condition. Excludes any sexual behavior disorder, compulsive gambling, kleptomania, pyromania, or

psychoactive substance use disorder resulting from the current illegal use of a controlled substance or other drug.

DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION

**Disability**

A person is recognized as disabled if he/she:

- has a physical or mental impairment that limits (i.e., it makes the achievement of the major life activity difficult) one or more major life activities (construed broadly to include physical, mental, social activities and working)
- has a history of such an impairment known to the employer; or is incorrectly regarded or treated as having or having had such an impairment
- is regarded or treated as having or having had such an impairment that presently has no disabling effects, but may become a qualifying impairment in the future

Your conduct constitutes just cause for disciplinary action pursuant to the Agreement covering your classification. Further, continuation of the above acts or other misconduct on your part will subject you to further disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

A copy of this letter will be placed in your personnel file. This letter will be withdrawn from your official personnel file eighteen (18) months from the date issued provided there has not been additional formal discipline during the eighteen (18) month period.

Sincerely,



David Risley, Deputy Chief  
Office of Investigations

Approved:



Aaron Donato  
Labor Relations Manager

Cc: Human Resources - Labor Relations

## **SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE**

This Settlement and Release (hereafter Agreement) is made and entered into November \_\_\_\_, 2020, by and between the City of Sacramento (City), Police Officer Angela Lansdale (Lansdale), and the Sacramento Police Officers Association (SPOA), regarding the disposition of Internal Affairs case number IAD2020-031 and the disciplinary action (Labor Relations case number 8674) which would have resulted in decertification as a Field Training Officer.

Specifically, the Agreement is as follows:

1. Officer Lansdale hereby acknowledges that her conduct, as outlined in the letter of reprimand in case number IAD2020-031, Labor Relations case number 8674, violated City Policy and Police Department General Orders. Case number IAD2020-031 will be resolved by the issuance of a letter of reprimand and completion of the Education-Based Discipline (EBD) program.
2. Officer Lansdale will be assigned an EBD coordinator, Lieutenant Joseph Bailey, to facilitate the completion of the program. Officer Lansdale will meet with Lieutenant Bailey within thirty (30) days of the date of this agreement to develop an EBD plan.
3. Officer Lansdale shall complete the EBD program within the timelines outlined in attachment 1. During that time, she shall not be assigned a trainee, but will continue to receive the FTO incentive, until she has satisfactorily completed the requirements within the EBD program, as outlined in attachment 1.
4. Officer Lansdale is required to actively participate and satisfactorily complete each of the elements of the EBD program. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in the termination of the EBD and Officer Lansdale's decertification as an FTO. Officer Lansdale and the SPOA hereby waive any right to appeal the imposition of decertification if it is imposed due to Officer Lansdale's failure to complete the EBD. No punitive action will be taken for any POST mandatory courses that cannot be completed within the stated timeframe due to scheduling issues related to COVID-19 but will be completed by Officer Lansdale at the earliest opportunity.
5. Once reassigned as an FTO, if Officer Lansdale receives an evaluation, verified by the Field Training Unit Lieutenant, documenting abusive behavior toward trainee(s) or a failure to provide trainee(s) the necessary exposure to the duties of a police officer, Officer Lansdale will be decertified as an FTO. Officer Lansdale and the SPOA hereby waive any right to appeal the imposition of the decertification if it is imposed as a result of a verified negative evaluation.
6. The letter of reprimand will be removed from all files eighteen (18) months after the date of issuance provided Officer Lansdale has not received any additional formal discipline during that time. If formal discipline above a written reprimand is imposed during that time period, the letter of reprimand will remain in Officer Lansdale's official personnel files and may be used as the basis for progressive discipline in that, or any subsequent disciplinary proceeding.
7. The City has sole discretion whether to use EBD to address any future acts of misconduct.
8. Officer Lansdale and the SPOA waive the right to appeal the decertification as a Field Training Officer to the Civil Service Board. Officer Lansdale and the SPOA waive the right to appeal, challenge, grieve, litigate, or otherwise file any claim regarding any matter concerning the decertification, or any associated

circumstances or issues, to the Civil Service Board, or in any other administrative or judicial forum. Officer Lansdale further agrees to withdraw, with prejudice, any and all current appeals, challenges, grievances, litigation, or claims, with the exception of valid worker's compensation claims, concerning the matters referenced in this agreement, or any associated circumstances or issues, to the Civil Service Board or in any other administrative or judicial forum.

9. Officer Lansdale and the SPOA agree that any and all issues associated with matters in this agreement are hereby resolved and that this agreement is the parties' acknowledgement that the resolution is mutually satisfactory and constitutes final settlement. By this agreement, it is the intent of the parties to effect final and comprehensive settlement.
10. Officer Lansdale and her representative agree to withdraw any and all claims that have been filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) and/or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) regarding Internal Affairs case number IAD2020-031, Labor Relations case number 8674, or the matters referenced in this agreement. In addition to withdrawing any and all claims that have been filed with the DFEH or EEOC, Officer Lansdale hereby releases and forever discharges the City and its successors, assigns, officers, agents, employees and any and all persons, firms and corporations having any interest in them or any of them of and from any and all claims and demands of any kind, nature and description whatsoever and from any and all liabilities, damage, injuries, action or causes of action either at law or in equity which Officer Lansdale has or in the future may have against any such entities or any one or more of them, arising out of or in any way related to or connected to the matters referenced in this agreement or the final notice of suspension referenced above, including, but not limited to, mental and emotional distress, psychic injury, bodily injury, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.
11. Officer Lansdale understands and acknowledges that various federal and state laws provide the right to file charges, claims or complaints against an employer for discrimination on the basis of race, ancestry, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, age, physical or mental disability or sexual preference. Among these laws are Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the California Family Rights Act of 1991, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, as amended, or any successor or replacement statutes.
12. With full understanding of the rights afforded to Officer Lansdale under these and all other available state, federal and local laws, Officer Lansdale, to the extent permitted by law, agree that she will not file or cause to be filed against the City, its officers, agents, employees or representatives, and does fully and finally release, discharge, indemnify and hold the City, its officers, agents, employees or representatives harmless from any charges, complaints or actions based on any alleged violation of these or other available laws, including but not limited to, common law and/or statutory claims relating to wrongful discharge whether in tort or on a contractual theory. Officer Lansdale agrees and represents that the City has not engaged in unlawful discriminatory conduct or actions against them related to or arising out of the facts and circumstances at issue in Internal Affairs case number IAD2020-031 or Labor Relations case number 8674.
13. Officer Lansdale hereby agrees to waive and release all claims arising from or related to Internal Affairs case number IAD2020-031, Labor Relations case


number 8674, or this agreement whether known, unknown, contingent, liquidated or non-liquidated. Officer Lansdale has read and understands and knowingly waives the benefit of the provisions of California Civil Code Section 1542, which reads as follows:

**“A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.”**

14. Officer Lansdale understands and acknowledges the significance and consequences of this Release and of the specific waiver of section 1542, and expressly consents that this Release shall be given full force and effect as to all claims, whether known or unknown.
15. Officer Lansdale acknowledges, agrees and understands that this agreement is executed voluntarily and without duress or undue influence on the part of or on behalf of any person, corporation or entity, and that she has been afforded an opportunity to discuss and review this agreement with her representative.
16. The agreement in this case does not establish a precedent, nor does it interpret any employee rights under the language of the Agreement, the Rules and Regulations of the Civil Service Board or any applicable policies or procedures of the Police Department, or the City.
17. This agreement memorializes and constitutes the entire agreement and understanding between the parties as to all matters referred to or included herein, and supersedes and replaces all prior negotiations, proposed agreements and agreements, whether written or oral.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the date and year first above written.

**FOR THE CITY:**

  
Howard Chan (Nov 6, 2020 17:15 PST)

Howard Chan  
City Manager

  
Christopher C Conlin (Nov 5, 2020 17:38 PST)

Chris Conlin  
Assistant City Manager

  
Daniel Hahn  
Chief of Police

  
Aaron A Donato (Nov 4, 2020 12:32 PST)

Aaron Donato  
Labor Relations Manager

**FOR THE EMPLOYEE:**

  
Police Officer Angela Lansdale

  
Sacramento Police Officer  
Association  
TIMOTHY DAUS

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

  
Brett M. Witter (Nov 4, 2020 17:07 PST)

Brett Witter  
Supervising Deputy City Attorney

**Education Based Discipline  
Lansdale, Angela  
Attachment 1**

**Officer Lansdale's Plan:**

In order for Officer Lansdale to improve her performance and correct past performance issues, the Field Training Unit (FTU) requires the following requirements be met for her to remain as a Field Training Officer (FTO):

1. Attend two (2) mandatory training classes within six (6) months, from the service of the final letter of disciplinary action, as listed in the Field Training Unit Manual to include:
  - a. 40-Hour POST FTO School
  - b. 40-Hour POST AICC Course
2. The above listed courses must be completed before being assigned a trainee.
3. Attend three (3) additional training classes approved by the Field Training Unit Lieutenant within nine (9) months from the service of the final letter of disciplinary action, related to the following topics:
  - a. Leadership
  - b. Effective Communication
  - c. Emotional Intelligence
  - d. Inclusion and/or EEO training
  - e. Coaching and/or mentoring employees
4. Complete three (3) reading assignments approved by the Field Training Unit Lieutenant related to the subsection topics of area 2, as stated above within nine (9) months from the service of the final letter of disciplinary action. Each reading selection must be a minimum of 180 pages.
5. Submit a ten (10) page writing assignment to the Field Training Unit Lieutenant outlining how the subsection topics of area 2 above will be incorporated into training new employees within nine (9) months from the service of the final letter of disciplinary action.
6. Meet with the Field Training Unit Sergeant monthly, after being assigned a trainee(s), for one (1) year for performance evaluations and/or feedback on training progress. Any issues raised each month shall be handled/corrected in a timely manner.
7. Officer Lansdale shall be decertified as an FTO for any of the following:
  - a. A negative evaluation, which has been verified by the Research and Development/Training Unit Lieutenant over the FTU, as such evaluation shows abusive behavior toward trainee(s) or a lack to provide trainee(s) the necessary exposure to the duties of a police officer.
  - b. Failure to complete the above assignments within the designated timeframe.  
*\*Officer Lansdale won't be penalized for any POST mandatory courses that are not scheduled within the stated timeframe due to COVID-19 issues. Mandatory courses will be taken at the earliest opportunity.*

Some examples of specific courses that would qualify as additional training classes include:

**Education Based Discipline  
Lansdale, Angela  
Attachment 1**

**PORAC Leadership Course** – this course meets for 2 weeks over a 3-4-month period. This course really dives into behaviors and treating people with respect.

---

**Sacramento State (CSUS)**

**ANTH 101. Cultural Diversity**

**General Education Area/Graduation Requirement:** United States History, GE AREA D, Race & Ethnicity Graduation Requirement (RE)

**Term Typically Offered:** Fall, Spring, Summer

Focuses on analyzing the historically conditioned political, economic and social factors that have contributed to cultural diversity in the U.S; a critical anthropological approach is developed to explore the intersection of race, class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality; the political economy of institutions and ideas, such as racism, classism, sexual stereotyping, family, religion, state, color-blindness, multiculturalism, etc.; and, discourses of cultural diversity in the U.S.

---

**Empathy and Emotional Intelligence at Work – by UC Berkeley (edX)**

This tutorial on Emotional Intelligence is created to help you enhance your emotional and social skills that build positive relationships at organization. The instructors will explain you the neuroscientific and psychological roots of compassionate, cooperative behaviors. By joining these classes, you will learn how to devise research-based strategies to resolve conflicts and strengthen empathy constructively. This program will help you improve skill set that will let you create more satisfying, productive and innovative experiences at work. Being a self-paced program, you can attend it from anywhere.

**Key Take-aways:**

- Get information about the biological and physiological roots of trust and empathy
- Know how you can lead with social intelligence
- Taught by experts from top university
- Get a great insight on how social intelligence and emotional skills support productivity and organizational happiness
- Detailed course that will help you learn about emotional intelligence

**Duration: 4 Weeks**

[https://www.edx.org/course/empathy-and-emotional-intelligence-at-work?source=aw&awc=6798\\_1597770127\\_0e5cbb3fbc889491cbf188433ae7b59e&utm\\_source=aw&utm\\_medium=affiliate\\_partner&utm\\_content=text-link&utm\\_term=427859\\_Digital+Defynd](https://www.edx.org/course/empathy-and-emotional-intelligence-at-work?source=aw&awc=6798_1597770127_0e5cbb3fbc889491cbf188433ae7b59e&utm_source=aw&utm_medium=affiliate_partner&utm_content=text-link&utm_term=427859_Digital+Defynd)

---

**Inspiring Leadership through Emotional Intelligence (Coursera)**

Conducted by Richard Boyatzis, this online program will help you reverse the harm of chronic stress. By attending this tutorial, you will learn how to refresh your body and mind by creating good relationships. You will be taught by a good professor who is a distinguished university professor. It is a self-paced learning program that you can attend from any place. Throughout

**Education Based Discipline**  
**Lansdale, Angela**  
**Attachment 1**

the class, you will come to know how to coach others effectively towards increased or learning motivation in work as well as life.

**Key Take-aways:**

- Learn about most interesting theories like emotional intelligence, intentional change theory and coaching with compassion
- Get learning from top instructor in a funny, interesting and engaging way
- Good exercises, readings and videos by highly experienced trainers
- Kickstart your career after completing the course
- Learn how to increase motivation in work and life
- Get certificate on completion that you can share on LinkedIn

**Duration: 25 Hrs**

[https://www.coursera.org/learn/emotional-intelligence-leadership?ranMID=40328&ranEAID=vedj0cWlu2Y&ranSiteID=vedj0cWlu2Y-Lnix2gKRWIV2.O5mjL5cRw&siteID=vedj0cWlu2Y-Lnix2gKRWIV2.O5mjL5cRw&utm\\_content=10&utm\\_medium=partners&utm\\_source=linkshare&utm\\_campaign=vedj0cWlu2Y](https://www.coursera.org/learn/emotional-intelligence-leadership?ranMID=40328&ranEAID=vedj0cWlu2Y&ranSiteID=vedj0cWlu2Y-Lnix2gKRWIV2.O5mjL5cRw&siteID=vedj0cWlu2Y-Lnix2gKRWIV2.O5mjL5cRw&utm_content=10&utm_medium=partners&utm_source=linkshare&utm_campaign=vedj0cWlu2Y)



**Sacramento Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division**

**Summary**

**Compl2020-031**

**Allegations: Conduct Unbecoming an Officer  
Discrimination**

**Complainant: Sacramento Police Department**

**Report Prepared by: Sgt. [REDACTED]**

**Investigating Office: Internal Affairs Division**

**Accused Employee: Officer Angela Lansdale, #0926**

During her tenure as a Field Training Officer, a majority of Officer Lansdale's trainees alleged belittling and condescending treatment, and a training style which was not conducive to a productive learning environment. Additionally, two trainees alleged Officer Lansdale made discriminatory comments related to age and learning ability.

**Report Number: Compl2020-031**

Please note that the records provided in this release do not include records or portions of records that are exempt from disclosure pursuant to applicable law. Without limiting other arguments against disclosure that may exist, the following records or portions of records are specifically prohibited or exempted from disclosure:

Records or information that constitutes the personal data or information of an officer or their family members (Cal. Pen. Code §§ 832.7(b)(5) and (b)(6)(A));

Records or information, the disclosure of which would compromise the anonymity of whistleblowers, complainants, victims or witnesses (Cal. Pen. Code § 832.7(b)(6)(B));

Records or information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (Cal. Gov. Code § 7927.700; see also City of San Jose v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1008);

Records or information, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law (Cal. Gov. Code § 7927.705; see also Cal. Const. art. 1 § 1; Cal. Pen. Code § 832.7(a); Cal. Evid. Code § 1040);

Records or information, the disclosure of which would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person (Cal. Pen. Code § 832.7(b)(6)(D));

Records or information, the disclosure of which would reveal personal identifying information, where, on the facts of the particular case, the public interest served by not disclosing the information clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the information (Cal. Pen. Code § 832.7(b)(7));

Records or information wherein the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure (Cal. Gov. Code § 7922.000);

Records or information from separate or prior investigations not independently subject to disclosure (Cal. Pen. Code § 832.7(b)(4)); and

Records or information, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law (Cal. Gov. Code § 7927.705; see also Cal. Const. art. 1 Sec. 1; and HIPAA 45 CFR Part 160 and Subparts A and E of Part 164).

Sacramento Police Department  
Professional Standards Unit  
916-808-3790

[spdpsu@pd.cityofsacramento.org](mailto:spdpsu@pd.cityofsacramento.org)