Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
(DPSST or the Department)
Memo

Date: November 19, 2026

To: Police Policy Committee

From: Melissa Lang-Bacho
Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Subject: **Staff Report – Separation**
Shanon Anderson; DPSST No. 61579

Reason for Discretionary Review

On March 25, 2025, Shanon Anderson was terminated from the Oregon State University, Department of Public Safety (OSU/DPS) following an investigation that sustained findings that she violated OSU's policies related to retaliation, discrimination, discriminatory harassment, civility in the workplace, proscribed conduct, and the OSU Code of Ethics.

The Department determined that the conduct being presented to the committee violates the Board's moral fitness standards. Through the case review process, the committee will affirm, modify, or negate the below identified moral fitness violations and make a determination on the disposition of this case:

Dishonesty: The Department did not identify intentional dishonesty.

Misuse of Authority: Anderson intentionally used her position of authority to obtain a benefit, to avoid a detriment, or to harm another: by treating employees who were seeking a union vote of no confidence against her in disparate ways and interfering with union business in violation of the law.

Misconduct: Although Anderson's conduct was not identified as intentional discrimination, her leadership decisions reflected a pattern of discriminatory or race-based decision making.

Anderson's leadership actions harmed employees who believed Anderson's actions were discriminatory against them. Anderson's leadership decisions, which included race-based decision making and interference with union business, harmed the reputation and efficient operations of the OSU/DPS.

Anderson's leadership decisions led to a toxic workplace which threatened the efficient operations of OSU/DPS.

Material Events and Conduct

In May of 2024, two employees filed complaints against Anderson. Employee 1 alleged that Anderson created an environment that was bullying and hostile. Employee 2 alleged that Anderson had targeted her in retaliation for her activity as a union officer.

In September 2024, the OSU/DPS retained an independent investigator to review the allegations. The investigation was later expanded to include additional allegations of discrimination which came to light while investigating the initial allegations.

No Confidence Vote

In early 2024, members of the Oregon State Public Safety Association (OSPSA) began discussing internally a no-confidence vote for Anderson, who was the chief of the OSU/DPS. Employee 1 and Employee 2 were vocal supporters of the no-confidence vote, and Employee 14 and Employee 16 opposed the vote.

Prior to the vote, Anderson met privately with Employee 2, who was the OSPSA president at the time, to ask what she had done wrong. Anderson also met with Employee 16 directly before the meeting involving the vote on no-confidence. Employees 1 and 6 expressed a belief that Employee 16 attended the meeting on the vote remotely, so he could share with Anderson what was being discussed in the meeting. Employee 19 believed it was likely that Anderson had Employee 16 and others convince members not to vote against Anderson.

At some point, Anderson learned of the impending vote on the issue of no confidence prior to the vote taking place. Witness 4, who was the Associate Director of Employee Labor Relations (ELR), reported that Anderson shared with her that she was frustrated with ELR and the implementation of the collective bargaining agreement that had just been achieved. Witness 4 indicated that Anderson had made promises related to overtime and pay to employees that were inconsistent with the CBA and Anderson blamed those differences for the loss of confidence in her. Witness 4 reported that Anderson described a "faction" of employees led by Employee 2 who were against her. Witness 4 met with Anderson the day after the OSPSA vote, and Anderson told Witness 4 details about the meeting and vote, including who was present and much of what was said. Witness 4 reported that Anderson was working with Employee 14 and 16 to replace the union leadership with people who she believed she would be able to work with more effectively. Witness 4 advised Anderson to remain neutral about the OSPSA Leadership. According to Witness 4, Anderson told her that she was going to do what she felt she needed to do for the benefit of the Department. Witness 4 reported to her leadership concerns about Anderson's engagement with union members and asked to be relieved of any future one-on-one meetings with Anderson.

Employee 3 recalled Anderson attempting to rally officers and supervisors to support her prior to the vote, and Anderson coming to his office seeking his support. Employee 3 told Anderson that he did not "have a dog in the fight" and Anderson told him that the vote would affect the department. Employee 3 told Anderson that he did not have a vote and so he was staying out of the issue. Employee 3 reported that after the vote, Anderson gloated about the results, stating "only two people didn't like me" and Employee 2 would be stripped of her position as an officer with the OSPSA.

Employee 9 also indicated that he recalled Anderson "trying to build a coalition to defend her" in the face of the no-confidence vote.

Anderson denied lobbying employees related to the vote of no confidence. Anderson also stated that she does not recall having conversations with bargaining unit members about getting Employee 2 removed from the Executive Board for OSPSA.

The investigator found Anderson, through her efforts to have Employee 2 replaced from the OSPSA Executive Board and to have Employees 14 and 16 assume leadership roles, falls short of the duties under the OSU Code of Ethics, which requests all employees conduct themselves, ethically and in compliance with all applicable laws. The investigation cited ORS 243.672(1), which describes unfair labor practices of a public employee to dominate, interfere with, or assist in the formation, existence, or administration of any employee organization.

Conduct Towards Employee 2 Related to Union Activities

Multiple witnesses in the investigation reported that prior to Employee 2 bringing forward grievances from the OSPSA, Employee 2 was viewed by Anderson in a favorable light. Witnesses also observed a marked change in Anderson's behavior towards Employee 1 and Employee 2 following the OSPSA grievances and deliberations relating to the no-confidence vote.

In January 2024, the OSPSA, through its attorney, made a demand for a one-time bonus for dispatchers based on claims they had been given extra duties. Employee 2 was the Union President at the time and was responsible for delivering the grievance to Anderson.

The example provided for how Anderson treated Employee 2 was identified as an incident that occurred in early February 2024. Anderson met with Employees 3, 9, and 2 in her office to discuss an incident that occurred on a prior shift. During the meeting Anderson was described as having berated Employee 2 to the point that Employee 2 was in tears. While Anderson was berating Employee 2, Employee 3 attempted to tell Anderson that the case in question was Employee 5's case only to have Anderson accuse Employee 3 of trying to avoid responsibility by blaming Employee 5. Employee 9, a captain with OSU/DPS, described Anderson's behavior as "completely out of line." Employee 3, supervised Employee 2 at the time, and described Anderson as "very hostile" towards Employee 2. Employee 3 also stated that Anderson treated Employee 2 "like shit. There's no other way to say it."

Employee 9 described the February 2024 encounter as part of a broader pattern of behavior towards Employee 2, indicating that after the no-confidence vote, Employee 2 "became the focal point of Anderson's ire." Anderson looked for reasons to find fault with everything Employee 2 did.

Additional employees corroborated the profoundly negative impact Anderson's behavior had on Employee 2, having concern that Employee 2 would harm herself in response.

Employee 2 filed a complaint against Anderson for retaliation and bullying, following her activities with the OSPSA. When the investigator spoke with Employee 2, she had already left OSU/DPS and confirmed the reason for her departure was what she experienced as retaliatory treatment from Anderson.

Anderson denied singling out Employee 2 and stated that the reason she experienced scrutiny was because of deficiencies in her performance. Anderson indicated that Employee 2 lacked basic knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for the job and that she came from another agency as a lateral hire, where according to Anderson, Employee 2 struggled with basic issues relating to use of force. Anderson alluded to Employee 2 having to go through remedial training at her former agency and that she hoped that she would perform at a higher standard in a new work environment. When Anderson was asked why Employee 2 was selected to work as a Field

Training Officer, Anderson stated that she gave Employee 2 additional responsibilities as an opportunity to develop her skills as a leader.

The investigator could not corroborate the performance deficits that Anderson noted in Employee 2. Both of Employee 2's direct supervisors indicated that she performed her duties well. Performance evaluations also reflected that Employee met or exceeded expectations, and worked as a Field training officer, CPR instructor, and RAD instructor.

The investigator found that Anderson singled out Employee 2, and a substantial factor in Anderson's hostility towards Employee 2 was her OSPSA activities. This conduct violated the University's policy against retaliation. Although Employee 2 was not formally disciplined by Anderson, the investigator found that the distinct scrutiny that Anderson imposed rose to the level of an adverse action under the policy.

Conduct Towards Employee 1 Related to Union Activities

Employee 1 asserted that when Anderson became aware of the pending no-confidence vote, Employee 1 was subjected to two investigations that on their face were pretextual and with an intent to retaliate against him. Both investigations and the context for them occurring were reviewed by the investigator and determined not to involve retaliation for union activities.

A third issue reported by Employee 1, which resulted in them being referred to a fitness for duty evaluation was also reviewed, which Employee 1 believed was in retaliation for his union activities.

On May 19, 2024, Employee 1 received a notice from Anderson that he was being placed on administrative leave in order for him to complete a fitness for duty assessment. The notice did not provide an explanation for why he needed to submit to an evaluation. Employee 1, through the union, was provided a letter several weeks later with information related to the basis for the examination. The letter outlined multiple concerns, some of which were previously investigated and did not result in disciplinary action, one investigation Employee 1 was exonerated of the allegations, included actions that occurred after he was placed on leave, and an incident where Employee 1 was the victim and was advocating for an investigation into the incident.

Omitted from the letter was information about a recorded phone conversation between Employee 1 and Employee 9 on February 27, 2024. The phone call occurred on Employee 1's day off. Employee 9 indicated they were calling to check on Employee 1 after he sent department-wide emails that were critical of colleagues. Employee 9 only confirmed the call was being recorded when Employee 1 asked. During the phone call, Employee 1 expressed the belief that he was the subject of retaliation and had absolute contempt for Anderson. In the phone call, Employee 1 stated "Anderson is a terrible human being. She is the devil. And anybody that lets themselves be on her side of what's going on right now is selling their soul to the devil."

Members of Anderson's command staff stated that the recorded phone conversation was a primary factor in their discussion about whether they needed an evaluation to determine Employee 1's psychological fitness for the job.

Anderson had requested Employee 9 call Employee 1 and record the call. After the phone call, Employee 9 reported the conversation to Anderson and Employee 12. Employee 9 reported to the investigator that he could understand Employee 1's anger and perception that Anderson was looking for an opportunity to fire him.

Employee 12 reported that Anderson was deeply bothered by Employee 1's statements and she took it personally because they were attacks on her. Employee 12 reported that Anderson stated that if Employee 1 passed "the fitness for duty evaluation, then he would be disciplined."

Anderson indicated that the call was brought to her attention by Employee 12, who expressed concern for her safety and advised she should listen to the recording. Anderson recalled that she and Employee 12 discussed Employee 1's behavior and it was a medical issue. Anderson indicated that she did not know why the recording was not listed on the fitness for duty letter, but that there was considerable discussion between Employee 12 and human resources on the contents of the letter.

The investigation did not find substantial evidence to find that Employee 1's union activities were a substantial factor in requiring Employee 1 to submit to a fitness for duty evaluation but did find that the statements Employee 1 made in the phone call about Anderson were a substantial factor in the decision. No finding was made on the legitimacy of the basis to refer Employee 1 for a fitness for duty evaluation as it was outside of the scope of the investigation.

Conduct Towards Employee 3 Related to Union Activities

In 2024, the sergeants at OSU/DPS voted to unionize. They formed the Oregon State University Department of Public Safety Supervisors' Association. Employee 3 served as the union president since its formation. While acting in his capacity as union president, Employee 3 emailed Anderson and ELR requesting a meeting to discuss the recognition of the newly formed union. Employee 3 and Anderson met on July 24, 2024. During the meeting, Employee 3 shared that he was a finalist for a chief of police position at another agency. Employee 3 reported in the investigation that during this meeting Anderson expressed that she did not believe Employee 3 was prepared for the role of chief. Anderson told Employee 3 that an example of this was the email Employee 3 sent to her about setting up the meeting. The email reads:

> *"On behalf of the Sergeants and Dispatch Supervisors of the Oregon State University Department of Public Safety, I am writing to request a meeting with you and the Employee and Labor Relations team. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the formation of a union in accordance with Oregon House Bill 4115."*

According to Employee 3, Anderson described the email as a reflection of his "pride and ego getting in the way of hearing and receiving help." According to Employee 3, Anderson told him that a "command person" would not have sent the email.

Employee 3 indicated that over time he perceived Anderson to be hostile towards him, and that she went out of her way to make disparaging remarks about him to others, including her opinion that Employee 3 inappropriately seeks attention.

When asked about these statements during the investigation, Anderson agreed that she told Employee 3 she believed he was not ready for a chief position and that she expressed disappointment that he did not share his candidacy with her earlier. She did not recall anything related to the Union discussed in the conversation.

In August 2024, Employee 3 attended an annual conference of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), which was held in New Orleans. Employee 3 learned they were being presented with an award at the conference and contacted Employee 12, shared the news about the award and asked if Anderson might be interested in being present

when the award was given to him. Employee 3, was encouraged to call Anderson to ask. Employee 3 reported that when he called Anderson, she did not congratulate him and instead asked, "Why would they give that award to you?" Anderson did not fly out to be present for the presentation of the award.

Anderson disputed that she did not congratulate Employee 3 on the award and indicated that she sought clarification on why Employee 3 had been selected for the award. Anderson indicated, "How do I share in his joy or achievement if I don't know how he got [the award]." Employee 3 was unable to provide her with any details about the award criteria or significance. Anderson indicated that because she did not have that information and the tight timeframes, she did not attend the presentation of the award.

Attendees at a command staff meeting after Employee 3 was given the award reported that Anderson was very hostile about the news. Employee 12 reported that Anderson was "beyond mad" and went out of her way to say that Employee 3 did not deserve the award. Employee 8 also recalled Anderson stating that Employee 3 did not deserve the award, that it was "totally inappropriate" for the organization to award Employee 3. Employee 8 also recorded in her journal that Anderson stated Employee 3 "is just trying to find anything that makes him stand out."

The investigation concluded that it was more likely than not that Anderson did raise Employee 3's email to ELR regarding union recognition as a basis for accusing him of letting "pride and ego" interfere with the kind of leadership she could expect from a "command person." The investigation concluded that Anderson's decision to use a legally protected activity of forming a union as a basis for impugning Employee 3's leadership abilities amounts to an effort to "interfered with or restrain" Employee 3 because of the exercise of his union rights in ORS 243.627, and that Anderson's conduct amounted to a violation of the university's code of ethics.

The investigator concluded that Anderson has been highly critical of Employee 3's performance of duties. The investigator credited Employee 3's recollection of the conversation, indicating that Employee 3's statements were consistent with the recollections of other witnesses. The investigator found that Anderson's response to Employee 3 receiving a national award to be one of hostility.

Disparate Treatment of Disciplinary Matters, Merit Based Pay

The internal investigation also included allegations that Anderson treated employees of color worse than white employees by subjecting employees of color to performance counseling, investigation and/or reprimand and then not subjecting white employees to those same corrective actions for analogous conduct.

The internal investigation reviewed an incident where Anderson authorized an investigation into an allegation that Employee 10, who identifies as Black, was in an improper relationship with a clerk at the 7-11 across the street from the campus, that the clerk was a felon and had been to Employee 10's house. The investigation cleared Employee 10 of any wrongdoing and established that the individual in question did not have a criminal record.

The investigator compared the decision to investigate the allegations against Employee 10, with a decision from Anderson not to investigate allegations that Employee 15, who resigned without notice, had an intimate relationship with Employee 14 while on duty, possibly during a time when Employee 14 was supervising Employee 15. Both Employee 14 and 15 identify as White.

When the allegations against Employee 14 were discussed with Anderson, along with the possibility that the conduct was potentially quid pro quo sexual harassment, she stated that Employee 14 may have been on a lunch break at the time and determined she did not want to look into it because she decided that the conduct should not be a career ender.

The investigator found that Anderson provided preferential treatment to Employee 14 and the conduct merited the same level of scrutiny that was applied to Employee 10.

Employee 4 identifies as Asian, and at the time of the investigation into Anderson's conduct, had recently left OSU/DPS for another agency. Employee 4 told the investigator that his primary decision to seek employment with another agency was for what he considered to be "racist treatment from Anderson."

Employee 4 alleged that he was denied a merit pay increase that was given to every other sergeant in the department because of his race. In 2024, Anderson had the discretion to offer merit-based pay increases between 2-6 percent to the sergeants at the department. Every other sergeant, including Employee 5, received a merit pay increase. Neither Employee 5 nor 4 were given performance evaluations in 2023 or 2024.

Employee 9 was a captain and supervised Employee 4. Employee 9 indicated that Anderson tended to focus on "select people", with Employee 4 being one of those persons that Anderson scrutinized. Employee 9 stated that Anderson did not approve of Employee 4's performance and wanted him to be placed on a "work plan." Employee 9 provided counseling to Employee 4 that he needed to be in the field more, which was received positively and improved Employee 4's performance. Employee 4 was not placed on a work plan.

Employee 9 also supervised Employee 5, whose performance was deficient. Employee 9 indicated that despite Employee 5's deficiencies, Anderson never suggested Employee 5 be coached, instructed, or for Employee 9 to address Employee 5's deficiencies. Employee 9 attributed Anderson's different attitudes about Employee 4 and 5 to race. Employee 9 observed that White male employees generally received a pass from Anderson, but employees of color, including Employee 4, 3 and 10, were held to a higher standard and subjected to greater scrutiny than White male employees (Exhibit A3 page 53 of 77).

Employee 12 agreed with Employee 9's assessment that Employees 4, 3 and 10 were held to higher standards than White male employees. Employee 12 noted that there were other White sergeants who, in his estimation, underperformed, indicating that Employee 14 and 15 "didn't want to do anything" while on the job.

Anderson confirmed with the investigator that Employee 4 did not receive a merit pay increase. Anderson told the investigator that Employee 9 identified performance problems and that Employee 9 made the determination that Employee 4 should not get a merit increase. Anderson indicated that when Employee 5 was talked with about deficiencies, he would improve, and Employee 4 would not. Ultimately, Anderson indicated that she delegated the decision about performance to managers and the merit pay increase was correlated to their performance.

Employee 9 recalled that Anderson "strongly suggested" that Employee 4 should not get a merit increase. Employee 12 also stated "that's what Anderson did."

The investigator concluded that the decision not to provide Employee 4 with a merit increase was initiated by Anderson and not Employee 9, and that there was no evidence to support the notion that Employee 4's performance was not minimally acceptable.

The investigator concluded that when taken in totality, Anderson's conduct represented a pattern of behavior with race appearing to be a substantial factor in which employees are singled out for preferential treatment and which employees are singled out for negative treatment. The investigator made the following findings (A3 page 62-63):

- Race was a substantial factor in Anderson's decision to treat the question of whether to investigate Employee 10's relationship with the 7-11 clerk and Employee 14's relationship with Employee 15 differently. Employee 14, who, according to witnesses, presents as White, received preferential treatment compared to Employee 10, who identifies as Black. Absent the differences of race, I find it more likely than not, these matters would have been treated consistently with one another.
- Race was a substantial factor in Anderson's decision to make sure that Employee 4 did not receive a merit-based pay increase. Without any performance evaluation there is no basis from which to find that Employee 4's performance was not minimally satisfactory. Employee 9, who supervised Employee 4, indicated that Employee 4 was improving and that a work plan was not needed. And,
- Race was a substantial factor in Anderson's evident hostility towards Employee 3 (discussed above). It was a factor in her criticisms of his qualifications, his status as a finalist in a different department, and the fact that he had received a national award from NOBLE.

The investigation noted that the University's policy does not require intent to be considered discriminatory. The investigator indicated that they make "no finding either way as to whether [Anderson] had any intention to discriminate on the basis of race."

The completed independent investigation was reviewed by the OSU's Director of Equal Opportunity Investigations, who notified Anderson on March 17, 2025, of the outcome of the formal complaint against her. In a determination letter, Anderson was notified of the sustained findings:

Retaliation: Anderson engaged in retaliatory conduct against employees who participated in protected union activities. This included subjecting a union leader to a higher level of workplace scrutiny than she did other similarly situated employees and engaging in overt hostility towards that employee because of her union activities. The investigation further found that Respondent interfered with the Union by attempting to oust Union leadership and replace them with people whom she believed she could work with more effectively.

Disparate Treatment Based on Race: A pattern of conduct revealed that at various times race was a substantial factor in Anderson's decisions to treat employees differently. Employees of color faced more frequent and harsher scrutiny compared with similarly situated White employees. Anderson ordered potential disciplinary matters relating to Black employees to be investigated while other matters involving White employees were not to be subject to investigation. An employee of color was denied a merit pay increase without adequate justification; another employee of color experienced unwarranted criticism regarding his qualifications and actions. Viewing the evidence as a whole, it is more likely than not that race was a factor that made a difference in Anderson's conduct towards employees of color. As a result, multiple actions of

Anderson were found to violate the University's Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment Policy.

Workplace Civility and Ethics Violations: Anderson engaged in conduct inconsistent with University policies on civility and ethics. This included disclosing confidential medical information without a business need, publicly berating employees, and applying favoritism in disciplinary matters.

On March 25, 2025, Anderson was terminated from the OSU/DPS.

Relevant Circumstances for Consideration

Anderson obtained Basic, Management, and Supervisory Police certifications.

Anderson was employed in public safety for 33 years.

Anderson provided written mitigation that includes both factual and character reference materials for the committee's consideration in the review of the case. In addition to the materials submitted by Anderson, the Department received letters of support from individuals for consideration. The information provided, labeled as Exhibit A8, is within the prerogative of the committee to consider when making determinations of moral fitness violations or identifying aggravating and mitigating findings in the case.

The independent investigation contained additional allegations that were not sustained, including allegations from employees that Anderson:

- Pushed for them to charge suspects with crimes when the conduct did not meet the statutory definition of a crime, or to elevate charges.
- Suggested a victim of a crime be charged so a subpoena could be issued to obtain evidence from a third party.
- Disclosing Employee confidential medical information to other employees.

Anderson is listed online as a team member with M3 Leadership. Her biography lists additional training experience:

"In addition to her police experience, she has served as the Assistant Commander at the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission, where she was charged with day-to-day operation of the Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA) and supervision of training officers from dozens of police agencies. She helped implement the Guardian approach to law enforcement currently taught at police departments across the nation. She has conducted implicit bias training on behalf of the Seattle Police Department and the International Association of Chiefs of Police."

ORS 243.672(1) describes impermissible labor practices by a public employer. Subsection (b) provides that it is an unfair labor practice for a designated representative of a public employer to "dominate, interfere with or assist in the formation, existence or administration of any employee organization."

If the committee recommends action in this case, the start date for an ineligibility period would be based on the date of Anderson's termination from OSU/DPS on March 25, 2025.

Exhibits Reference

DPSST Employee Profile Report	A1

F4s Personnel Action Separation Form	A2
Independent Investigative Report	A3
Investigative Exhibits	A4
Determination Letter	A5
Termination Letter	A6
M3 Leadership Biography	A7
Mitigation	A8