

OREGON DPSST
ETHICS BULLETIN
Volume No. 47



The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training (BPSST) has the legislative mandate to establish and enforce the physical, mental, and moral fitness standards for all law enforcement officers, telecommunicators and emergency medical dispatchers in the state. This requirement also defines the procedure for the Department and Board to use when denying or revoking certification of an officer, telecommunicator or emergency medical dispatcher who has fallen below the moral fitness standards.

The Ethics Bulletin is published to provide insight into the types of misconduct that could result in revocation or denial of certification. The following cases have resulted in consideration of **revocation or denial** of certifications by DPSST in **July 2007**.

The Department continues to ensure that certified public safety officers and those seeking certification who abuse the public's trust will be held accountable for their actions.

July Statistics

CASES OPENED:	9	OF THE 12 CASES CLOSED:	
Cases Closed:	12	Revoked:	0
Cases Pending:	136	Denied:	0
		No Action:	12

Case 1

Officer A resigned and was later convicted of four (4) counts of Custodial Sexual Misconduct, two (2) counts of Official Misconduct, and one (1) count of Bribe Receiving. In this case, Officer A engaged in a sexual relationship with an inmate she was supervising and supplied the inmate with tobacco. Officer A voluntarily signed a Stipulated Order revoking her certification. Officer A's misconduct ended her 9-year career.

Officer A's Basic Corrections Certification was Revoked

(This case stems from an April 2006 conviction, and was inadvertently omitted from the Ethics Bulletin during that month.)

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

www.dpsst.state.or.us 503-378-2305 – July 2007 Ethics Bulletin

Page 1 of 2

Case 2

The employer of **Officer B** notified DPSST of his DUI conviction, in compliance with OAR 259-008-0010. Officer B voluntarily agreed to allow the employer to transfer him to a corrections position. The Corrections Policy Committee considered mitigating and aggravating circumstances. An aggravating circumstance was that this was Officer B's second DUI in the past three years. Mitigating circumstances included Officer B's completion of a 10-week intensive treatment program, the fact that neither incident involved property damage or injury to persons, that Officer B did not use his position to avoid the consequences of his actions in either incident, and that he was truthful and forthright with the arresting officers. Ultimately the Corrections Policy Committee recommended NOT revoking Officer B's certifications. This recommendation was then forwarded to the Board which affirmed the Policy Committee's recommendation. **This matter is closed and Officer B's police and corrections certification remain in good standing.**

Case 3

Officer C resigned after an internal investigation revealed that he misrepresented facts on more than one occasion. The Police Policy Committee considered mitigating and aggravating circumstances in its review of whether Officer C violated the moral fitness standards. An aggravating circumstance was that the misrepresentations occurred on more than one occasion. Mitigating circumstances included the conclusion by the Police Policy Committee that Officer C's actions were the result of incompetence rather than willful deception. Ultimately the Police Policy Committee recommended NOT revoking Officer C's certifications. This recommendation was then forwarded to the Board which affirmed the Policy Committee's recommendation. **This matter is closed and Officer C's Basic Police certification remains in good standing.**

Case 4

Officer D resigned during an internal investigation. The investigation centered on Officer D's actions regarding his 19-year old son and an outstanding warrant that Officer D believed was resolved. The Police Policy Committee considered mitigating and aggravating circumstances. While several internal policy violations were sustained, none of them involved dishonesty or untruthfulness, nor did Officer D or his son benefit from Officer D's actions or their consequences. Ultimately the Police Policy Committee recommended NOT revoking Officer D's certifications. This recommendation was then forwarded to the Board which affirmed the Policy Committee's recommendation. **This matter is closed and Officer D's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Supervisory, Management and Executive Police certifications remain in good standing.**

Now available:

Professional Standards Complaint Forms can be accessed from the DPSST website:

<http://www.oregon.gov/DPSST/SC/CJForms.shtml>

These forms should be used by employers when reporting criminal convictions and may be used by citizens when reporting complaints.

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

www.dpsst.state.or.us 503-378-2305 – July 2007 Ethics Bulletin

Page 2 of 2