

Corrections Policy Committee Meeting Minutes – DRAFT February 10, 2026

The Corrections Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on February 10, 2026, in the Boardroom at the at the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training located at 4190 Aumsville Hwy SE, Salem, Oregon. Chair Nick Hunter called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Committee Members:

Nicholas Hunter, Chair, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Jennifer Cameron, Vice Chair, Non-Management Parole & Probation
Josh Aldrich, Oregon State Sheriff's Command Council – (Teams)
Margeux Bowden, DOC, Non-Management Corrections
Laurie Frasco, Department of Corrections, AFSCME
John Frost, DOC, Non-Management Corrections – (Teams)
Mike Hartford, Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors
Michael Mays, Non-Management Department of Corrections – (Teams)
Matthew Phillips, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Brian Stephen, Oregon Dept. of Corrections Designee for Michael Reese, Director
John Taber, DOC Training Division – (Teams)

Committee Members Absent:

Guests:

Sefiu Ballam – (Teams)
DeAndre Brown
Alexander Navruzov
Austin Wilcox

DPSST Staff:

Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director
Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director
Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jennifer Howald, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Sam Tenney, Public Information Officer
Juan Lopez-Hernandez, Executive Support Specialist



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guests and staff.

2. Approve November 12 and December 16, 2025, Meeting Minutes

A consensus was reached to approve the November 12 and December 16, 2025, meeting minutes as written.

3. *Administrative Closures Consent Agenda (The following items to be ratified by one vote)

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

The Department presented recommendations to administratively close the following professional standards cases to the Corrections Policy Committee.

a) Jacob Pratt, DPSST No. 61212; Corrections

The Department opened a professional standards case after receiving notification from the Multnomah County Sheriff’s Office that Jacob Pratt resigned on October 29, 2025. Pratt’s resignation was reported to occur during allegations of misconduct.

Records from the MCSO indicated that Pratt was absent from work on leave without pay, beginning in July 2025, continuing through October 2025. Attempts to get cleared for work or leave through Paid Leave Oregon were unsuccessful.

Based on the information provided, the Department has determined Pratt’s separation does not violate the Board’s moral fitness standards defined in Oregon Administrative Rule.

The Department recommends administrative closure of this case with no action.

- *Vice-Chair Cameron motioned to return the Administrative Closures Consent Agenda to staff for review. Matthew Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

4. *Ballam, Sefiu, DPSST No. 59203; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

On March 21, 2024, Sefiu Ballam was terminated while on trial service with the Marion County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO) after he falsified a wellness check entry.

Sefiu Ballam provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Chair Hunter disclosed an actual conflict of interest due to having been the final decision maker for the case in question. Chair Hunter therefore recused himself from the voting process.			
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: Ballam intentionally falsified a record to reflect that he conducted a wellness check at a time when he did not conduct a check. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misconduct: The committee did not identify elements of misconduct. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballam failed to conduct the checks and counts required for every corrections officer in a timely manner and this is one of the most important tasks to perform in his capacity. • Ballam was a corporal in the past and should have known his conduct was inappropriate. • Ballam put the safety and security of the institution at risk. • Ballam was previously employed in public safety and should have known the proper steps to perform tiered checks. • Ballam discussed how to enter the record properly with his field training officer and still chose to do this wrong. • Ballam’s verbal and written mitigation did not express accountability for his intentional actions to omit information. <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee did not identify any mitigating factors.
--

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Brian Stephen moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Josh Aldrich	10 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed
Brian Stephen moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board’s moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that Board action should be taken against Ballam’s certifications.	Margeux Bowden	10 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed
Mike Hartford moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Ballam be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	Matt Phillips	10 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed

5. Wilcox, Austin, DPSST No. 64231; Corrections Officer

Presented by Cindy Park

Reason for Discretionary Review

The Department opened a professional standards case after receiving an F28 Criminal History Reporting form from Austin Wilcox, in which he reported being cited for Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII) and Recklessly Endangering Another Person in Malheur County, Oregon, on February 9, 2024.

Wilcox was formally charged with DUII (two counts), Recklessly Endangering Another Person, and Reckless Driving by the Malheur County District Attorney on March 1, 2024.

On April 3, 2024, Wilcox pled guilty to one count of DUII and Recklessly Endangering Another Person, both criminal dispositions as defined in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR)259-008-0005(9), as part of a deferred judgment and bench probation. The other charges were dismissed.

On April 4, 2025, the DUII and Recklessly Endangering Another Person charges were dismissed, as Wilcox had completed diversion. Wilcox is currently employed at the ODOC Snake River Correctional Institution as a corrections officer but has not yet been certified.

Austin Wilcox provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misconduct: Wilcox pled guilty to DUII and Recklessly Endangering Another Person, a criminal disposition as defined in OAR 259-008-0005(9), as part of a deferred judgment with the Malheur County Court. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilcox’s conduct put the passenger of the operating vehicle in danger. • Wilcox’s BAC was twice the legal limit and he initially refused to take an intoxilyzer test. <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilcox was cooperative throughout the process and followed through with the requirements. • Wilcox took full responsibility and expressed remorse for his actions. • Wilcox received letters in support of him from co-workers. • Wilcox successfully completed the required court ordered diversion courses and is actively involved in community engagement as a result of the incident. • Wilcox immediately reported the incident in question to DOC leadership and is still actively employed there. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilcox already received a Letter of Reprimand from his employer, demonstrating their intent to retain him. 			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			
Margeux Bowden moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Laurie Frasco	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Brian Stephen moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board’s moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that no Board action should be taken against Fisk’s certifications.	Mike Hartford	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

6. Navruzov, Alexander. DPSST No. 64946; Corrections Officer

Presented by Cindy Park

Reason for Discretionary Review

The Department opened a professional standards case upon receipt of a Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) report that Alexander Navruzov had been cited for Recklessly Endangering Another Person, a Class A misdemeanor (ORS.163.195), on July 23, 2024, in Beaverton, Oregon. Navruzov negligently discharged a firearm, sending a bullet through his apartment, through another apartment, and into a third apartment.

Navruzov told the officers that he had been practicing drawing his firearm and accidentally put his finger on the trigger, which resulted in a round being fired through the wall of his apartment.

On December 4, 2024, Navruzov entered into a diversion agreement with the Beaverton Municipal Court. On June 5, 2025, the charge was dismissed after Navruzov completed the conditions of his diversion agreement. Navruzov is currently employed with the Washington County Sheriff’s Office but has not yet received his DPSST certification.

Alexander Navruzov provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			

The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:

Moral Fitness Violations:

- Dishonesty: The committee did not identify evidence of dishonesty.
- Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify evidence of misuse of authority.
- Misconduct: Navruzov engaged in conduct that threatened harm to others when he negligently discharged a firearm in his apartment building. Navruzov was charged with Recklessly Endangering Another Person, and pled guilty, constituting a criminal disposition as defined in Oregon Administrative Rule 259-008-0005(9).

Aggravating Factors:

- Navruzov discharged his firearm in a residential building, putting other lives in danger.

Mitigating Factors:

- Navruzov has the support of Sheriff Massey, who was present during his verbal mitigation, and other command staff.
- Navruzov ensured people were safe after the incident occurred and was cooperative with law enforcement.
- Navruzov suffered a human performance issue which he acknowledged as such.
- Navruzov showed integrity by immediately taking responsibility.
- Navruzov completed the required court ordered diversion agreement.
- Navruzov continued to be employed with the Washington County Sheriff's Office.
- Navruzov has a desire to convert the incident in question into a teachable moment for others in the field.
- Navruzov was disciplined by his agency and this provided accountability.
- Navruzov purchased a clearing tube to safely clean firearms and avoid future risk.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Mike Hartford moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Jennifer Cameron	11 ayes; 0 nays;	Motion Passed Unanimously
Brian Stephen moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the	Matt Phillips	11 ayes; 0 nays;	Motion Passed Unanimously

aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that no Board action should be taken against Navruzov's certifications.			
---	--	--	--

7. Brown, DeAndre, DPSST No. 61256; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

The Department opened a professional standards case after receiving an automated message from the Law Enforcement Data Systems reporting DeAndre Brown was arrested on June 11, 2023, for Reckless Driving and Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII).

The Department also reviewed a report from Brown that he was arrested for a Violation of a Restraining Order (VRO) on January 9, 2025.

On June 26, 2023, Brown entered a plea of no contest to the DUII charge and entered a diversion program. Brown's diversion included a one-year diversion period, a \$490.00 fee, completion of a victim impact panel, and the installation of an Ignition Interlock Device (IID). The charge for Reckless Driving was dismissed.

On March 14, 2025, Brown was found in Contempt of Court for VRO and was sentenced to 18 months of bench probation.

DeAndre Brown provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Laurie Frasco disclosed an actual conflict of interest due to having been involved in Brown's representation throughout his appeal.			
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: Brown violated criminal law and has a criminal disposition for DUII after he entered a plea of no contest to the charge. Brown threatened persons or property when he operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated. Brown threatened another person when he violated an order of protection. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brown had a BAC that was twice the legal limit when he was arrested for DUII. 			

- Brown violated a no contact order.
- Brown demonstrated multiple instances of inappropriate behavior.
- Brown’s failure to abide by the protective order poses a boundary issue that has the potential to impact his employing agency.
- Brown is prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms or ammunition.

Mitigating Factors:

- Brown took accountability for his actions and has maintained sobriety.
- Brown had a letter of support from Attorney Blaney clarifying that Brown’s behavior was not threatening in nature when he violated the no contact order, as stated by the presiding judge in the case as well.
- Brown was retained by his employer after the administrative investigation when he could have been dismissed at that point.
- Brown has actively sought treatment and engaged in self-betterment programs after the incident.
- Brown received multiple letters of support accompanying the verbal mitigation he provided.
- Brown was cooperative with the investigating and responding officers during both of his arrests.
- Brown’s cooperation has increased his parenting time, as per the child custody agreement, demonstrating a commitment to move forward.

Chair Hunter moved that the Corrections Policy Committee recall the case as presented for further review and information by DPSST staff.	Mike Hartford	10 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed
--	---------------	----------------------------------	---------------

8. Bingham, Robert, DPSST No. 38928; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

On February 24, 2023, Robert Bingham was terminated from the Washington County Sheriff’s Office (WCSO) as part of an investigation into sustained findings of misconduct.

In November 2022, the WCSO began an investigation into an allegation that on June 14, 2022, Bingham had struck another deputy (PC) on the buttocks when thanking him for assisting with a work task.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:			

Moral Fitness Violations:

- Dishonesty: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty.
- Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority.
- Misconduct: Bingham threatened or harmed persons by smacking another deputy on the buttocks.

Aggravating Factors:

- Bingham was previously disciplined by his agency for behavior of a similar nature.
- Bingham has a history of misconduct at his agency.
- Bingham has been employed in public safety for 33 years.
- Bingham’s actions made another individual uncomfortable and they were unwanted.
- Bingham acknowledged his actions as being offensive.
- Bingham was a field training officer and should have known better.
- Bingham failed to follow agency policies and was there after hours to complete reports that should have been completed during regular working hours.
- Bingham had just completed appropriate sexual harassment and in-service training but stated, “I hope that didn’t offend you,” after the incident.
- Bingham violated multiple agency policies with regards to professional conduct and harassment-free workplace.

Mitigating Factors:

- Bingham’s conduct did not rise to the level of a moral fitness violation as defined in Administrative Rule.
- Bingham’s conduct was not intentionally sexual in nature.
- Bingham’s conduct was not against a person of a protected class.
- Bingham’s relationship between himself and the victim revolved around sports, and the gesture in question was perceived as a “thank you.”
- Three months had elapsed from the date of the incident and the date when it was reported.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Chair Hunter moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the amended moral fitness violations as presented.	Brian Stephen	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
John Taber moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board’s moral fitness	Matt Phillips	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that no Board action should be taken against Bingham's certifications.			
---	--	--	--

9. Martin, Louis, DPSST No. 45897; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

The Department opened a professional standards review after receiving an F4S Personnel Action Separation form from the Oregon Department of Corrections/Coffee Creek Correctional Facility (ODOC/CCCF) reporting that Louis Martin had been terminated as a result of an investigation into misconduct.

The misconduct identified included dishonesty, engaging in an inappropriate relationship with a parolee, putting those incarcerated at the CCCF in danger, accessing a confidential law enforcement database for no business purpose, and failing to report that the parolee told him they had been a victim of sexual abuse by a past ODOC employee.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: Martin was dishonest during the ODOC's internal investigation by denying he had personal communications with a parolee, misrepresenting the truth, and by not being forthcoming with ODOC about his relationship with a parolee. Martin was dishonest when he omitted information that a parolee reported about past sexual abuse by an ODOC employee. • Misuse of Authority: Martin misused his authority, for his benefit, by having personal communications, some of which were sexual in nature, with a parolee whom he had supervised, while they were incarcerated at CCCF, and who was on felony supervision at the time of the communication. Martin misused his authority when he accessed a confidential law enforcement database (DOC400) to review information about the parolee, for his benefit, and with no business purpose, after they had been released from the CCCF. • Misconduct: Martin harmed the efficient operations of the ODOC/CCCF by risking the safety of Adults in Custody (AIC) when he openly displayed pictures of a "rat" while on duty. Martin harmed the efficient operation of the ODOC/CCCF by accessing a confidential law enforcement database on several occasions, for no business purpose. Martin harmed the efficient operations of the 			

ODOC/CCCF by withholding and lying about personal communications he was having with a parolee who had been released from the facility but was still under felony supervision. Martin harmed the parolee by repeatedly sending unwanted communication to her and making her feel scared when Martin picked her up and transported her from the hospital.

Aggravating Factors:

- Martin misused the DOC computer system to look up information and contact a parolee, whom he sent unsolicited photographs to.
- Martin exhibited grooming behaviors and intimidated a parolee for his own satisfaction which is a violation of PREA law and personal boundaries.
- Although the parolee in question was no longer in custody, Martin was still considered an authority figure and created a sense of trauma and fear within the victim.
- Martin had extensive PREA training and utilized a false name when corresponding with the parolee.
- Martin gave his personal email address to the parolee while she was in custody and instructed her to keep their communication a secret after she was released.
- Martin allowed the parolee in custody to sit in the front seat of a work vehicle without restraints which placed the public at risk.
- The parolee reported previous sex abuse from another employee at DOC, which Martin did not report.
- Martin’s use of a “rat stamp” at DOC put Adults in Custody (AICs) at risk of being harmed by other AICs.
- Martin used a separate phone to contact the parolee and demonstrated intentional dishonesty in his attempt to conceal the relationship.

Mitigating Factors:

- The committee did not identify any mitigating factors.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Brian Stephen moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Margeux Bowden	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Matt Phillips moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board’s moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case,	Mike Hartford	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

that Board action should be taken against Martin's certifications.			
John Frost moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Martin be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	Jennifer Cameron	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

10. Reid, Ryan, DPSST No. 48586; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

The Department opened a professional standards case review after receiving notice of two separate misconduct allegations against Reid, who was employed with the Oregon Department of Corrections/Columbia River Correctional Institution (ODOC/CRCI).

On October 22, 2022, the Department received an F28 Criminal History Reporting form from Ryan Reid, in which he reported two charges for criminal conduct. Those charges were later dismissed, set aside, and sealed and thus are not the basis for a misconduct finding by the Department. The ODOC/CRCI began an investigation related to Reid's criminal charges but did not complete the investigation because Reid was ultimately terminated due to the second misconduct allegation, detailed below.

On October 28, 2022, a separate investigation was opened into Reid's fraudulent use of PEBB benefits. This investigation was initiated after a payroll administrator submitted a complaint that Reid had been claiming benefits for his wife well after he had been legally divorced from her.

On March 1, 2023, Reid was terminated from the ODOC/CRCI after the PEBB investigation sustained findings that he had verified his ex-wife was a dependent on the Open Enrollment form, allowing her to receive benefits since they divorced in April 2015.

<i>Corrections Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: Reid was intentionally dishonest when he fraudulently claimed his ex-wife as a dependent on his health insurance plan from the date of his divorce in 2015 to 2022, amounting to approximately \$47,035.00 in benefits. Reid showed reckless disregard for the truth when he said he thought it was agreed to in the divorce that he continued to pay his ex-wife's health insurance until she was employed and receiving her own. The divorce decree clearly stated Reid was only responsible for a portion of his child's health insurance costs incurred for a certain amount of out-of-pocket expenses. 			

Reid was intentionally dishonest by misrepresenting the truth about the eligibility of his ex-wife to the PEBB during an “eligibility review” process in 2017.

- Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify sufficient evidence to make a finding of misuse of authority.
- Misconduct: Reid engaged in misconduct when he fraudulently and with recklessness and misrepresentation of the truth, harmed the PEBB public employers' health benefits program, the ODOC, and the State of Oregon by causing the ODOC to overpay for his ex-wife’s medical benefits of \$47,035.00. Reid engaged in misconduct when he harmed the public trust by fraudulently obtaining medical benefits for his ex-wife for approximately seven years after attesting to PEBB and his agency that she was eligible for health benefits paid by his employer.

Aggravating Factors:

- Reid consistently lied to his employing agency about his ex-wife being an eligible dependent as well as lying on a verification form for dependents.
- Reid’s dishonesty came at a significant cost to the public.
- Reid was dishonest every year during open enrollment to the PEBB benefits program by claiming his ex-wife as an eligible dependent.
- Reid’s initial statements stated his actions were a result of a divorce decree, but his wife was employed at the time of this statement.
- Although the report cannot contain information surrounding Reid’s criminal accusations surrounding this incident, there is indication that there were charges filed against him as a result.

Mitigating Factors:

- The committee did not identify any mitigating factors.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

<p>Brian Stephen moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.</p>	<p>Mike Hartford</p>	<p>11 ayes; 0 nays</p>	<p>Motion Passed Unanimously</p>
<p>Brian Stephen moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board’s moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that Board action should be taken against Reid’s certifications.</p>	<p>Laurie Frasco</p>	<p>11 ayes; 0 nays</p>	<p>Motion Passed Unanimously</p>

Brian Stephen moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Reid be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	Nick Hunter	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
--	-------------	--------------------	---------------------------

11. Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-008-0005, 259-008-0290, 259-008-0300, 259-008-0310, 259-008-0320, 259-008-0330, 259-008-0340, and 259-008-0400

Presented by Jennifer Howald

The Criminal Justice Moral Fitness Workgroup met from September 2023 through December 2024, and again in October 2025, to review the current moral fitness standards and the denial and revocation procedures for public safety professional certifications. During this process, the Workgroup examined existing standards, discussed potential improvements, and considered draft rule changes. Each meeting was recorded and posted on the DPSST YouTube page, and copies of agendas, memos, and minutes are available on the DPSST rulemaking webpage.

The memo provided to the Committee summarizes the proposed rule changes developed from the Workgroup and DPSST staff recommendations. These changes address moral fitness standards and certification denial and revocation procedures. The Workgroup reviewed draft rules during its October 2025 meeting, and the summary and attached proposed rule changes reflect revisions based on these discussions.

- *Mike Hartford asked if a conditional discharge is included in the definition for deferred prosecution.*
- *Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, replied that yes, deferred prosecution refers to umbrella terms such as diversion, conditional discharge, and the sorts of programs that in some jurisdictions do not require a plea, but do oftentimes involve findings being made that the conduct did occur. Right now, this would not technically fall within DPSST's jurisdiction and this rule is therefore attempting to be more inclusive as to what DPSST can review.*
- *Vice Chair-Cameron asked why the definition of ORS 259-008-0005 specifically lists 'Armed Parole and Probation Officer.'*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that the definition that is currently there is a separate outline of standard, and this is a standard that requires firearms training for armed parole and probation officers. There are no changes being made to this item, and it just happens to be a definition in the definition rule.*
- *Matt Phillips expressed concern about the definition of "Harm" under ORS 259-008-0005(22)(b), since the language is subjective and difficult to prove. Member Phillips then asked if this was discussed in the Workgroup.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that yes, and when the Workgroup examined the definitions of 'harm' as they appear within legal dictionaries and other sources, there are many components to this term. In using the example of 'gross misconduct', the definition states, "deliberate or reckless conduct that causes or could have caused significant harm." Therefore, these criteria would need to find a significant harm level, which is also subjective. In the definition of 'misconduct' that the policy committees see, it*

- states, “conduct that causes or could have caused harm,” so this definition of harm would be used to assist interpretation of these definitions. The Workgroup also found the definition in question to be subjective, but process-wise, DPSST would apply the information, identify what is potentially considered as ‘harm,’ and then findings would proceed to the committee for consideration and discretion on deciding whether or not a moral fitness violation is present and actionable.
- Mike Hartford asked if DPSST knows what the extra workload for the committee would be under the proposed changes to ORS 259-008-0290(5).
 - Jennifer Howald and Director Atwood stated that this would be a good point of analysis.
 - Vice-Chair Cameron asked if theft or related crimes are mandatory disqualifications under ORS 259-008-0290(12).
 - Jennifer Howald replied that only if they are a felony. At the moment, mandatory disqualifiers are limited to convictions and felonies. Theft is not currently a standalone, automatic disqualifier but rather discretionary.
 - Director Atwood commented that the proposed concept is only regarding pre-employment conduct that is at least a decade old or more.
 - Mike Hartford asked what the impetus for this rule change was, i.e. a sponsor, agency, internal review, etc.
 - Jennifer Howald replied that the question was posed to the Workgroup based on a contested case where DPSST had to issue a denial based on the administrative rule. The case was a pre-employment conviction involving drugs that occurred more than ten years ago, and the individual had to be mandatorily denied their certification. The individual previously had a career in public safety in another state and was transferring to Oregon. The ALG therefore suggested that DPSST should consider whether the agency will continue to uphold this mandatory lifetime disqualifier or figure out an alternative consideration. There is also an older case from many years ago that did not go through the contested case process, whereby a telecommunicator that had been hired and applied for certification with DPSST had a prior felony for a DUI in another state before ever having been employed in public safety. leading to a mandatory disqualifier.
 - Director Atwood noted that it is important to think about this proposal in light with the proposed definition change for ‘criminal disposition’ now, given that if those are changed to include matters such as diversionary programs, someone might have gone through diversion a decade ago for what was previously a mandatory disqualifier – to name an example. In this scenario, the individual may have done everything that was required of them and not result in a conviction, therefore it could have fallen into DPSST’s purview of cases it would consider in order to allow someone into the public safety profession.
 - Margeux Bowden asked if the emergency suspension outlined in ORS 259-008-0300(6)(B) is a temporary suspension.
 - Jennifer Howald replied that an emergency suspension order immediately suspends an individual’s certification without prior notification. The process outlined in this administrative rule means that DPSST would have received a notification that an individual has been charged with a felony crime. Upon this step, DPSST would collect the information available on that charge and convene the Executive

- Committee of the Board to ask members to review and approve whether the incident rises to a level warranting an emergency suspension. In part, this recognizes that although most agencies would have to place the individual in question on leave, when one looks at the public records and contacts DPSST, it still appears as if the individual is employed and certified until they are separated from their employer or until their case has gone through a final determination. The proposed rule change therefore seeks to close this loophole and ensure that a person with such egregious, pending charges cannot serve in a public safety capacity.*
- *Brian Stephen asked whether the Executive Committee's determination is being passed on as a recommendation to other agencies.*
 - *Jennifer Howald replied that no, if the Executive Committee chose not to exercise their authority to conduct an emergency suspension, the individual would still have a pending professional standards case until those criminal allegations are finalized. This then becomes a matter of how the employer handles the situation, i.e. are they still allowing the individual to perform public safety duties during this time. DPSST would continue to follow the charges up to their resolution to determine if they are mandatory or discretionary before committee review regardless. In essence, the non-issuance of an emergency suspension does not mean that the individual will not be an open professional standards case that's reviewed when incompletely vetted.*
 - *Brian Stephen expressed reservations regarding public perception of this rule change. Chair Hunter concurred with this sentiment but recognized the precedent that will be set when public safety agencies, in conjunction with DPSST, are actively coordinating on what charges and circumstances DPSST considers as constituting an emergency suspension.*
 - *Brian Stephen agreed that the rule change would be positive, but wondered if an automatic suspension would be better given that when agencies have an officer involved shooting, the officer in question is automatically placed on administrative leave during the review process. If some were on leave and some were not, this would have a completely different perception.*
 - *Director Atwood asked member Stephen if by "automatic" he is referring to a process that would occur internally within DPSST, leading to an emergency suspend, and then proceeding with the case via a normal course, or whether he is referring to delineating more specific parameters for the Executive Committee to use in their determination.*
 - *Brian Stephen answered that he would like to see specific criteria parameters in place for the Executive Committee.*
 - *Deputy Director McAlpine added that internal discussions within DPSST revolved around at least two public safety officials being arrested for homicide in the last two years and although emergency suspension was discussed then, it was notional at best, since in both cases the individuals were placed on administrative leave, and both could not attain bail. The question became, to what end does DPSST engage in these next steps? Does the agency demonstrate to the public that it is also suspending their certifications pending the outcome of the case? Some of these questions relate to public perception since DPSST looks to see if the agency takes away their arrest authorities. In this instance, there is a common sense that these individuals cannot perform their duties as a public safety officer. At this point, the ability to impose*

- emergency suspensions was deemed to be important and has simply not been done in the past.*
- *Director Atwood added that, anecdotally, DPSST has had cases where someone has been arrested for very significant, person-felony crimes, and has been able to make bail. Although their employment process might still be ongoing, they would still be out in the community and thus, for public perception purposes, even though they are not actively in the field on duty, it could give the public reassurance that DPSST is temporarily halting the status of their certifications until an outcome is determined.*
 - *Josh Aldrich asked whether there has been any discussion about DPSST's confidentiality when it comes to releasing information to someone who is the recipient of an emergency suspension? Would this generate an automatic press release, would it only be a public records request, etc.? Member Aldrich also asked if there are other possible requirements that could be added to the ending of ORS 259-008-0300(6)(C). For instance, what if a charge is reduced and is reviewed by the Board and it results in neither a revocation nor closure (i.e. a middle-ground solution).*
 - *Deputy Director McAlpine commented on how this is ultimately attributed to terminology.*
 - *Chair Hunter reiterated that some [charges] could fall under a felony charge and that would then meet [a charge] that is more egregious and is ultimately pled out to be a lesser [charge].*
 - *Chair Hunter also addressed Member Stephen's question regarding officer-involved shootings by commenting that many law enforcement agencies no longer use the terminology "administrative leave," regarding officer-involved shootings and this is titled differently [due to terminology]. In some cases, there is an ongoing investigation around homicide, and to this point, [the rule change] should be clarified from the beginning so as not to confuse public perception.*
 - *Jennifer Howald sought clarification on further narrowing when [the rule] would be applied.*
 - *Chair Hunter answered that this matter should be kept out of the Executive Board's purview by citing one of the aforementioned officer-involved shootings and how this individual is now being investigated for a homicide. Some jurisdictions are not going to grand-jury, and some are making decisions in other places, so until that decision is made, that is the circumstance being addressed. Therefore, some clarity in those situations might not be a bad idea and Chair Hunter deferred to Directors McAlpine and Atwood as to what that language would look like, along with defining the responsibilities of the Executive Board's decision making, to abate public perception.*
 - *Director Atwood replied that this provision only applies when somebody has been formally charged and that is what would initiate a proceeding for a possible emergency suspension. In an officer involved shooting, the individual in question would have had to be indicted, so this takes it out of the category of non-misconduct type shooting situations.*
 - *Matt Phillips asked if a certification will be revoked because it looks right, does this really have anything to do with the person's authority? For example, if Member Phillips swears in a reserve deputy and that person could get in trouble with no*

- certification, then be arrested, would he still be allowed to let her work because they are still a reserve deputy with arrest authority under his commission?*
- *Deputy Director McAlpine replied “yes.”*
 - *Matt Phillips continued and asked if the individual in his example does have certification and it is removed, does this mean that their arrests would be unlawful if they wrote someone a citation, i.e. would it still be valid?*
 - *Jennifer Howald stated that there is a matching language component that elaborates on law enforcement officer duties found in the language of emergency suspensions under ORS 259-008-0300.*
 - *Jennifer Howald also addressed Member Stephen’s comment regarding parameters for the Executive Committee decision-making by stating that the recommendation put forth [by the Workgroup] to have such a committee review these cases was to recognize that not all felonies and jurisdictions are equal. There could be further limitation of this application to specific types of felonies if the Corrections Policy Committee would like to go that route.*
 - *Mike Hartford asked if the suspension would be listed in CJIS/IRIS.*
 - *Jennifer Howald replied “yes.”*
 - *Chair Hunter stated that since DPSST is the certifying authority, then if it makes a decision regarding a certification, this doesn’t necessarily mean that the employing agency has to support such a decision, but DPSST nevertheless reserves the right to make such a decision.*
 - *Jennifer Cameron also commented that this is a temporary suspension that requires Board approval either way.*
 - *Matt Phillips asked if DPSST has any data on the number of individuals that are revoked for any discipline, for any period of time, and have regained re-employment in law-enforcement in Oregon.*
 - *Director Atwood replied that if someone has been revoked in Oregon, one cannot regain certification, although Member Stephen added that the CPC recently heard a case whereby the committee revoked a re-employed individual’s certifications for three years to acknowledge time-served and the good work they had been doing while also acknowledging the incident that led to certification review.*
 - *Deputy Director McAlpine added that DPSST has staff that monitor the time of revocation for individuals and employing agencies are at their discretion to hire individuals after the penalty elapses regardless.*
 - *Matt Phillips asked what DPSST is trying to accomplish by taking action. What is the utility of the shorter ineligibility timelines being proposed?*
 - *Chair Hunter replied that it allows for more consistency and cited the case brought up by Member Stephen as an example.*
 - *Matt Phillips sought clarification on whether this applies to individuals who left their employment prior to receiving discipline by the Board.*
 - *Jennifer Howald stated that this would only apply to the discretionary cases that the Committees hear, meaning this is a denial of certification if they don’t possess it already, or if they are certified, leads to a revocation. When certification is revoked, it is permanent, but there is an administrative law process whereby because this is discretionary, DPSST must tell the individual how they may reapply in the future. By determining a case based on aggravating and mitigating circumstances and assigning*

- it an ineligibility period, in part, fulfills part of the administrative law function and duty.*
- *Josh Aldrich commented that DPSST should include what will be back on the agency for the complaints under ORS 259-008-0400.*
 - *Brian Stephen motioned to approve the Proposed Rule Changes for OAR 259-008-0005, 259-008-0290, 259-008-0300, 259-008-0310, 259-008-0320, 259-008-0330, 259-008-0340, and 259-008-0400. Matthew Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

12. Agency Updates

Presented by Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director

- Deputy Director Kathy McAlpine recognized Member John Frost for four years of service on the Corrections Policy Committee. DPSST has also hired a project manager for the new Learning Management System (LMS), and she will be touring the campus this month. DPSST will update Board and Committees as the project progresses. Deputy Director McAlpine also thanked members who were present for their thoughts and discussions as subject matter experts.
- Director Atwood acknowledged the Annual Legislative Report on Professional Standards statistics and the written report will be released to policy committee members in between meetings or at the next scheduled meeting. Moreover, DPSST is finally conducting its initial wave of onboarding of the new case management system, which will expedite the case review process. Some immediate changes that will affect constituents directly on this front are that F-4s, separation form, and F-28, criminal history form, will be eligible for electronic submission. These changes will be broadcasted to agencies and constituents accordingly.
- Jennifer Howald also shared an announcement that the January 2026 Board approved the formation of a Workgroup to review maintenance standards (i.e. what is required of a person who is certified to continue to maintain their certification?), and this will be shared to all of the policy committees for their input.
- Chair Hunter gave a final thank you to the committee members and their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

13. Next Corrections Policy Committee Meeting: May 12, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Administrative Notes:

These minutes reflect the order of the discussion/voting items as they appear on the official meeting agenda. The actual order in which they were discussed may vary.

All documents reviewed and discussed in this meeting are subject to Oregon Public Records Law (ORS 192.410 to ORS 192.505). These documents can be requested by contacting DPSST at dpsst.records@dpsst.oregon.gov.