

Corrections Policy Committee

Minutes

August 8, 2017

The Corrections Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on Tuesday, August 8, 2017, in the Governor Victor G. Atiyeh Boardroom at the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training located in Salem, Oregon. Chair Jason Myers called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Committee Members:

Jason Myers, Chair, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Nadine Purington, Vice Chair, Non-Management Parole & Probation (phone)
Carol Dishion, Non-Management Corrections – DOC/Coffee Creek
Matthew English, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Matthew Frohnert, Oregon Sheriff's Jail Command Council
Kristen Hanthorn, Or. Assn. of Comm. Corrections Directors
Kimberly Hendricks – DOC Superintendent
Jeanine Hohn, Department of Corrections Training Division
Rob Perrson, Designee for Director of Department of Corrections
Jeff Wheeler, Oregon Sheriff's Jail Command Council (phone)

Committee Members Absent:

Gary Bergerson, Non-Management Corrections Officer
Donna Petit, Non-Management Corrections Officer

DPSST Staff:

Linsay Hale, Professional Standards Division Director
Mona Riesterer, Professional Standards Assistant
Jennifer Howald, Rules Coordinator
Debbie Anderson, Certification & Compliance Specialist
Bob Sigleer, Training Compliance Auditor
Kristen Hibberds, Professional Standards Investigator & Coordinator
Katrina Robson, Professional Standards Investigator & Coordinator

Guests:

Kristen Leshley, Coos County Sheriff's Office
Alex Nauman, DOC OSCI
Russell Shield, Coos County Sheriff's Office
Jerry Tabler, Public
John Ware, DOC
Jen Chapmen, AFSCME



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guest and staff were presented.

2. Minutes of May 9, 2017

Approve the minutes of the May 9, 2017 Corrections Policy Committee meeting.

To see a complete record of the May 9, 2017 Corrections Policy Committee minutes, please go to:

<http://www.oregon.gov/dpsst/BD/pages/correctionspolicycommitteemeetingminutes.aspx>

- *Matt English moved that the committee approve the minutes of the May 9, 2017 Corrections Policy Committee meeting. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

3. Quarterly Review of DOC BCC by DPSST Training Compliance Unit

Presented by Robert Sigleer

In 2009, the Legislature approved the Oregon Department of Corrections (DOC) to provide its own training as an alternative to the DPSST Basic Corrections Course, provided by DPSST. The Training Compliance Program periodically audits the program to ensure the program meets minimum training standards established by the Board. The Training Compliance Program provides the Corrections Policy Committee with quarterly updates of the DOC BCC. These audits verify compliance with class hours, student attendance, instructor certification, academic testing and course documentation. The attached report does not involve an evaluation of the quality of the BCC curriculum content, delivery, instructor or student performance.

The quarterly review was presented to the Corrections Policy Committee for the reporting period of April through June, 2017. The findings indicated BCC meets minimum training standards approved by the Board for Correction officers employed by DOC.

4. *OAR 259-008-0010 Proposed Rule Change – HB 2594, Changes to Citizenship Requirements for Certification

Presented by Jennifer Howald

During the 2017 legislative session, the Oregon legislature passed House Bill 2594. This bill allows a person who is a nonimmigrant legally admitted to the United States under a Compact of Free Association to become certified as a corrections officer, a parole and probation officer or a police officer.

The changes to the Oregon Revised Statutes that identify the citizenship requirements for certification as a corrections officer, parole and probation officer and a police officer become effective January 1, 2018. OAR 259-008-0010 outlines the minimum standards for employment as a law enforcement officer and will need to be amended to reflect the statutory changes resulting from the passage of HB 2594.

DPSST staff is facilitating the permanent rulemaking process now to ensure that adequate timeline allow for permanent rule changes to be filed and become effective January 1, 2018 to coincide with statutory changes.

- *Jeanine Hohn moved to recommend to the Board filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0010 with the Secretary of State as a proposed rule and as a permanent rule if no comments are received. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*
- *By consensus the committee found no fiscal impact to small businesses.*

5. *Ware, John DPSST #30288 – DOC; Further Discussion: Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Corrections Certifications

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is in February 2016, DPSST received notification from DOC that Ware had been convicted of DUII. On June 9, 2016, staff contacted DOC Human Resources who confirmed that Ware reported the arrest and conviction and is currently working.

On August 9, 2016, the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) met and recommended to the Board the revocation of Ware's certification. After reviewing the ALJ's opinion in the Ruling on Motion for Summary Determination, staff is requesting the CPC discuss, for the record, the relationship between Ware's conviction of a DUII and his ability to be certified as a correction officer.

By consensus, the committee found that Ware's DUII conviction and all intervening circumstances in this case impact his ability to be certified as a corrections officer because his conduct was unbecoming of a public safety officer, because he blamed others and refused to accept responsibility which violates the code of ethics. Ware displayed poor judgment in going back to the bar after his initial arrest. There is a presumed higher expectation of a public safety officer whether they are on or off duty. Corrections officers are expected to use good judgement when they are entrusted with the lives of others.

6. *Leshley, Kirsten DPSST # 57500 – Coos County Sheriff's Office; Application for Training and Subsequent Certification

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Kirsten Leshley's conduct on May 26, 2013, that led to her arrest and subsequent conviction of Theft in the Third Degree and whether her Application for Training and subsequent Corrections certification should be denied as a result.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendations are based. Matt Frohnert seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Leshley's conduct on May 26, 2013 violated the law and resulted in a criminal conviction. Theft in the Third Degree is a presumed Category V Misconduct.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Kirsten Leshley's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant denial of Leshley's Application for Training when considered alone. Kristen Hanthorn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did not involve any aggravating circumstances.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Kirsten Leshley's behavior did involve **mitigating circumstances** due to the fact that Leshley seemed cooperative and apologetic in her mitigating letter. Leshley was honest and upfront when she disclosed the conviction on her F-5 Application for Training. She has fully paid restitution and it has been four years since the incident.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Jeanine Hohn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Leshley's Application for Training and subsequent certification **not be denied**. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. ***Farrell, Zachary DPSST #57262 – DOC Eastern Oregon Corrections Institution; Application for Training & Subsequent Certification**
Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Farrell's conduct leading to his arrest and conviction of Theft in the Third Degree and whether his Application for Training and subsequent Corrections certification should be denied as a result.

Kimberly Hendricks moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendation is based. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule due to Farrell's conduct violated the law and resulted in a conviction. Theft in the Third Degree is a presumed Category V Misconduct.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Zachary Farrell's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant denial of Farrell's Application for Training when considered alone. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did not involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did not involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did not involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did not involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did involve **aggravating circumstances** due to that fact that Farrell tried to justify the theft in relation to money he claimed Walmart owed him. Also, Farrell lists on the F-5 Application for Training that he took a pair a boots rather than admitting that he had stolen them and tried to blame others.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Zachary Farrell's behavior did involve **mitigating circumstances** by his admission on the shoplifter report and realizing that it was wrong. Farrell's letter to the policy also admits that he took responsibility for his actions. It has been five years since the incident occurred. Farrell's plead a no contest plea and paid all fines and fees. In the shoplifter report, he could of very easily of explained his vendetta against Walmart but chose not to and took ownership.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Jeanine Hohn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Farrell's Application for Training and subsequent certification **not be denied**. Kimberly Hendricks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

8. ***Shield, Russell DPSST #42422 – Coos County Sheriff's Office; Application for Intermediate Corrections Certifications & Revocation of Basic Corrections Certifications**

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Shield's conduct leading to his arrest and conviction of Removal/Parts of a Wildlife Carcass/Wasting Wildlife and whether his Basic Corrections certification should be revoked and his Application for Intermediate Corrections Certification be denied as a result.

Matthew English moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendation is based. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule due to Shield's conduct violated the law and resulted in a conviction. Removal of parts of a Wildlife Carcass/Wasting Wildlife is a presumed Category V.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Russell Shield's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant denial of Shield's Application for Intermediate Corrections Certification when considered alone. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shields behavior did not involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did not involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did not involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule by Shield's initial contact with law enforcement, he did not admit to the deer being shot. The committee felt that Shield's failed to be forthcoming and his omission to the trooper also showed dishonesty.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Russell Shield's **Dishonesty** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Shield's certification and denial of Shield's Application for Intermediate Corrections Certification when considered alone. Kristen Hanthorn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did involve **aggravating circumstances** based upon when the state trooper first approached Mr. Shield's, he could of admitted at that time he had no cell service. Mr. Shield was on a mentor hunt with his son and chose to no disclose of the situation to authorities and conceal the deer from OSP.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Russell Shield's behavior did involve **mitigating circumstances** due to his heartfelt letter written to Correction Policy Committee as well as he received many letters of support from the community and organizations. Shield's completed his court obligations.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Matthew Frohnert moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Shield's Application for Intermediate Corrections certification **be denied** and Shield's Basic Certification **be revoked**. Shields displayed the inability to uphold the integrity that a public safety professional needs to maintain. Shields also violated the Code of Ethics. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Russell Shields **Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period for three years. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Kristen Hanthorn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Russell Shield's **Dishonesty** warrants for ineligibility period for a lifetime. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

9. ***Todd, Cheryl DPSST #51507 – DOC SFFC; Basic Corrections Certifications**

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Cheryl Todd's conduct identified in Investigative Case #16-0004-I, related to her violation of the Code of Conduct and her boundary issues with an inmate.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendation is based. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Todd's violation of DOC's Code of Conduct policy related to relationships with inmate/offenders.

Matthew English moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Cheryl Todd's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Todd's Certification Corrections when considered alone. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule base upon Todd's actions put staff and faculty in a compromising situation by engaging in a personal relationship with an inmate. Todd violated the rules and regulations as the Department of Corrections has a zero tolerance for sexual assault.

Kristen Hanthorn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Cheryl Todd's **Gross Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Todd's certification. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Todd abused her duty as a Corrections Officers as well as neglected her duties while visiting the inmate in the middle of the night.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Cheryl Todd's **Misuse of Authority** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Todd's certification. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Todd engaged in inappropriate relationships while she should have been watching the inmates. This put others at risk and as well as violated the fundamental duties of an officer.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Cheryl Todd's **Disregard for the Rights of Others** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Todd's certification. Kristin Hanthorn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Todd's initial memo to her Lieutenant did not disclose the her actions and she blamed others. If not for the inmate disclosing what had taken place, it may have not been discovered.

Rob Perrson moved that the Correction Policy Committee find that Cheryl Todd's **Dishonesty** does rise to the level to warrant revocation of Todd's certification. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did involve **aggravating circumstances** by the initial report shows that Todd displayed previous signs of affection toward the inmate and she continued to seek out the inmate to help him through his issues. Todd showed a clear effort to conceal her behavior by hiding. She also seemed to downplay the affection that was displayed between her and the inmate.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Cheryl Todd's behavior did not involve **mitigating circumstances**.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Jeanine Hohn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Todd's certification **be revoked** based upon the danger created by having a relationship with an inmate who created a danger to other inmates and staff. This includes a violation of the Code of Conduct and DOC policy and violation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Cheryl Todd's **Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period for seven years. Matthew Frohnert seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Cheryl Todd's **Gross Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period for ten years. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Cheryl Todd's **Misuse of Authority** warrants ineligibility period for ten years. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Cheryl Todd's **Disregard for Rights of Others** warrants ineligibility period for fifteen years. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Rob Perrson moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Cheryl Todd's **Dishonesty** warrants ineligibility period for a lifetime. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

10. *Frost, Nicolas J. DPSST # 48377 – DOC DRCI; Basic & Intermediate Corrections Certifications

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Frost's conduct surrounding his violation of agency policies and procedures, and whether his certifications should be revoked as a result.

Matthew English moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendations are based. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Frost's conduct creating an unsafe work environment. Frost would have not been able to hear if there was a call for an emergency while he had his headphones on. Frost violated both policy and procedures.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Frost's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon using headphones while working, created an unsafe environment as he would not have been able to hear if there was an emergency while he watched Netflix with his headphones on.

Kristin Hanthorn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Nicolas Frost's **Gross Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Kimberly Hendricks seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did not involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon Frost's behavior showed a clear failure to protect inmates while he engaged in watching movies for the majority of the shift.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Frost's **Disregard for the Rights of Others** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Kristen Hanthorn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did not involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did involve **Aggravating Circumstances** based upon Frost continued this behavior for quite some time during his eight hour shift. He failed to take responsibility and blamed management and supervisors. Frost's resignation letter accuses management of harassing him.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Nicolas Frost's behavior did not involve any **Mitigating Circumstances**.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Frost's Certification **be revoked**. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Nicolas Frost's **Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period of seven years. Jeanine Hohn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Kristen Hanthorn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Nicolas Frost's **Gross Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period for ten years. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board the Nicolas Frost's **Disregard for the Rights of Others** warrants for ineligibility period for fifteen years. Matthew Frohnert seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

11. *Nauman, Alexander DPSST #54373 – DOC OSCI; Basic Corrections Certifications

Presented by Kristen Hibberds

The issue in this case is Alexander Nauman's conduct on October 19, 2016 and October 20, 2016, that led to his arrest and ultimate conviction of Unlawful Possession of a Firearm.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee adopts the staff report as the record upon which its recommendations are based. Matthew English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did not involve **Insubordination** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did involve **Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon the criminal conviction of an Unlawful Possession of a Firearm.

Matthew English moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Nauman's **Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Matthew Frohnert seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did involve **Gross Misconduct** as defined in Administrative Rule based upon the conviction of Unlawful Possession of a Firearm is a presumed Category IV.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the Corrections Policy Committee find that Alexander Nauman's **Gross Misconduct** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did not involve **Misuse of Authority** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did not involve **Disregard for the Rights of Others** as defined in Administrative Rule.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did involve **Dishonesty** as defined in Administrative Rule due to Nauman's failure to disclose that he has a concealed firearm during the traffic stop and his blatant untruthfulness.

Matthew Frohnert moved that the Correction Policy Committee find that Alexander Nauman's **Dishonesty** does rise to the level to warrant revocation when considered alone. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did involve **Aggravating Circumstances** based upon Nauman openly admitted that there was a large police presence at his home and Nauman stated he did not want to come out due to the fact that he was too intoxicated. Nauman not disclosing the fact that he had a firearm shows a blatant officer safety issue for the arresting officer. Nauman does admit in the record that he does not have a conceal carry permit, which is required for anyone in the state to carry a weapon.

By discussion and consensus, the committee determined that Alexander Nauman's behavior did involve **Mitigating Circumstances** by the letters of support that were received by peer and coworkers. He voluntarily attended support group at his church. His timely email to his supervisor was also a mitigating circumstance. Kristen Hibberds stated that the staff report did not include that on May 30, 2017, Mr. Nauman did report his arrest and conviction to DPSST.

After considering the totality of the circumstances, Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Nauman's Certification **be revoked** based on the totality of the case and the fact that there were several opportunities for Mr. Nauman to report the incident. There were very clear issues with dishonesty in regards to the firearms issue which violated the Code of Ethics. There is a higher standard for criminal justice professionals and there are multiple actions by Mr. Nauman that question his ability to perform his fundamental responsibilities as a public safety professional. Mr. Nauman was asked a direct question by another public safety professional and failed to disclose the truth. Kristen Hanthorn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Jeanine Hohn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Alexander Nauman's **Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period of seven years. Carol Dishion seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Kristen Hanthorn moved that the committee recommends to the Board that Alexander Nauman's **Gross Misconduct** warrants for ineligibility period for ten years. Rob Perrson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Matthew English moved that the committee recommends to the Board the Alexander Nauman's **Dishonesty** warrants for ineligibility period for a lifetime. Matthew Frohnert seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

12. Department Updates

Linsay reported that the Legislative session is over. All three Board-approved bills passed.

The bills include:

- Granting the Board the authority to immediately suspend the certification of armed private security provider for a failure to complete annual training; which includes the marksmanship training.
 - Addition of a public member to all of the policy committees which will be effective January 1, 2018. Staff is working on the process of selecting qualified members.
 - The Board-approved housekeeping bill clarifying DPSST's fingerprinting authorities. It was noticed through communication of Department of Corrections that there was an oversight in the statutory language that requires DPSST to request and requires agencies to grant access to personnel action/investigation that pertain to certification issues.
-
- The new denial revocation standards have been adopted. This will affect how cases will be presented to the Corrections Policy Committee in the future. One significant change that will take place is the Policy and Board members will have the opportunity to suspend rather than permanently revoking. The officers affected will have the opportunity to speak to the policy members and provide their mitigation. This will not be an open forum for questions asked from or to the officer, rather than providing a statement to the policy members.
 - Staff is working on implementation of the new maintenance standards that incorporate corrections and parole & probation into the Police Maintenance Standard. We are working with the OACCD to also incorporate part time parole & probation officers.
 - We are in the process of forming a workgroup to review the minimum standards for Executive and Management Certifications. The recommendation was to have the discussion with agency leadership. The workgroup will also be tasked with looking at the purpose of the rank structure that is on file at DPSST. A review of who signs forms and when, the multi-discipline requirements, and retirement cards will also be part of discussion. The group will start meeting in September.

- There was a request by the Board meeting in July to look at and evaluate how officers are being separated from their agency. It was found that there are opportunities to create a more streamlined process and staff will be drafting a recommendation to propose at the next Board meeting in October.
- The agency continues to struggle with the volume of records request. Specifically the work that is done throughout the policy committee's regarding denial/revocation related to the public safety officers. DPSST is very committed to transparency and will continue to look for ways to improve.
- Kimberly Hendricks wanted to address DPSST staff regarding the safety of the policy members and the overall structure of the room to provide more of an open forum seating specifically when reviewing revocation/denial cases. Lindsay stated DPSST is actively working on piloting equipment that would allow the meeting to be accessible live via the internet. This would allow individuals to watch from anywhere. Chair Meyers agreed in presenting the information to the Executive Committee and Director Gabliks and discuss some ideas regarding safety and security.

13. Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting – November 14, 2017 @ 1:30 p.m.

** 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@state.or.us.*