

Corrections Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes – DRAFT

May 12, 2026

The Corrections Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on May 12, 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 10:00 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
Michael Mays, Non-Management Department of Corrections – (Teams)
Matthew Phillips, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Greg Rice, Oregon Sheriff's Jail Command Council – (Teams)
John Taber, DOC Training Division – (Teams)

Committee Members Absent:

Mike Hartford, Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors
Brian Stephen, Oregon Dept. of Corrections Designee for Michael Reese, Director

Guests:

Garrett Piel – (Teams)
John Kile (DOC) – (Teams)
Jacob Pratt – (Teams)

DPSST Staff:

Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director
Christ Enquist, Training Division Director
Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jason Ridgeway, Training Coordinator
Victor Sanchez, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jennifer Howald, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Juan Lopez-Hernandez, Executive Support Specialist



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guests and staff.

2. Approve February 10, 2026, Meeting Minutes

A consensus was reached to approve the February 10, 2026, 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) Randall Daniels, DPSST No. 48116; Corrections

On November 21, 2022, Randall Daniels submitted a criminal history reporting form (F28), indicating that he received criminal citations for Transporting Fish Without a License and Check Station: Fail to Stop. Both charges are misdemeanor offenses in the state of Idaho.

Reporting by the Idaho Fish and Game indicates that on November 19, 2022, Daniels was operating a vehicle with a boat in tow with fishing equipment visible and did not pull into a check station. Daniels pulled into a turnout a short distance down the road, and a conservation officer pulled in behind him and activated his overhead lights. When asked why he did not pull into the check station, Daniels indicated that he thought it was only for hunters.

Daniels reported that he and his passengers had steelhead onboard and showed the officer six bags with fish fillets in them. Daniels did not have his fishing license or steelhead permit with him and reported that he left them on the boat he was fishing on, which was not the boat he was towing. Daniels was issued two criminal citations, Transporting Fish Without a License and Check Station: Fail to Stop, which are both misdemeanor charges.

Idaho County Magistrate Court records reflect that the charges against Daniels were dismissed on motion of the prosecutor on January 13, 2023, with a bond forfeiture. No plea of guilt or no contest was entered or found.

Daniels' employer, the Department of Corrections did not conduct an internal investigation to review his criminal charges. Daniels reported his citations to his employer.

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

b) Tyler Ostrom, DPSST No. 63369; Corrections

On November 13, 2023, Tyler Ostrom reported to the Department that he was arrested for the offense of Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants (DUII).

On November 9, 2023, Ostrom was stopped by the Prineville Police Department after being observed traveling at a high rate of speed. The officer noted signs of impairment and requested Ostrom participate in standardized field sobriety tests (SFSTs), which indicated clues of intoxication.

Ostrom was arrested for DUII and transported to the Crook County Jail. Ostrom provided breath samples for testing with a resulting Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) of 0.03%.

The Crook County District Attorney's Office did not file charges related to this incident. As a result, no internal investigation was completed by the Oregon Department of Corrections.

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

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

4. ***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.

The Department presented this case at the February 10, 2026, Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) meeting. The case was returned to the Department for additional information to be included in the review. The CPC requested a copy of the application for the restraining order.

During the CPC meeting, the committee identified the following mitigating factors:

- Brown took accountability for his actions and is committed to his continued sobriety by attending meetings.
- Brown's written mitigation included a letter from his attorney in his Violation of Restraining Order case indicates that the underlying restraining order did not allege physical threats or injury. (A12 pg. 107)
- Brown's employer reviewed his conduct and has retained Brown as an employee.
- Brown has actively worked to address the issues in his life.
- Brown's written and verbal mitigation was mitigating.
- Brown was cooperative with responding officers.
- In Brown's written mitigation, he is prepared to be with his children and is committed to working on his issues.

The CPC identified the following as aggravating factors:

- Brown is not able to possess or own firearms or ammunition.
- In the DUII, Brown's BAC was twice the legal limit.
- Brown had contact with the petitioner of his restraining order, which was in violation of the court's parameters.
- Brown's failure to abide by a protective order is a boundary issue. As a corrections officer, it is important to know boundaries.

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>
Member Frasco disclosed an actual conflict of interest due to having represented Brown during the investigation and recused herself from the voting process.			

A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
The Corrections Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> • Dishonesty: The Department 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. <i>Additional Aggravating Factors:</i> • The committee's previously identified aggravating factors carry over into the record. • The application for the restraining order included a pattern of threatening behavior. • There is a discrepancy between a previously mitigating factor, which is now an aggravating factor. • During the 2023 DUI incident, Brown blamed the arresting officer while being taken into custody and stated he could lose his employment. • During the active restraining order, Brown's conduct was psychological and gaslit his victim. • Brown's attorney minimized his conduct by not acknowledging it as a violent person crime, which the victim disagreed with and sought protective action for the children involved. • The restraining order violation occurred after Brown completed treatment. • The restraining order application reflects that Brown consumed alcohol during his treatment at a time of mandated sobriety. <i>Additional Mitigating Factors:</i> • The committee's previously identified aggravating factors carry over into the record. • Brown's mitigation includes letters from coworkers and his attorney, which were mitigating. • Brown voluntarily sought a continued extension program for alcohol diversion, even throughout the investigation process, which is mitigating.			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			
Member Phillips moved that the Corrections Policy Committee	Nicholas Hunter	8 ayes; 0 nays;	Motion Passed

affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.		1 recusal	
Chair Hunter 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 Brown's certifications.	Matt Phillips	8 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed
Matt Phillips moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Ballam be ineligible to hold public safety certification for three (3) years.	John Taber	8 ayes; 0 nays; 1 recusal	Motion Passed

5. Piel, Garrett, DPSST No. 63834; Corrections Officer

Presented by Cindy Park

Reason for Discretionary Review

On January 19, 2025, the Department received a Criminal History Reporting form (F28) from Garrett Piel disclosing an Arrest for Driving Under the Influence (DUI), 2nd Offense in Ada County, Idaho on January 17, 2025. Piel was formally charged with DUI, 2nd Offense in the Ada County Magistrate Court and pled guilty to the charge on April 4, 2025.

Garrett Piel 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: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misconduct: Piel pled guilty to DUI, 2nd Offense, a criminal disposition as defined in OAR 259-008-0005(9) in the Ada County, Idaho Magistrate Court. Piel threatened harm to persons and caused harm to property by driving a motor vehicle while over the legal limit of alcohol and rear-ended another vehicle. <i>Aggravating Factors:</i> • Piel was on active probation. • This is Piel's second offense for DUII during a 6-year period. • Piel has been arrested three times.			

- Piel's BAC was .09 despite stating that he only had, "two beers."
- The DOC investigation focused on potential dishonesty since Piel spoke with officers on scene, denied any alcohol intake, and the language in his current mitigation statement proves otherwise.
- During the pre-dismissal meeting, Piel stated that if he would have waited a period of time, he could have blown a BAC below .08, which shows a lack of accountability.
- There was harm to both property and a driver.
- Piel stated that the incident was an 'accident,' but this is an crash caused by Piel.

Mitigating Factors:

- Piel's first two DUI arrests occurred when he was underage.
- Piel gave no excuses and took responsibility for his actions and admitted to his substance abuse.
- Piel is committed to working and to his continued sobriety.
- Piel received a mitigating letter from Lieutenant Harris with DOC.
- Piel reported the DUI incident in a timely manner to both his agency and to DPSST.
- Piel completed all his court ordered requirements in a timely manner.
- Piel was reduced from active probation to inactive probation.
- Piel maintains support from his employer, and he has mitigating letters from coworkers.

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

Member Aldrich moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Margeux Bowden	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Member Taber 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 Piel's certifications.	Margeux Bowden	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Member Aldrich moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Piel be ineligible to hold public safety certification for three (3) years.	Nicholas Hunter	9 ayes; 0 nays;	Motion Passed Unanimously

6. Pratt, Jacob. DPSST No. 61212; Corrections Officer

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho

Reason for Discretionary Review

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

Pratt's separation was presented to the February 10, 2026, Corrections Policy Committee as a recommended administrative closure. The CPC voted to overturn the recommendation and for the Department to present the case to the committee with all the records.

Jacob Pratt 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: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> • Dishonesty: The Department did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The Department did not identify elements of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: The Department did not identify elements of misconduct. <i>Aggravating Factors:</i> • The committee did not identify any aggravating factors. <i>Mitigating Factors:</i> • The committee did not identify any mitigating factors.			
A consensus was reached to confirm the lack of identified moral fitness violations. Member Phillips commented that this appears to be a case in which the county and employee were navigating, FEMLA, OFLA, Paid Leave Oregon, and ADA accommodations. Member Phillips noted that members do not have insight into the process, nor should they. The circumstances denoted here raise suspicions when an individual does not return to work after their position does not certify them with a disability. However, the record does not indicate dishonesty or a moral fitness violation. This is perhaps a policy issue, due to a lack of communication, for the agency and employee to navigate. Chair Hunter noted that the reason why the Committee requested to review this case was due to Multnomah County having an open investigation at the time that they separated			

with Mr. Pratt. There was concern of other elements involved in this separation other than the time lost, but this does not appear to be the case.			
Member Taber moved that the Corrections Policy Committee affirm the lack of a moral fitness violation as presented.	Josh Aldrich	9 ayes; 0 nays;	Motion Passed Unanimously

7. Applicant Review Committee Nominations

Presented by Marie Atwood

- *Member Frasco asked the length of an appointment period.*
- *Professional Standards Division Director Marie Atwood replied that members serve one (1) year terms.*
- *Member Bowden asked how the ARC receives information for review.*
- *Director Atwood replied that the information would arrive on an F28 form when someone has been hired by an agency and would like to begin basic training. The Committee would then review this to see if this would be an appropriate step to take.*
- *Vice-Chair Cameron asked if the candidates under review are individuals who have criminal backgrounds that were known by the agency.*
- *Director Atwood replied that this is correct, and that many agencies upon learning of an individual's criminal history may decide not to hire that individual after all. The ARC is for those agencies who are aware of a criminal background yet would still like to proceed with the academy process.*
- *Member Aldrich asked for the makeup of the ARC.*
- *Director Atwood replied that the ARC consists of two members from each of the Policy Committees, i.e. Police Policy, Corrections Policy, Telecommunications Policy, and one member of the Board. The ARC must consist of these numbers. Quorum required for ARC is four members, and there is an active seat for the Board. As a matter of notice, the other member who is serving as a representative of the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) is Mark Boren, meaning there will be another vacancy for this committee in November.*
- *Vice-Chair Cameron sought clarification on whether a Board member who is dually appointed to the CPC may still be a member of ARC.*
- *Director Atwood replied that yes, a dually appointed member may still be appointed to ARC if they sit on the CPC.*
- *Member Aldrich volunteered to be on the ARC given that he believes he will only be able to serve one term regardless.*
- *Director Atwood replied that Member Aldrich would be eligible to serve almost two full terms given that he expires from the CPC in April 2028.*
- *Member Aldrich motioned to serve on the Applicant Review Committee. Chair Hunter seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

8. DOC Request for CPC Approval – Pilot of Revised Corrections Course (BCC)

Presented by John Taber

The Oregon Department of Corrections (DOC) respectfully requests the Committee's support to pilot a revised Basic Corrections Course (BCC) aligned with the competency-based instructional framework adopted by the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) in 2024.

DOC has updated the BCC using the same competency-based approach adopted by DPSST, grounded in research-based training principles and modern correctional practice. This revised model is designed to meet the operational needs of DOC facilities, align with DOC policy, and support the Department's mission to protect communities, promote accountability, and transform lives.

As the Committee is aware, the current rule under OAR 259-008-0085 prescribes a section-based instructional structure grounded in earlier instructional models. While appropriate at the time of adoption, this structure does not fully align with the competency-based, integrated curriculum framework now reflected in DPSST's Basic Corrections Local program.

DOC has developed a revised BCC framework aligned with current Board-approved training principles, emphasizing integrated learning, scenario-based application, and competency reinforcement across the program. This approach reflects modern correctional practice, where communication, decision-making, behavioral management, and professional judgment are central to maintaining safety and institutional stability.

At this time, DOC is not requesting a rule change. Instead, DOC is seeking the Committee's support to conduct a limited pilot of the revised BCC under DPSST awareness and oversight.

- *Member Phillips stated his support for the concept but found that the restrictiveness of the OAR makes it difficult getting this updated so that DOC may update its own training to best practices.*
- *Member Taber mentioned that one of the asks that DOC will come back to the Committee with is OAR language changes. This is not included in the pilot and there were changes made to the OAR to allow for the Basic Corrections Local rewrite. The old legacy language was left in the OAR so that DOC may continue to operate on their existing program. There will have to be OAR changes in order for DOC to permanently align with what DPSST is doing. Additionally, if members look at what is being proposed, this is opening doors for flexibility for that exact reason.*
- *Chair Hunter stated his support for Member Taber and Member Phillips' comments. Focusing on the science of learning and human performance is what a lot of the courses that are being updated require.*
- *Chair Hunter asked Training Division Director Enquist to provide statements to the Committee before proceeding to a motion and vote.*
- *Training Director Enquist stated that the memo in question serves two purposes. The first is to ask the CPC to approve its support for this pilot. Given the unique relationship with DOC's conducting of the basic training outside of DPSST's organization, DPSST is just highlighting what this support might look like. These documents articulate a strong program, and it has been an effective collaboration. Two years ago, right around the time that the 2024 BCL implementation began at*

DPSST, Training Director Enquist, Member Taber, and other DPSST staff started to integrate and take a second look at what DPSST's audit function looks like compared to DOC's. Even five or two years ago, it was a very structured paper audit that was very focused on questions like, were the students in class for two hours, did the instructors utilize a specific slide?, etc. There is a value in this sort of monitoring, however, this process has morphed into one that is more collaborative. It has taken the form of DPSST pushing instructors to DOC for BCC when running programs. While DPSST is certainly auditing what they are doing, oftentimes, the agency is there teaching alongside them or side-seating with instructors. This has given the Department a better view of the actual instruction given rather than the checkbox audit that DPSST was previously doing. This has been a core part of how DPSST has supported their development, and it is likely to be the main thrust as to how the agency would support the implementation of a pilot by continuing to identify staff that work here who teach in Basic Training, by skill areas, and partnering with DOC as they run these pilot courses (as much to assist as to learn). One of the best things that has come out of the process is a shared realization among both DPSST and DOC that they are both providing quality training, and there is room to grow on both sides. The way DOC operates its scenario training program in some ways is better than how BCL is run here on DPSST's campus. The Department has taken action to implement the lessons learned, and there are plenty of places where DPSST is happy to provide technical assistance to DOC as they continue their own implementation. This is an open-ended process other than the timeline Member Taber laid out in terms of how many classes are run in the pilot. For the duration, DPSST is more than prepared to continue to place resources in support of DOC.

- *Member Phillips motioned to approve DOC's request for CPC Approval of a Pilot of Revised Basic Corrections Course Curriculum. Member Bowden seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

9. Approval for DPSST Support of a Pilot of Revised Basic Corrections Course (BCC) Curriculum

Presented by Chris Enquist

DPSST requests the approval to collaborate with the Oregon Department of Corrections (DOC) in the operation of pilot program to evaluate revised curriculum within the BCC program. This request is linked to DOC's request for approval to operate a pilot program.

Background:

In 2024, DPSST conducted a formal revision to the Basic Corrections Local (BCL) program. This revision resulted in changes to both the content of the program and the instructional model used to deliver this content. While the BCC program is codified separately from BCL within OAR (259-008-0085), core elements link the programs. DPSST and DOC engaged in a collaborative process to review the applicability of BCL program updates to the BCC course. Additionally, DPSST staff observed and supported BCC program delivery over the duration of 2024 and much of 2025. The result of these efforts is the proposed curriculum package which this memorandum proposes to operate as a pilot. DOC has developed a curriculum package which integrated the competency-based approach to learning adopted by

DPSST with the 2024 BCL revision. The proposed pilot curriculum places research-based training concepts at the foundation of a training program which allows for contextual learning and integration of DOC-specific operational needs.

- *Chair Hunter motioned to approve DPSST Support of a Pilot of Revised Basic Corrections Course Curriculum. Member Aldrich seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

10. Criminal Justice Fee Implementation

Presented by Chris Enquist

The agency's Training Division (TD) requests review and approval of a study to consider the implementation of fees for external partner registration to courses offered by the Criminal Justice Regional Training Program.

Background:

DPSST operates the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, built in 2006 to support mandated basic training for certified public safety professionals. External public safety partners routinely use the campus through a facility use request process that transfers liability for damage and requires adherence to DPSST training and safety policies. Approximately 200 requests are processed each year, resulting in about 1,200 external training events. While DPSST has previously explored cost-recovery models—such as charging for safety officer staffing or implementing facility use fees – these were not adopted due to workforce reductions and recession-era concerns about shifting costs to partner agencies. As campus infrastructure continues to age under heavy use, DPSST remains concerned about long-term facility sustainability since routine wear is not covered under current agreements.

DPSST also administers the Criminal Justice Regional Training Program, which delivers training statewide based on partner needs and emerging practices. In 2025, the program provided 97 training events to roughly 1,200 students. However, last-minute cancellations and no-shows have reduced operational efficiency. Because classes are capacity-limited and often require instructor travel and lodging—especially in remote areas—late withdrawals impede appropriate staffing adjustments and prevent waitlisted professionals from filling open seats. Although many cancellations stem from unavoidable local factors such as staffing shortages or court obligations, these challenges persist. DPSST's review of comparable organizations in other states shows that most charge registration fees for non-mandated training, presenting a potential model for improving efficiency and cost management.

In December 2025, the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training approved a study of criminal justice fees. The Board directed DPSST to present the findings of this study to each policy committee for endorsement prior to returning to the Board for final review in July of 2026.

DPSST has concluded this study which is summarized in attached documents. A component of this study was the completion of a survey of constituents. This survey gathered mixed feedback from constituents on the concept, with many constituents articulating dissatisfaction with the concept of fees for existing services while many of the same respondents simultaneously concurred with DPSST's need to consider fee imposition.

- *Member Phillips asked what the anticipated revenue from these fees would be.*

- *Training Division Director Enquist replied that this is a difficult question to answer. When DPSST looked at how data is collected, specifically on the no shows for regional, the calculated revenue would be pretty nominal since this is set as an absence fee. This would be about 40-60 absences in a year - at the maximum end. The money would then be retained within the operational budget, regional training, and really to offset use of part-time instructors.*
- *Member Phillips asked if the absences in question are in more rural areas or if they are uniform throughout the State.*
- *Director Enquist replied, yes, and that staff see absences at nearly every venue that they run. However, this is largely due to the backlog that DPSST experienced and individuals seeking training in general. A handgun instructor program might be offered in Ontario intending to meet local need, and yet there might be three students from the Western side of the State simply because they are searching for the next available class. It is difficult to pinpoint where the absences are being driven from when the population is not necessarily representative. Revenue would be nominal at this point, but it would help close the gap on no shows. DPSST placed caveats such as communication within 72 hours prior to the start of a program, along with carving out a path on both fees for agencies to submit hardship waivers. On the campus side, some of the data that was collected is a bit murky. There are about 200-300 facility use requests processed in a year, and many of these are for multiple days of training. Salem Police Department is a good example since they submit a single use request, but for 12 days of track use. Assessing the revenue from these requests is challenging since they fluctuate yearly in terms of how agencies run their training. There are approximately 1,200 training events, and averaged out to \$50 each, it does not add up to a significant amount of revenue.*
- *Member Phillips asked if the revenue would go into the General Fund or to a specific budget for the maintenance of this facility.*
- *Training Director Enquist replied that this revenue would be retained by the agency and will likely be managed by the Administrative Services Division.*
- *Member Phillips highlighted the EVO track and how despite it being 27 years old, it does not receive as much wear and tear as one might expect. Member Phillips then asked if this is due to environmental reasons or if police cars really do cause as much damage as expected.*
- *Training Director Enquist replied that this consists of a combination of factors and that miles are one way to measure this. There are many miles on the track, although not nearly as many as Highway 20 or 22. Its core specifications are different since it is built to ODOT's specifications in terms of road grade and design, but the underlying design is different, particularly on the concrete portion. This is rated to the point where DPSST could run a fire apparatus on it. Wear and tear is difficult to assess, and Training Director Enquist commented that how DPSST trains and operates vehicles on the track probably creates wear on the asphalt side. Most of this damage is probably environmental due to a road that has been in place for over 20 years. Specifics on the track are not immediately available and will be lumped into a facility condition assessment that will be completed next year.*
- *Chair Hunter asked for elaboration on the deferred maintenance and the 2% minimum, which has now become standard. Chair Hunter also commented that as a*

consumer of training space from a facility that is right next door, where some of this data is lost revolves around business need. The survey results indicate a proclivity to save money given budgetary constraints. If the context of the question is shifted to understanding the business need, for example, tactical team training, then agencies have an idea of what costs are. If DPSST is providing a service on campus or regionally, then the quality of the service should be evaluated and whether this service should continue. Just because there were no significant changes to DPSST's budget moving forward, this does not mean that this is sustainable and that the requirements are not outpacing the resources – regardless of where one might be in the State. Chair Hunter stated his support of the fees as a concept and the caveats are not unreasonable given the State's failures to fund what needs to happen in public safety in general. This is not something that DPSST controls, and Chair Hunter has given testimony in support of DPSST's essential mission in front of the Legislature, which continues to fail public safety officials. This request ensures that there is some sort of mechanism in place to continue to receive the type of training expected from DPSST. The last update from the Director mentioned that the track was two years out in terms of needing repairs, and safety is of utmost importance given the cumbersome nature of county roads. The concerns with regards to Measure 5 and Measure 50 will never go away and DPSST could have probably predicted these concerns without a survey. Chair Hunter emphasized DPSST's willingness to collaborate with other agencies to solve these problems and merely asked that any fee implementation be accompanied by an annual evaluation that accommodates any economic fluctuation in the future.

- Member Phillips agreed with Chair Hunter's comments but was concerned whether the revenue was going to be enough to resurface the entire track. Member Phillips also expressed doubt regarding agencies training at DPSST's facility, given that providing a training facility is not a requirement by the State, then staff from Clatsop County would not be able to readily access the campus like Marion County staff. This task falls onto a county's individual need, and there should be some sort of cost recovery effort on this front.
- Training Director Enquist replied that this consideration is certainly a piece of this conversation since DPSST is in Salem.
- Member Taber commented that use by agencies for classes not being run by DPSST makes sense, but the concern would be that down the road, this turns into a fee for training. DAS also mandates training and then charges to attend it, which is a frustration even for state agencies. Member Taber then advised the Department to be careful proceeding down this road. Fee for usage is one thing, fee for training is completely different.
- Training Director Enquist stated that, on behalf of DPSST leadership, the feedback received places attention on the agency's philosophical mission to provide basic training, and a distinction must be made between this point and the one made above.
- Member Phillips asked if the proposed motion would be to allow DPSST to continue to have a conversation with all of the other Policy Committees, or if this is an all-encompassing vote of approval.

- *Training Director Enquist replied that he would functionally like an endorsement or a non-endorsement on both the facility and regional use fees that would then proceed to the Board for approval.*
- *Member Phillips motioned to approve the Criminal Justice Fee Implementation, as presented. Chair Hunter seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

11. Basic Parole and Probation Curriculum Revision

Presented by Chris Enquist

Background:

The BPP Program was last revised and updated in 2025 after an in-depth analysis by staff from the Center for Policing Excellence (CPE). Several recommendations were made that included the implementation of mandated content from legislation passed in Senate Bill 1510 that applied to community corrections training. This included a requirement for initial officer training to include trauma-informed care, culturally specific services and de-escalation techniques.

Additionally, course content and hours were reorganized within the 5-week program to align with both intentional class sequencing and to interleave content throughout each class to bridge conceptual gaps and promote better student comprehension and retention. These changes connected the various courses with one another rather than present each course as distinct and separate from the others.

During this extensive revamp process in 2025, DPSST staff and constituents have pushed for innovation and improvement in the delivery of the Armed Parole and Probation (APP) program which is a condensed and physically demanding 2-week program that focusses on adding firearm training as a use of force tool for officers. A review by DPSST of the APP program which originated in 2019 led to several recommendations to both improve student learning and retention of skills and reduce the heightened risk of student injury due to the increased physical demands of the condensed 2-week course.

The resulting plan is to merge the content of the Basic Parole and Probation (BPP) program with the content of the Armed Parole and Probation (APP) programs into a combined 7-Week Basic Parole and Probation (BPP) program for all prospective parole and probation officers. The most notable of those recommendations are listed below:

- Applying evidence-based spaced-learning principles to all content including firearms.
- Adding content on Emotional Intelligence consistent with other DPSST programs.
- Standardizing the terminology for several course series within BPP with terminology used in other DPSST programs.
- Refining course hour allocation to reflect relevant job task demands of officers.
- Increasing the total combined hours from 274 to 280 to reflect and utilize a traditional 40-hour work week for constituents and supplement with additional essential content.

These changes strategically sync two current programs into one continuous and integrated program designed to help students make connections between many topics and better prepare them with safety and tactical skills. Further, through the intentional spacing of classes that

contain higher degrees of physicality, students' preparedness for strenuous elements will improve thus reducing the risk of training-related injuries.

- *Chair Hunter agreed with this request since there are several individuals who attend Armed Parole and Probation (APP) after going through Basic Parole and Probation (BPP). There is a lack of science of learning within the APP course itself, and this is detrimental for learning retention and transference. The ability to go from 5-7 weeks of training but now being able to interweave firearms throughout the entire program, allows for better outcomes and is consistent with academy studies, which is the most important feature. Chair Hunter noted his frustration with the corrections components related to this request but acknowledged this is a conversation for a different day.*
- *Member Phillips asked, notwithstanding the pilot, whether the goal is for all parole and probation classes to be this 7-week course that includes firearms training, or whether the course would be offered a couple times a year, one being unarmed, which would make it difficult to hire and train many people.*
- *Training Director Enquist replied that yes, and that the end goal, if successful, would be for this template to become the basic parole and probation program. However, DPSST would maintain the armed parole and probation for two weeks, as stand alone. This would probably be a once a year offering for legacy officers in the field or for those who graduated with a basic certification but moved into armed status mid-career. DPSST also has the need to maintain something along these lines for out-of-state lateral hires. There is a likelihood of keeping this legacy program alive as long as it is needed. If the pilot is successful, then DPSST may recommend that this becomes the statutory requirement.*
- *Vice-Chair Cameron commented that she supports the training and making a better-rounded parole officer. In the State of Oregon, there is a trajectory towards mandatory training. For new hires, there are very few counties that are not requiring this anymore.*
- *Member Phillips motioned to approve the Basic Parole and Probation Curriculum Revision, as presented. Member Taber seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

12. Basic Corrections Firearms Workgroup Report

Presented by Marie Atwood

Under the current rules and minimum standards, all corrections officers must complete a basic corrections officer training course, delivered by DPSST or Department of Corrections (DOC), and a DPSST approved corrections officer field training manual to obtain certification. Both the DPSST course and the DOC course include 240 total hours of training, with 24 hours of entry-level firearms training. There are also firearms related components in the use of force classroom hours and scenarios.

In 2024, DPSST received a constituent request asking the agency to evaluate whether changes were needed to the firearms training requirements for corrections officers. The request highlighted potential needs related to corrections officers who are hired for positions that do not require use of or access to firearms (unarmed).

The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training (Board) approved DPSST's request to conduct research and engage with stakeholders to assess whether the current firearms training and certification requirements for corrections officers should be modified.

DPSST convened a workgroup comprised of state and local law enforcement agencies that employ corrections officers, including Sheriff's Offices and the Department of Corrections (DOC). Membership represented agencies of varying sizes and geographic regions. The workgroup was charged with evaluating statewide needs related to the inclusion of basic firearms training within the entry-level training and certification requirements for corrections officers and with developing recommendations based on those needs.

- *Chair Hunter provided additional context to this request by noting that the push towards the formation of this Workgroup originated with him. Looking at Senate Bill 1510, and parole and probation transitioning to mandatory armed, this changes how DPSST would like to look at basic parole and probation curriculum. This must be integrated because it is an outcome that is already known. Looking at corrections firearms, there are differing perceptions around the State. There are several corrections officers who are working in what would otherwise be unarmed positions, working within facilities, etc. There is little need to work with firearms, and several of them do not want to. Just looking at this pool is part of the consideration. Is the applicant pool being limited at a time when they are needed to come into the profession. This also places potential strain on agency training for somebody who would otherwise not want to, or need, to be armed. Chair Hunter stated the costs to agency resources and underscored this information for deliberations. Chair Hunter praised DPSST's partnership in reaching an answer, and where the State is at right now wanting more armed corrections officers.*
- *Member Taber stated that DOC is unique compared to the counties since the vast majority of staff will never work an armed post. There are 4,500 employees, 3,00 security staff, and the vast majority will never use a firearm throughout the course of their duties. If they were, this would most likely be a rifle and not a Glock. There have been three (3) lethal force incidents at DOC over the last 40 years, and these have all been with a rifle. There have been applicants who have backed out of the recruitment process due to the armed requirement, or those who were lost during the training phase simply because they cannot get past the Glock qualification. Member Taber expressed satisfaction that the idea will continue to be explored moving forward. This is important for serving the various agencies' needs throughout the State, and DOC is committed to upholding these conversations.*
- *Member Aldrich thanked the members who formed part of this Workgroup and commented that although he does not support the outcome in its entirety, the idea of frequently reviewing this is warranted. Member Aldrich recommended implementing a timeline as to how frequently the review should be conducted.*
- *Chair Hunter agreed, and sooner rather than later is preferred for this discussion.*
- *Member Phillips motioned to approve the Basic Corrections Firearms Workgroup Report, as presented. Member Taber seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

13. Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0300 and 259-008-0310

Denial and Revocation Processes for Professional Standards Cases Involving Student Dismissals or Employment Arbitration Findings

Presented by Marie Atwood

Overview:

At the February 2026 Policy Committee meetings, the Department presented a comprehensive package of proposed changes to the moral fitness standards and the processes used to deny or revoke public safety professional certifications. Following that work, staff identified two additional issues requiring clarification within the rules that guide professional standards cases. This memo presents proposed rule amendments to address those issues.

Professional Standards Cases Based On A Student Dismissal

OAR 259-008-0300 (3)(b)(D) gives the Department broad discretion to open professional standards cases based on any violation of student conduct standards, even when the violation did not result in dismissal. This exceeds the intended scope of the rule and creates ambiguity about who determines that a violation occurred.

The proposed amendment limits discretionary professional standards cases to situations where a student is dismissed under OAR 259-012-0035 for a conduct violation. This clarifies that the Training Division, not Department compliance staff, makes the conduct determination and narrows the grounds for opening professional standards cases.

Professional Standards Cases That Include An Employment Arbitrator's Finding

OAR 259-008-0310 (8) ties the outcomes for professional standards cases to an arbitrator's findings, which unintentionally limits the Board's independent authority to determine moral fitness.

The proposed revisions remove prescriptive outcomes based on an arbitrator's findings and instead affirm that the Department, Board, and Committees retain authority to make independent findings related to moral fitness and certification. Arbitrator findings may still be considered while reviewing professional standards cases, but the findings are not determinative. An arbitrator's findings about employment, such as whether misconduct occurred or whether reinstatement is warranted, do not control moral fitness and certification decisions.

The amendments also clarify that when an arbitrator orders reinstatement, the Department may continue to review and process the professional standards case as a discretionary case.

- *Chair Hunter clarified if the Committee is recommending that all the other Policy Committees will be asked the same questions and then this request will go to the Board for final approval.*
- *Director Atwood replied, yes, and then this would move to the Secretary of State for the public comment period.*
- *Member Phillips commented that he appreciates separating criteria from the arbitrators, particularly since they do not adhere to the relatively new law enforcement standards of conduct.*
- *A consensus was reached to approve the fiscal impact statement.*

- *Member Taber motioned to approve the proposed rule changes for OAR 259-008-0300 and 259-008-0310, as presented. Member Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

14. Review of Public Comments for Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (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

Amending Public Safety Professional Certification Denial and Revocation Standards and Processes

Presented by Marie Atwood

DPSST forwarded a memo to the CPC to review the comments collected for the proposed rule changes to Oregon Administrative Rules (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.

The comprehensive rule change package amends the moral fitness standards and denial and revocation processes for criminal justice public safety professionals. It also includes process changes for DPSST review of complaints made against a public safety professional. These rules apply to police officers, corrections officers, parole and probation officers, regulatory specialists, telecommunicators, and emergency medical dispatchers. The changes are based on discussions and recommendations from the DPSST Criminal Justice Moral Fitness Workgroup (a rules advisory committee) and the DPSST Professional Standards Division.

DPSST presented the proposed rule changes to the Policy Committees during the February 2026 meetings. Each Policy Committee provided feedback that DPSST collected as part of the comment process. Following the Policy Committee meetings, DPSST held the public comment period from February 26 – March 31, 2026.

DPSST received one submission by Anita Yandle from the Policing Project at New York University School of Law. A copy of the complete comment was sent to CPC members.

DPSST staff also provided a summary of the comment and the agency's interpretation or analysis based on current application of the rules and the intent of the proposed rule changes. DPSST did not recommend any changes to the proposed rules based on the written comments but prepared responses to the comment's suggested changes.

- *Member Phillips commented on the volume of what was provided for this public comment but stated his intention to go with the DPSST recommendation.*
- *Chair Hunter concurred and believed that the public comment in question was very involved with subjective perceptions. Chair Hunter also stated that he believes DPSST did a good job responding to the questions that were posed. Unfortunately, this public comment appeared to want to make a statement on record despite other components of the commentary being clearly outlined.*
- *Member Phillips motioned to approve DPSST's recommended response to the public comment received, A-F, as presented. Member Taber seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

15. Agency Updates

Presented by Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director

- Director Atwood began by informing present members of the requisition process for the Learning Management System (LMS). This project has maintained rapid progress over the last couple of months, especially since onboarding the project manager and assembling a project team within the agency to help identify what the needs are at the microscopic level. This is to ensure that whatever product that receives approval from DAS, really fulfills what it is being asked to accomplish. To this end, a lot of leg work has already gone into this on behalf of the agency. DPSST has finally received State, CIO, DAS, and EIS approval to proceed with the Stage Gate 1 endorsement. What this means is that the initiation phase is over and DPSST may proceed to an identification and procurement stage. This is a great achievement in a short amount of time. DPSST is also pursuing a Policy Option Package (POP), to add support staff for the adoption and maintenance of the LMS.
- Another large agenda item for the agency is accreditation. DPSST is fairly unique in the nation given that it is one of the only combined academy and post operations that train public safety professionals and ensures statewide compliance. Deputy Director McAlpine is spearheading DPSST's intent to become an accredited academy and post through IADLEST. First, DPSST will proceed with the academy training level accreditation before transitioning its attention to professional standards accreditation. These will be kept separate since it is an enormous amount of work. There is a lot being accomplished through the self-assessment process, which basically requires everyone in the agency, all the way from the individual contributor level to small teams, units, divisions, etc., to evaluate all that they do for best, evidence-based approaches in law enforcement training. After this process is completed, there will be an onsite assessment or audit by IADLEST to ensure that the request for accreditation is actually reflected in what DPSST does in its daily operations. If this can be achieved, it will be a milestone for both the academy and for Oregon given its national recognition in quality training. This assessment process would have to be renewed every three (3) years and will hopefully become a regular feature of what the agency does.
- Furthermore, budgetary issues are at the forefront of local, county, and state government concerns. DPSST is in a much better position from 6 months ago, and the agency is cautiously optimistic moving forward. DPSST was considered a 'no-harm' agency by the State, and despite being in a small budgetary deficit, DPSST's goal is to conclude the biennium with \$5.5 million in overflow. Preliminary projections place the Department at \$6.2 million in overflow – notwithstanding the \$3 million in monthly operational costs. This is in addition to cost studies, in collaboration to the CFO and LFO on inflation budgeting, in particular.
- DPSST is proud to present the deferred maintenance that has been occurring on campus, specifically the roofing project in B-Building that began three weeks ago. Moreover, in late June or July, DPSST will proceed with a repaving project for the main parking lot and will be replacing the front gate of the campus. This is in addition to the replacement of the campus memorial lighting. Finally, Professional Standards will be proceeding with Workgroups for training maintenance standards, which were recently approved. Participants are needed and encouraged to apply.
- Chair Hunter gave a final thank you to the committee members and DPSST staff for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 12:46 p.m.

16. Next Corrections Policy Committee Meeting: August 11, 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.

DRAFT