To increase the public's trust, the Oregon legislature has mandated the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training establish minimum standards that are required to be met and maintained by Oregon's providers of public safety, including police officers, corrections officers, parole and probation officers, telecommunicators (9-1-1), emergency medical dispatchers, public safety instructors and OLCC regulatory specialists. The Department of Public Safety Standards and Training is responsible for certifying public safety professionals who meet all of the Board-established standards, and for denying or revoking the certification of those who do not meet or fall below the standards.

In addition to physical and intellectual standards, the Board has adopted minimum standards of moral fitness. Public safety professionals and applicants for public safety positions who have been convicted of a crime or have engaged in behavior that is deemed to fall below the minimum standards are subject to review as prescribed in Oregon Administrative Rule 259-008-0070. The sole purpose of this review is to determine if the Board's standards of moral fitness have been violated and if proceeding to deny or revoke public safety certification should be initiated. The review specifically looks for behavior that appears to involve dishonesty, disregard for the rights of others, misuse of authority, gross misconduct, misconduct, insubordination and incompetence.

The Professional Standards Ethics Bulletin has been developed as an educational tool aimed at providing insight and transparency into situations involving public safety professionals that may violate the Board's standard of moral fitness. The bulletin details the conduct and the resulting DPSST action. The names and agencies of the individuals in this report have been omitted to ensure focus remains on the behavior.

Questions about these incidents or about DPSST's processes and procedures can be directed to DPSST: (503) 378-2100 or oregon.dpsst@state.or.us.

The following cases have resulted in consideration of revocation or denial of certifications by DPSST in June, 2016.
Officer A retired during an investigation related to discriminatory conduct he was alleged to have engaged in. DPSST notified Officer A that his case would be heard by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and gave him the opportunity to provide mitigating circumstances for the PPC's consideration. He provided a response.

The PPC met and recommended to the Board the revocation of Officer A's certifications based on conduct that involved Misconduct, Gross Misconduct and Disregard for the Rights of Others.

The PPC found that Officer A's conduct constitutes Misconduct when he engaged in discriminatory conduct when he called African Americans monkeys, referred to them as animals and sang a song that depicted an African American being held by the collar and beaten. This conduct violated Officer A's agencies policies and procedures and the practices and standards generally followed in Oregon’s public safety professions.

The PPC found that Officer A's conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct by creating a danger and risk to the efficient operation of the agency recognizable as a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable public safety professional would observe in a similar circumstance. As a high-ranking officer, Officer A is held to a higher standard and the described conduct impacts his ability to operate an agency without creating a danger and risk to the efficient operation of that agency.

The PPC found that Officer A's conduct constitutes Disregard for the Rights of Others by a demonstrated disregard for the principles of fairness, respect for the rights of other and the fundamental duty to protect or serve the public.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances that Officer A would engage in the type of behavior as described in the record, and attempt to identify other individual's wrongdoing instead of taking responsibility for his own actions. They found Officer A's statement of having the freedom of speech in this situation was wrong and inappropriate. The PPC found Officer A's excuse of being frustrated with the current events in the nation as aggravating when his conduct contributed to the negative image. The PPC also found as aggravating the fact that his conduct had global consequences and will impact the ability of the profession to re-gain trust from communities. Finally, the PPC found Officer A's letter to the PPC aggravating as he seemed to only recognize that his error was in engaging in the behavior in front of subordinates, therefore failing to recognize the impact this type of behavior has on his ability as the agency head to lead effectively. Also, in Officer A's letter he indicated that he was forced to retire however, records show he sought out the separation and settlement agreement.

The PPC found no mitigation to consider.

After considering the totality of the circumstances the PPC voted unanimously, minus two recusals that Officer A's conduct rises to the level to warrant the revocation of his certifications and recommended to the Board the same. In a unanimous vote the PPC determined that Officer A’s misconduct warrants revocation of his certifications for a seven years ineligibility period for Misconduct; 10 year ineligibility period for Gross Misconduct and 15 year ineligibility for Disregard for the Rights of Others. Officer A was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and did not request a hearing. Officer A's misconduct ended is 29-year career.

Officer A's Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Police certifications are Revoked.

Officer B resigned during an investigation relating to on-duty and off-duty behavior, his relationship with another officer’s wife and his conduct that led to his conviction of Furnishing Alcohol to a Person under 21.

DPSST notified Officer B that his case would be heard by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and gave him the opportunity to provide mitigating circumstances for the PPC’s consideration. Officer B did not provide a response.

The PPC met and recommended to the Board the revocation of Officer B’s certifications based on conduct that involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct.
The PPC found Officer B’s conduct constitutes Misconduct. An internal investigation was conducted and resulted in Officer B’s arrest for three counts of Furnishing Alcohol to Person under 21 [ORS 471.410]. He later pleaded guilty to and was convicted on one count Furnishing Alcohol to Person under 21. The PPC found that Officer B’s conduct violates the law, practices and standards generally followed in the Oregon public safety profession.

The PCC found that Officer B’s conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct. By administrative rule, a conviction of Furnishing Alcohol to a Person under 21 [ORS 471.410] violates Gross Misconduct based on the elements of the crime. As a police officer, Officer B was entrusted to enforce and uphold the laws. His conduct described above creates a risk to the efficient operation of the public safety agency. As a police officer he provided alcohol to individuals under age, which is a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable public safety professional would observe in similar circumstances.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances the age of the minors Officer B was hanging out with and providing alcohol to and the fact that he knowingly drove to a location with the intent to drink and provide minors with the ability to drink. Additional aggravation was when Officer B was at a local business highly intoxicated, acting inappropriate and walking up to citizens asking for gum.

The PPC found no mitigating circumstances to consider.

After considering the totality of the circumstances the PPC voted unanimously, that Officer B’s conduct rises to the level to warrant the revocation of his certification and recommended to the Board the same. In a unanimous vote the PPC determined that Officer B’s misconduct warrants revocation of his certification for a seven years ineligibility period for Misconduct and 10 year ineligibility period for Gross Misconduct. Officer B was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and did not request a hearing. Officer B’s misconduct ended his 8-year career.

**Officer B’s Basic Police certification is Revoked.**

**Officer C** was arrested for Felony Possession of Methamphetamine and Resisting Arrest and subsequently convicted of Felony Possession of Methamphetamine [ORS 475.894], a crime which requires revocation of certification by administrative rule. Officer C resigned his position as a Parole and Probation Officer. Officer C was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and he failed to request a hearing. Officer C’s misconduct ended his 23-year career.

**Officer C’s Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Management and Executive Police certifications and Basic Parole and Probation Officer certification are Revoked.**

**Officer D** resigned during an investigation into allegations of a personal relationship she was having with an inmate. DPSST notified Officer D that her case would be heard by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and gave her the opportunity to provide mitigating circumstances for the CPC’s consideration. She provided a response.

The CPC met and recommended to the Board the revocation of Officer D’s certifications based upon conduct that involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct.

The CPC found that Officer D’s conduct constitutes Misconduct. She violated professional boundaries and her relationship with an inmate in custody and during post-prison supervision violated the practices or standards that are generally followed in the Oregon public safety profession.

Additionally, the CPC found that Officer D’s conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct by creating a danger and a risk to the efficient operation of the agency. Crossing professional boundaries and engaging in relationships with inmates compromises the safety and security of a correctional institution.
The CPC found as aggravating circumstances that Officer D had an inmate sleep over in her house when she knew the rules based on all of the previous conflicts she identified and reported. Additionally they found as aggravating how little time passed from when the inmate was paroled to when Officer D began the relationship.

The CPC found that Officer D’s was forthcoming during the employment interview as a mitigating circumstance to consider.

After considering the totality of the circumstances the CPC voted unanimously, that Officer D’s conduct rises to the level to warrant the revocation of her certification and recommended to the Board the same. In a unanimous vote the CPC determined that Officer D’s misconduct warrants revocation of her certifications for a three years ineligibility period for Misconduct and five years ineligibility period for Gross Misconduct. Officer D was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and she failed to request a hearing. Officer D’s misconduct ended her 2-year career. **Officer D’s Basic Corrections certification are Revoked.**