PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS—CRIMINAL JUSTICE

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.

Upcoming Board & Policy Committee Meetings

Telecommunications Policy Committee—August Meeting Cancelled
Corrections Policy Committee—8/8/17
Police Policy Committee—8/17/17
Board on Public Safety Standards & Training—10/26/17
JULY STATISTICS

Currently Certified Law Enforcement in Oregon:

◊ Police 5,635
◊ Corrections 4,039
◊ Tele/EMD 911/870
◊ P & P 625
◊ OLCC 33

Professional Standards Cases Opened in July:

◊ Police 11
◊ Corrections 7
◊ Tele/EMD 4
◊ P & P 2
◊ OLCC 0

Professional Standards Cases Pending as of July 31, 2017:

◊ Police 68
◊ Corrections 57
◊ Tele/EMD 10
◊ P & P 5
◊ OLCC 4

Cases Closed in July:

◊ Revoked 8
◊ Deny 0
◊ No Revoke 1
◊ No Deny 4
◊ No Action 14

To view prior ethics bulletins visit HTTP://WWW.OREGON.GOV/DPSST/PAGES/PUBLICATIONS.ASPX
The following cases have resulted in revocation or denial or a vote not to revoke or deny a public safety certification by DPSST in July 2017

**Officer A** was charged and convicted of two counts of Official Misconduct in the Second Degree. As part of Officer A’s plea agreement, Officer A stipulated to the revocation of their public safety certifications. Officer A’s misconduct ended their 33 year career.

**Officer A’s Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced Police certifications and Basic Corrections certification are hereby Revoked.**

**Officer B** was discharged for cause after repeated dishonest statements made to staff while attending the Oregon Public Safety Academy. Officer B was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to request a hearing. Officer B’s misconduct ended their 2-year career.

**Officer B’s Basic Corrections certification is hereby Revoked.**

**Officer C** resigned in lieu of termination following an internal affairs investigation in which Officer C was found to be intoxicated while on duty. Officer C was notified that the Police Policy Committee (PPC) would review the case and was provided an opportunity to submit mitigation in writing. The PPC met and recommended to revoke Officer C’s certifications to the Board. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer C’s conduct involved Misconduct being the agencies policies and procedures were violated, but the PPC voted 9-2 that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer C’s Police certifications.
- Officer C’s conduct involved Gross Misconduct being Officer C was intoxicated while on duty, in uniform, and operating a marked patrol vehicle. Additionally, after several hours had transpired from when it was discovered that Officer C was intoxicated to when Officer C’s blood alcohol content (BAC) was taken, it registered .08, meaning it was initially much higher when Officer C reported for duty. The PPC found that this was a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer C’s Police certifications.
- Officer C’s conduct involved Disregard for the Rights of Others based upon the fact that Officer C was intoxicated while on-duty and put the public and fellow co-workers at risk. In a vote of 7-2 the PPC voted that this was a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer C’s Police certifications.
- Officer C’s conduct involved Dishonesty being when initially asked if Officer C had been drinking, Officer C only admitted to one beer prior to shift starting. PPC voted 9-2 that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer C’s Police certifications.

**The PPC found as aggravating circumstances:**
Officer C committed the crime of DUII while on duty and in uniform, lied to coworkers of the same rank, lied about the amount of alcohol consumed and type of alcohol (beer vs. liquor), and took police action while intoxicated which could have jeopardized a criminal case.

**The PPC found as mitigating circumstances:**
The letters that were submitted on behalf of Officer C and Officer C’s mitigation letter, Officer C’s change of career to help counsel others, Officer C went to treatment for alcohol abuse and is committed to recovery and trying to do the right thing, and even though Officer C was initially dishonest Officer C was later truthful. Additionally, Officer C took full responsibility for their actions and did not blame anyone else throughout the process.

Please disseminate this information to all public safety officers

www.dpsst.state.or.us  503-378-2100
THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC and Officer C was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke. Officer C did not request a hearing. Officer C’s misconduct ended their 23-year career.

Officer C’s Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Police Certifications Were Revoked.

Officer D worked as a deputy sheriff from 1995 until 2013. DPSST was notified that Officer D had been arrested for DUII and Reckless Driving, and was subsequently convicted of Reckless Driving. The DUII was diverted. Officer D was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended not to revoke Officer D’s certifications to the Board. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer D’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct being Officer D violated the law of Reckless Driving, which resulted in a conviction. The PPC voted 10-1 that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer D’s Police certifications.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer D’s Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) was .16 and that there was a passenger present in the vehicle. Additionally, Officer D had a culpable mental state, Officer D knew they were drunk, but drove anyway.

The PPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer D wrote a letter that upon successful completion of probation the charge of Reckless Driving will be reduced to a violation, and Officer D successfully completed a drug and alcohol program. Additionally, the PPC found that Officer D was retired when the conduct occurred.

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC.

Officer D’s Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced Police Certifications Were Not Revoked.

Officer E was hired as a deputy sheriff and submitted an Application for Basic Police Certification which indicated that Officer E had been convicted of Recklessly Endangering Another Person. Officer E was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer E’s Application for Certification. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer E’s conduct involved Misconduct being Officer E violated the law and it resulted in a conviction. The PPC voted that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to deny Officer E’s Application for Certification.

- Officer E’s conduct involved Gross Misconduct being Officer E was a risk to themselves, the passenger, and others by going over 100 mph in a construction zone and also performing a wheelie on a motorcycle. The PPC voted that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to deny Officer E’s Application for Certification.
THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

The PPC found no aggravating circumstances.
The PPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer E’s misconduct took place over a decade ago and Officer E was 21 years old at the time. In Officer E’s mitigation letter they took full responsibility for their actions and didn’t blame anyone else. Additionally, the hiring Sheriff supported Officer E and said Officer E was truthful during the background investigation.
The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC.

Officer E’s Application for Basic Police Certification was Not Denied.

Officer F was hired as a telecommunicator and submitted an Application for Training which indicated that Officer F had been convicted of DUII. Officer F was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Telecommunications Policy Committee (TPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The TPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer F’s Application for Training and subsequent certification. The TPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:
• Officer F’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct being Officer F violated the law and was convicted of DUII. The TPC found that this conduct when considered alone does not rise to the level to deny Officer F’s Application for Training.

The TPC found no aggravating circumstances.
The TPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer F has not been arrested or had any other incidents with law enforcement since the 2012 DUII arrest/conviction, Officer F was cooperative with law enforcement at the time of arrest, and the mitigation letters submitted on Officer F’s behalf.
The Board approved the recommendation of the TPC.

Officer F’s Application for Training and Subsequent Certification was Not Denied.

Officer G was employed as a corrections officer from 2014 until Officer G resigned during the time period of the revocation case in 2017. DPSST was notified that Officer G had been arrested for DUII, Reckless Driving, and Recklessly Endangering Another. Officer G was convicted of Reckless Driving, but received diversion for the DUII. Officer G was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board to revoke Officer G’s Basic Corrections Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:
• Officer G’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct being Officer G violated the law and was subsequently convicted.
• Officer G’s conduct involved Disregard for the Rights of Others. When Officer G drove recklessly they put their passenger at risk, as well as any other individuals, to include children, that may have normally been present at the site of the crash.

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

www.dpsst.state.or.us 503-378-2100
The following cases have resulted in revocation or denial or a vote not to revoke or deny a public safety certification by DPSST in July 2017

- Officer G’s conduct involved Dishonesty. Officer G was dishonest when Officer G told law enforcement on scene that they had only had one beer and weren’t racing their vehicle. Additionally, Officer G returned to the site of the crash to tell the property owner they hadn’t been drinking, which was found by the CPC to be dishonest.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer G was a risk to themselves and others when Officer G drove under the influence of alcohol. When Officer G was asked to take the Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) test, Officer G became belligerent and confrontational. Officer G was dishonest to law enforcement and to the homeowner, whose property Officer G crashed onto. Additionally, Officer G blamed the homeowner claiming they were being dramatic and did not take responsibility for Officer G’s own actions.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer G’s DUII was diverted, Officer G took drug and alcohol classes, and in the mitigation letter Officer G took responsibility for their actions.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC. Officer G was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer G’s misconduct ended their 3 year career.

Officer G’s Basic Corrections Certification was revoked.

Officer H worked as a corrections officer from 1991 until 2017. Upon submittal of Officer H’s retirement paperwork to DPSST it was discovered the Officer H had an arrest and conviction for DUII dating from 2002. Officer H was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to revoke Officer H’s Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Corrections Certifications. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer H’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct being Officer H violated the law by committing the crime of DUII and was convicted. The CPC voted that this was not a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer H’s Corrections certifications.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:
When Officer H was asked to take field sobriety tests he refused.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer H’s mitigation letter was well written and took ownership for Officer H’s own actions. Officer H quit drinking following the incident and reported the arrest to the agency. Additionally, Officer H continued to work following the conviction and received 21 commendations for Officer H’s years of service. Plus it’s been 15 years since Officer H’s conviction and there have been no further violations of law in that time period.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC.

Officer H’s Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Corrections Certifications Were Not Re- voked.
THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

**Officer I** was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training which indicated that Officer I had been convicted of Reckless Driving. Officer I was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer I’s Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer I’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct being Officer I violated the law and it resulted in a conviction of Reckless Driving. The CPC found that this conduct when considered alone does not rise to the level to deny Officer I’s Application for Training.

**The CPC found no aggravating circumstances.**

**The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:**

- Officer I was straightforward and honest with the officer on scene, and afterwards wrote an apology letter to the victims taking full responsibility for Officer I’s own actions. Officer I completed the tasks required by the court and the misdemeanor crime was lowered to a violation. In Officer I’s mitigation letter Officer I took full responsibility for what had occurred. Additionally, the incident occurred 4 years prior to the application for training.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC.

**Officer I Application for Training and Subsequent Certification was Not Denied.**

**Officer J** worked as a parole and probation officer from 2011 until 2014. Officer J was discharged for cause, but due to being employed as an at-will employee Officer J’s case was reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee. Officer J was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board to revoke Officer J’s Basic Parole and Probation Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer J’s conduct involved Misconduct being Officer J violated the agencies policies and procedures. The CPC found this conduct alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer J’s certification.
- Officer J’s conduct involved Dishonesty being statements made by Officer J to supervisors were inconsistent and contradictory. Additionally, statements made by Officer J to DPSST staff were found to be untrue; Officer J claimed the discharge for cause was overturned, but the court documentation received independently of Officer J stated to the contrary, and Officer J claimed to have sent documentation to DPSST staff that was never received even after providing Officer J with the fax number and advising them to resend it.

**The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:**

The statements made by Officer J to DPSST staff about the discharge being overturned and having sent paperwork that was never received. Additionally, the CPC found Officer J’s drug use and uncooperative behavior with the agency to be aggravating circumstances.
THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

The CPC found no mitigating circumstances.
The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC. Officer J was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer J’s misconduct ended their 3 year career.

Officer J’s Basic Parole and Probation Certification was Revoked.

Officer K was employed as a corrections officer from 2007 until 2017 and resigned during an investigation. Officer K was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board to revoke Officer K’s Basic Corrections Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer K’s conduct involved Misconduct being Officer K’s misuse of the Taser violated the agencies policies and procedures and jail standards. The CPC found this conduct alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer K’s certification.
- Officer K’s conduct involved Gross Misconduct being Officer K used an improper level of force when dealing with inmates, and the conduct was a gross deviation from the standards of care that a reasonable public safety professional would observe in a similar circumstance. The CPC found this conduct alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer K’s certification
- Officer K’s conduct involved Misuse of Authority being Officer K used the Taser for punitive reasons and when it was unnecessary. The CPC found this conduct alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer K’s certification
- Officer K’s conduct involved Disregard for the Rights of Others being Officer K used the Taser as corporal punishment to punish the inmates and there was no legitimate correctional objective in doing so. Officer K also blamed the inmates for the use of the Taser. The CPC found this conduct alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke Officer K’s certification
- Officer K’s conduct involved Dishonesty being witness statements and video evidence was contradictory to statements made by Officer K. Also Officer K claimed their OC spray was empty when it wasn’t.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer K’s unnecessary and unprofessional comments in incident reports. Officer K’s behavior was unbecoming of a professional. Officer K Tased an inmate who was of no threat to themselves or others while the inmate was lying in their bunk. Officer K’s behavior made other employees so uncomfortable that they reported the conduct immediately. Additionally, the CPC found that Officer K had been employed as a corrections officer since 1992 (includes out of state employment) and knows better than to have engaged in the conduct and in doing so Officer K showed a conscious disregard for the rules.

The CPC found no mitigating circumstances.
The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC. Officer K was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer K’s misconduct ended their 10 year career.

Officer K’s Basic Corrections Certification was Revoked.

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS
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THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

Officer L reported a DUII conviction out of California upon hire. Officer L was notified their case would have to be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC).

- Officer L’s conduct involved Misconduct. The Committee found that Officer L’s conduct violated the law and resulted in a conviction of DUII. Misconduct is a separate and sufficient basis to deny Application for Training.
- Officer L’s conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The Committee found that Officer L’s conduct violated Gross Misconduct based upon the conviction of DUII, a presumed Category IV crime based on the elements of the offense. Gross Misconduct is a separate and sufficient basis to deny Application for Training.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer L was cooperative at the time of the incident and has had no incidents since. Officer L fully disclosed to the employer during the background and the mitigation letter spoke of positive changes and lessons learned. Additionally Officer L has stopped drinking, got a job, and finished school.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer L had a revocation hearing for failure to pay fines associated with the conviction in addition to the length of time it took to fully pay the fines.

The CPC recommended that Officer L’s Application for Training not be Denied to the Board. The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC.

Officer L’s Application for Training and Subsequent Certification was not Denied.

Officer M is retired from law enforcement. DPSST received a LEDS hit regarding their arrest for Taking, Angling, Hunting, Or Trapping in Violation of Wildlife Law or Rule, ORS 498.002. Officer M was subsequently convicted and notified the Police Policy Committee (PPC) would be reviewing the conduct.

- Officer M’s conduct involved Misconduct. The Committee found that Officer M’s conduct on May 27, 2016, violated the law and resulted in the conviction of Taking, Angling, Hunting, or Trapping in Violation of Wildlife law or rule. OAR 498.002, is a presumed Category V Misconduct crime based on the elements of the offense. The Committee found that the identified Misconduct when considered alone does not rise to the level to warrant revocation.
- Officer M’s conduct involved Dishonesty. The Committee found that Officer M engaged in Dishonesty when they repeatedly lied about how many clams they had. The Committee found that when Officer M saw the Trooper they started to walk away from him knowing they had more clams than they should, which they considered a deceitful act. The identified Dishonesty when considered alone is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke their certifications.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer M engaged in multiple lies and deception. The letter of mitigation submitted by Officer M’s daughter seemed to pit one Trooper’s integrity against another which they found aggravating.

The PPC found no mitigating circumstances.
The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC and Officer M was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to request a hearing.
THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE RESULTED IN REVOCATION OR DENIAL OR A VOTE NOT TO REVOKE OR DENY A PUBLIC SAFETY CERTIFICATION BY DPSST IN JULY 2017

Officer M’s Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Police Certifications were Revoked.

Officer N resigned in lieu of termination after an internal investigation revealed untruthfulness, performance issues and being under the influence of alcohol on duty. Officer N was notified that the conduct would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC).

- Officer N’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The Committee found that Officer N’s conduct from April 11-15, 2016, where allegations were made that Officer N had not been at work or worked very little. During the investigations Officer N admitted to telling other officers that they would be in Tillamook to do follow up on a case, which was not true. Officer N admitted that to not engaging in assigned duties as a detective that week, but had self-assigned them self to patrol although Officer N did not have a uniform on, drive a marked patrol car, or communicate with the dispatch center.

On March 4, 2016, Officer N seized and processed a baggie of a suspected drug. Officer N claimed that they tested the white powder with NIK field tests for methamphetamine and heroin and they both came back negative. Officer N claimed that they labeled the plastic bag with the case number and then retained it in their briefcase with the intention of consulting with an officer from another agency to determine what the substance was. The plastic baggie remained in the unlocked briefcase in the detective’s office for approximately 9 weeks until it was discovered by another detective. The white powder was tested and the substance immediately tested positive for methamphetamine.

On July 8, 2016, Officer N reported to work under the influence of alcohol. The Chief conducted a breath test and Officer N’s test results were in excess of the .04 mg/dl amount referenced in Agency Policy #6.1.6. The first reading of .172% was tainted by Officer N having chewing tobacco in their mouth. A subsequent reading of .124% and .112% were obtained over a period of approximately 30 minutes. After testing positive for alcohol Officer N responded to a call as a cover officer while under the influence of alcohol subjecting Officer N, fellow officers and the agency at risk. Officer N’s conducts constitutes Misconduct and Gross Misconduct and are separate and sufficient basis’ to revoke their certifications.

- Officer N’s conduct involved Dishonesty. The Committee found that Officer N engaged in Dishonesty throughout the investigations. Specifically:
  Officer N misrepresented the amount of alcohol that was consumed after performing a breath test that showed a Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) in excess of the .04 mg/dl amount referenced in Agency Policy #6.1.6. The first reading of .172% was tainted by Officer N having chewing tobacco in their mouth. A subsequent reading of .124% and .112% were obtained over a period of approximately 30 minutes.
  Officer N’s BAC was taken 7-11 hours after they claimed to have had their last drink. Officer N’s claim that they had consumed minimal alcohol prior to shift is not credible.
  Officer N admitted to lying to other officers when Officer N claimed that on April 12, 2016 they went to Tillamook to do follow up on a case.
  Officer N’s time sheet for April 2016 did not report leaving work early or not reporting to work at all on multiple occasions to deal with personal issues and coded the time as time worked.
  Officer N’s conduct constitutes Dishonesty and is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke their certifications.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances:
Officer N initially denied consuming alcohol to the Chief, lied to fellow officers demonstrating a blatant disregard for the safety of fellow officers.

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS
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The PPC found as mitigating circumstances:
Officer N later admitted during the investigation that they were untruthful and had completed a substance abuse program.
The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC and Officer N was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to request a hearing. Officer N’s misconduct ended their 24-year career.

Officer N’s Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Police Certifications were Revoked.
NEW & NOTEWORTHY ITEMS

◊ **Updates to Denial/Revocation Standards take effect August 1, 2017**

As of August 1, 2017 the new denial, revocation, and suspension standards are in effect. DPSST has developed a training to help our constituent partners and members of the public navigate the changes to the standards that govern the denial, revocation and suspension of criminal justice certifications in Oregon. The training is approximately 33 minutes in length and includes instructions on how to add this training event to a DPSST Training Record. (NOTE: This training has not been updated to reflect the implementation of this rule. However, the content of the training is still valid.)

The video can be viewed by searching for DPSST Professional Standards on YouTube or by copying this link: https://youtu.be/kMY8ikzMm2M

The new standards can be viewed in PDF form by clicking this link or going to DPSST’s homepage and selecting New Criminal Justice Denial/Revocation Standards & Processes.

Any questions or concerns about any of these recommendations can be directed to DPSST Administrative Rules Coordinator Jennifer Howald (503-378-2432/Jennifer.Howald@state.or.us) or Professional Standards Division Director Linsay Hale (503-378-2427/Linsay.Hale@state.or.us).
Our mission is to promote excellence in public safety by delivering quality training and developing and upholding professional standards for police, fire, corrections, parole and probation, and telecommunications personnel, in addition to licensing private security providers and private investigators in Oregon.

DPSST also regulates and licenses polygraph examiners, determines sheriff candidates’ eligibility to run for office and provides staffing for the Public Safety Memorial Fund. We strive to provide resources and certification programs that public safety officers and local public safety organizations need to maintain the highest professional skill standards, stewardship and service to Oregon’s communities and citizens. These services are based at our 236-acre academy and extend across the state through a network of regional training coordinators.

Agency functions are guided by several Oregon Revised Statutes and our authority is defined specifically in Chapter No. 259 of the Oregon Administrative Rules. We are governed by a 24-member Board and five discipline-specific policy committees; we serve more than 41,000 public safety constituents across the state.

Contact Information

Linsay Hale Professional Standards Division Director
Phone: 503-378-2427
Email: linsay.hale@oregon.state.us

Kristen Hibberds Professional Standards Investigator/Coordinator
Phone: 503-378-6702
Email: kristen.hibberds@state.or.us

Katrina Robson Professional Standards Investigator/Coordinator
Phone: 503-378-2305
Email: katrina.robson@state.or.us

To view the Oregon Administrative Rules for Criminal Justice please visit:
http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_200/oar_259/259_008.html