



Integrity Bulletin

Volume 13

February 2011

Special Points of Interest

- Page 1, Good Moral Character
- Page 2, NDI Database
- Page 3, Domestic Violence
- Page 4, What Would It Take to Persuade You to Abandon Your Values
- Page 4, Council Rescinds Position
- Page 5, Teaching Professionalism
- Page 6, Trust Involves Character and Competence
- Page 6, Federal Misconduct Case
- Page 8, Garrity & POST Actions
- Page 8, POST Character Form
- Page 9, Demonstrating Moral Leadership

IDAHO PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

Note From the POST Administrator

This 2011 edition of the POST Integrity Bulletin will focus on some of the basic tenants of ethics and good moral character. We have researched various sources available to assist Idaho's agency administrators and officers, alike, in acquiring additional training in moral behavior. We hope the information herein will bring more attention on our abilities to deter official misconduct, improve the public's perception of our law enforcement, correctional, probation and juvenile officers in Idaho, and promote responsible, ethical discourse within your agency or department.



“Good Moral Character”

The provision of peace officers being held to a standard of “good moral character” is relative to many of the states in our nation. “It is well establish, ‘a state can require high standards of qualification for a profession such as good moral character, as long as it has a rational connections to the applicants’ fitness or capacity (especially when discussing a “true profession” like law, medicine or law enforcement where ethics should be the most minimal of qualifications).” It is a term that has been enacted by almost every state as a standard for background investigations, since 1974. A key factor in determining what is and is not “good character,” relies on associating the behavior displayed to the “job-relatedness” of the character issue. In Idaho, the language of this provision is addressed in IDAPA 11.11.01.054 “Character”, where [t]he POST Council may take into consideration the commission of any act or offense involving moral turpitude to ensure an applicant is of good moral character and warrants the public trust. The purpose of this requirement is to prohibit persons who engage in dishonest, unprofessional, unethical, or immoral conduct from becoming law enforcement officers, and to protect against acts or conduct which may endanger the safety and welfare of the public. (4-2-03)”

So what determines “good moral character”? This is a term that many public institutions use in there statutory provisions or administrative rules, but few attempt to provide a definition for, as they leave it for the courts or agency disciplinary actions to determine. For instance, in Idaho law and administrative rule, the term “good moral character” has been used by the Board of

I hope I shall always possess firmness and virtue enough to maintain what I consider the most enviable of all titles, the character of an “Honest Man”.
George Washington



Decertification Matters:

Drug Use & Lying	Pg 2
Unlawful Sex and Code of Ethics	Pg 2
Felony Conviction #1	Pg 3
Involvement with Felon and Lying	Pg 3
Felony Conviction #2	Pg 3
Intimidating Witness	Pg 3
Misrepresentation & Lying	Pg 3
Code of Ethics	Pg 4

(Continued on Page 7)

The National Decertification Index (NDI) — DOJ/IADLEST Database —

For the past 10 years, the U.S. Department of Justice and the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST), the association of the 50 state POST Directors, have been developing a database of decertified officers to aid the effort to prevent officers determined to be “bad cops” from becoming “Gypsy Cops”, moving from department to department and state to state. The database, administered by IADLEST, is called the *National Decertification Index* database (NDI). The database is available to the POST directors, and is a tool to be referenced during background investigation checks by state and local agencies. At the present time, 26 states are regular contributors to the NDI database, and it has been accessed by nearly 46 states for background investigation purposes.

POST encourages Idaho law enforcement agencies to make NDI checks a mandatory part of their pre-employment background investigation process. NDI has a proven track-record in stopping the “Gypsy Cop” phenomenon from occurring in other states. At the present time, NDI Checks must be conducted through the state POST agency.

Idaho law enforcement agencies can make NDI checks by going to the POST website and clicking on the “Professional Standards” portal, and selecting the “NDI Checks” portal. Complete the required information on the portal; the information will be forwarded to POST Certification staff. POST staff will conduct the NDI Check and respond back to the agency background investigator.

A “hit” on the NDI database only provides the name of referencing state that entered information on the officer and contact information for investigators to acquire more information regarding the reason for entry into the NDI system. It is the responsibility of the agency conducting background investigations to contact the referencing state for further information.

The NDI system is only a tool in the effort to ensure a professional criminal justice system. It is the employing agency’s responsibility to determine what efforts should be taken to demonstrate adequate and reasonable hiring practices in hiring law enforcement officers worthy of serving the public.

Decertification Actions

Incident #1 Drug Use and Lying

Deputy illegally obtained Hydrocodone drug-medication over a period of time from the jail. In the course of the POST decertification investigation, a POST subpoena was issued for both the state criminal and agency administrative investigations. It was determined the deputy admitted that over an 11-month period of time, the deputy used Hydrocodone on a regular basis while on-duty as a detention officer. The deputy had illegally obtained the drug from two jail nurses who were also found complicit in the activity. The investigations also revealed the deputy initially lied during to investigators, but eventually admitted to the drug use and possession. It was estimated that the deputy obtained 440 to 500 Hydrocodone pills from the jail during the 11 months. The deputy was terminated from her employment. The deputy told POST investigators that she did not deny what she was accused of, and voluntarily signed a stipulation agreement for decertification.

Incident #2 Unlawful Sexual Conduct, Violation of Law Enforcement Code of Ethics

Two Juvenile Probation Officers engaged in sexual relations on at least two occasion inside the county probation offices in two separate communities. Both initially denied having sexual relations while on-duty; and that the sexual activity took place after completing home visits of probationers, while off-duty. During the POST decertification investigation, one of the probation officers admitted to questions regarding the sexual activity. The other probation officer admitted to the sexual activity during the agency internal investigation. One probation officer voluntarily signed a stipulation agreement for decertification.



Domestic Violence

As has been illustrated in national criminal justice reports, domestic violence among peace officers is rising to troubling proportions and Idaho has not been immune to the incidence of this activity. Over the past two years, the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) has been charged with investigating several cases of peace officer involved domestic violence. While many of these cases involve misdemeanor criminal charges, some relate to uncharged conduct. Regardless of judicial interest in these cases, OPR scrutinizes the facts and circumstances, including potential federal prohibition against gun possession, attending every case. POST encourages agencies to utilize their resources and influence to assist officers who appear to be in jeopardy of falling into the realm of domestic violence.

Decertification Actions (Continued from Page 2)

Incident #3 Felony Conviction

Police Officer convicted of felony injury to children. Officer was sentenced to a minimum term of three years and an indeterminate term of confinement not to exceed seven years. The officer was decertified by the POST Council for his conviction under IDAPA provision 11.11.01.091.02.(3)(a).

Incident #4 Involvement with Convicted Felon and Lying

County Deputy was intimately involved with convicted felon on felony probation, and lied about the involvement when confronted by Internal Affairs. The deputy and felon had travelled out of state together. The deputy encouraged the felon to mislead her probation officer regarding the relationship and that she had been living with the deputy for a period of time. During the investigation, the deputy voluntarily signed a stipulation agreement for decertification.

Incident #5 Felony Conviction

Corrections Officer convicted of felony sexual abuse of a child under sixteen years of age. Officer was sentenced to a fixed term of four years and a subsequent indeterminate term of eight years. The officer was decertified by the POST Council for his conviction under IDAPA provision 11.11.01.091.02.(3)(a).

Incident #6 Intimidating a Witness

Corrections Officer was married, and she believed her daughter was going to testify against the officer's husband in a criminal case involving sexual relations with the daughter. The officer did willfully influence and/or intimidate the daughter in an attempt to prevent the daughter from testifying fully and truthfully. The officer told her daughter to testify the crime was committed when the daughter was an adult, and that she had consensual sex with the husband. The Officer was criminally charged and plead guilty to Intimidating a Witness, a violation of Idaho Code 18-2604.

Incident #7 False Misrepresentation & Lying During Investigation

County Deputy misrepresented himself as a narcotic detective in order to improperly obtain undercover "loaner" cars from a local car dealership. The IA. investigation also found the deputy falsely claimed to have made a down payment in connection with a vehicle purchase from the dealership. The deputy obtained three vehicles and was attempting to obtain another vehicle. Deputy was found to be untruthful in his response regarding the down payment. When interviewed during the POST decertification investigation, the deputy he had "done things that would have cause[d] his certification to be pulled." The deputy voluntarily signed a stipulation agreement for decertification.



What would it take to persuade you to abandon your values?

Arizona The officer was a frequent user of inappropriate and offensive language in the workplace. He commonly used derogatory terms that implicated race, national origin, sexual orientation, immigration status and mental capacity. He also misused city computers to distribute political, offensive and/or inappropriate emails, after having been previously disciplined for the same conduct. The Arizona POST Board adopted a Consent Agreement that called for a one year suspension of his peace officer certification for misfeasance and malfeasance in office and conduct that tends to jeopardize public trust in the profession.

Oregon An officer resigned during an investigation after being accused of enticing a youth on the internet. The officer was subsequently convicted in the State of Idaho of Enticing of Children over the Internet, a felony crime. The officer was served a Notice of Intent to Revoke Certifications, and failed to make a timely request for a hearing. The officer's misconduct ended his 16-year career, and his Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Corrections Certificates were revoked.

Utah A deputy was employed as a law enforcement officer for a Sheriff's Office. A complaint was made against the deputy alleging he had an extra-marital relationship with complainant's wife, while complainant was deployed with the military. During a POST investigation, the deputy admitted to engaging in on-duty sexual relations with complainant's wife. The deputy also admitted that he had an on-duty sexual relationship with his current wife, when he was previously married to another woman. The deputy signed a consent agreement for the revocation of his peace officer certification. POST Council ratified the conditions of the consent agreement.

California Former Highway Patrol officer convicted after dismissing a speeding ticket in exchange for sex, was sentenced to two years in state prison. *Peo. v. Abram Anthony Carabajal*, #SCN259352, Super. Ct. San Diego Co. (2010).

POST COUNCIL RESCINDS POSITION

On February 3, 2011, POST Council rescinded a previous waiver decision regarding the affect of "wobbler provisions" on felony convictions from other states and Idaho peace officer certification. The Council directed they will only offer future consideration to a felony offense, if the offense has been decriminalized by the sentencing state, and only if the act would not have been a felony if the act was committed in Idaho.

Incident #8 Violation of Law Enforcement Code of Ethics

While on duty, the officer sent sexually explicit images from his cell phone to the cell phone of a female whom he had previously encountered during a DUI traffic stop. The female was a passenger in the vehicle stopped for investigation of DUI. During the POST investigation, the officer's agency internal investigation was reviewed. The officer's sent images of a male masturbating from his cell phone to the female's cell phone. The investigation confirmed the female received the officer's video message. The female showed the video to a friend, who reported the matter to the employing agency.

POST alleged the officer violated the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics adopted by the POST Council under IDAPA Rule 11.11.01.091.04. subsections (a) "I shall conduct myself at all times in a manner that does not damage or have the likely result of damaging or bringing the public image, or reputation of my department or myself into discredit or disrepute"; and (e) "I shall willfully observe and obey the lawful verbal and written rules, duties, policies, procedures, and practices of my department. I shall also subordinate my personal preferences and work priorities to the lawful verbal and written rules, duties, policies, procedures and practices of my department, as well as to the lawful orders and directives of supervisors and superior command personnel of my department. . . Direct, tacit, or constructive refusal to do so is insubordination."

During the POST investigation, the officer voluntarily signed a stipulation agreement for decertification.



Teaching Professionalism To Our Recruits and Officers

A few weeks ago, I sat in a training meeting during a national conference and participated in previewing a new reality television program about law officers in the United States. It was the first time I had previewed a television program before its release to the public. There were many law enforcement leaders in the room watching the preview, and I wondered what each of them thought after the 30 minute preview. It was the first time I sat in a meeting with this association, and it's because I was reluctant to voice my thoughts after the program ended, that I write about it now.

Like many reality television programs about law enforcement, the events shown were actual interactions of law enforcement officers with the public we serve and the criminal element we pursue. There was the action of the chase; the sadness of the human condition that victims of crime find themselves in; the compassion of the officers; and special tactics that law enforcement uses to perform its duties. What continues to astound me in the development of such programs, is the lack of concern towards the professional image of law enforcement by those allowing the use of their officers and those producing the programs. I thought to myself, "Where's Jack Webb?"

I've found every reality "cop show" has two things in common. First, tactically, they're not necessarily the type of programming that academy police trainers prefer basic police recruits and new officers to view; and second, the professional ethics that law enforcement agencies strive to achieve and display to the public goes right out the window — through the actions or language used by the officers being filmed. The preview shown was typical in this regard. However, the producer's focus was not to worry about my concerns with such programming; his were showing the difficulties that law enforcement faces, today, in trying to keep citizens safe, manage the political realities, the fiscal constraints, and conditions law enforcement faces working in the field. While the tactics shown were not too bad from a training viewpoint, what did ruin the preview, for me, was the consistent profanity used by officers in their interactions on the screen.

As trainers, we strive to teach our officers to act professionally during their duties and interactions with others. This philosophy is commonplace for chiefs, sheriffs and administrators throughout the United States; and is fundamental for law enforcement academies and the training curricula we present. Officers are taught that good communication skills are the primary resource to deactivate tense situations. Academies do not have an evaluation criteria during written or practical testing that provides positive ratings for the use of profane or abusive language. You would fail a practical exercise for such conduct. We all know the words chosen by an officer can either demonstrate professionalism or lead to public condemnation and discipline. It appears that we are not getting this professional communication message through to officers, and it's reflected, all too often, by officers chosen to participate in reality programs. A producers' sense of reality and ratings will always supersede law enforcement's positive public image.

As more and more law enforcement agencies become involved with television producers, we encourage you to have a plan on how you're going to allow your officers to be projected. Issues to consider: (1) What the officers do is a direct reflection upon the department's image; (2) The department image is a direct reflection upon the policies of the agency administrator; (3) The agency administrator's vision is directly impacted by public perception of the department and community standards; (4) The mind of every child or adult watching reality programs about law enforcement officers is impacted positively or negatively by what they see. If they are offensive, what will the public say to your councils or commissions; and what will your councils or commissions say about your ability to administer the agency?

Where does professionalism lie? One answer may be, strive to teach and demand proper language from your officers . . . at all times. If they are considered officers 24-hours a day, then their conduct should reflect that premise when in the public presence. The image of the police is subject to constant scrutiny. We should demand better communication skills from officers during the scope of their duties. Reality shows tend to blur the public's perception of law enforcement's commitment to professionalism.



Michael Josephson Commentary

705.1

Trust Involves Character and Competence

Today, I want to talk about the qualities that generate trust. I'm talking about being trustworthy, not trusting others. There's a relationship between the two concepts, but a decision to trust another is a choice, not a moral obligation.

Being trustworthy is an indispensable aspect of good character. We should always act so as to be worthy of trust – not because it's wise to do so but because it's the right way to live.

Being worthy of trust entails two qualities: character and competence.

The attribute we first associate with trustworthy behavior is integrity. This aspect of good character is demonstrated through scrupulous honesty and moral courage. If we want people to trust us or our organization, they must believe we will consistently do the right thing regardless of circumstances or pressures.

Other aspects of character include accountability and fairness. People trust those who accept responsibility for their choices and don't palm off blame to others. It's also important to be regarded as fundamentally fair.

In business, confidence in character is not enough to justify trust. In this case, trust also involves the conviction that the person or organization will successfully do what is expected. This competency dimension embraces faith in ability, knowledge, and judgment as well as the belief that the person or organization will be reliable and responsive. Reliability is established through diligence and follow-through while responsiveness involves respectful communication and demonstrated concern.

This is Michael Josephson reminding you that character counts.

FEDERAL CASE OF MISCONDUCT

Former Kershaw County, South Carolina, Sheriff's Department Officer Found Guilty for Using Excessive Force on Detainee

(February 4, 2011)

WASHINGTON – A federal jury in Columbia, S.C., convicted Oddie Tribble, 51, a former officer with the Kershaw County, S.C., Sheriff's Office, of a civil rights violation for his use of excessive force on a man in his custody on Aug. 5, 2010.

According to evidence presented in court, Tribble struck Charles Shelley, 38, a handcuffed arrestee, more than 25 times with a metal baton, lacerating his skin and fracturing his leg. The assault was captured by video cameras at the Kershaw County Detention Center. Eyewitnesses to the beating, including law enforce-

ment officers, testified that they were shocked to see the unjustified attack by a police officer.

“The jury’s verdict demonstrates that no one is above the law, and that those who are sworn to protect our citizens will be held accountable when they violate the public trust and abuse the rights of individuals in their custody,” said Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division. “Let's be clear, the reason the jury found Oddie Tribble guilty is that he used a metal baton to beat a handcuffed man who posed no threat. The jury's verdict shows that South Carolina will not tolerate misconduct by our law enforcement officers.” Sentencing is scheduled for May 12, 2011. Tribble faces a maximum sentence of 10 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine.



Good Moral Character, *(Continued from page 1)*

Accountancy as “the lack of a history of dishonest dealings or a felonious act.” Under Idaho Accountancy Rules, 020 — Demonstrating Good Moral Character, under subsection 02. Evidence: Prima facie evidence of a lack of good moral character includes, but is not limited to: (a) Any deferred prosecution agreement involving admission of wrongdoing, or any criminal conviction, including conviction following a guilty plea or plea of nolo contendere, for any felony or any crime, an essential element of which is fraud, dishonesty, or deceit, or any other crime which evidences an unfitness of the applicant to provide professional services in a competent manner and consistent with the public safety; (b) Revocation of any license or other authority to practice by or before any state, federal, foreign or other licensing or regulatory authority; or (c) Any act which would be grounds for revocation or suspension of a license if committed by a licensee of the Board.

Under 54-915, Idaho Code, Qualifications, states, “[n]o person hereafter shall be eligible for licensure to practice dentistry or dental hygiene in this state unless the applicant: Is of good moral character and has not pled guilty to or been convicted of any felony, or of any misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, unless the person demonstrates that he has been sufficiently rehabilitated to warrant the public trust.”

In Ohio Revised Code, Section 4701.01, subsection (V) (1) for accountants, "good moral character" means the combination of personal traits of honesty, integrity, attention to duty, forthrightness, and self-restraint that enables a person to discharge the duties of the accounting profession fully and faithfully. Subsection (2) states, “A history of dishonest acts or felonious acts or convictions is sufficient to prove lack of good moral character if that history demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that the person lacks one or more of the personal traits referred to in division (V)(1) of this section. A person who has a felony conviction related to one or more of these personal traits bears the burden of establishing the person's present good moral character, including the person's full and complete rehabilitation subsequent to the conviction.

The State of Michigan defines “good moral character” by the “Good Moral Character Act” as “the propensity on the part of the person to serve the public in the licensed area in a fair, honest, and open manner.”



Good Moral Character for use by law enforcement, and by the very laws we protect, should include, but not be limited to, the primary character attributes we demand within our profession: honesty; integrity; truthfulness; [fairness; attention to duty;] obedience to the law; obedience to the oath of office; obedience to our code of ethics and code of conduct; respect for authority; respect for the rights of all individuals regardless of age, race, gender, religion, disabilities, sexual preference, political beliefs, or attitudes towards the conduct and responsibilities of law enforcement.⁴

Notes:

1. *Dixon v. McMillian*, 527 F.Supp. 711, at 721(N.D. Texas 1981); *Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 249, 77 S.Ct. 752, at 761 (1957).
2. Leonard Territo, C.R. Swanson, Jr., and Neil C. Chamelin, *The Police Personnel Selection Process*, the Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1977, pp 4-6.
3. William C. Smith, “*Of Conduct and Good Character: Miscellaneous Legal Considerations In the Decertification of Law Enforcement Officers*,” IADLSET, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 1990, p.5.
4. “*Sample Policy on Character and Reputation of Sworn and Non-Sworn Employees*”, Flink, William L., Law Enforcement Legal Defense Manual, p.26, (Spring 1998).

OPR Statistics For 2010-2011

CASES OPENED 51

CASES CLOSED 45

OF THE CASES CLOSED:

REVOLKED 35

UNSUSTAINED 01

NO ACTION 09

PENDING CASES: 31

Of the 31 pending cases: 12 are under review to determine whether POST will take action, 14 are under investigation, and 6 are awaiting legal proceedings.

POST Core Values

- Customer Service
- Innovation
- Collaboration
- Ethical Conduct
- Integrity

Garrity and POST Actions

Recently, POST investigations changed in manner that cases are conducted and hearings will be held. Under administrative law, government agencies conducting administrative investigations are Constitutionally-clothed with the ability to legally coerce statements, for administrative purposes, from individuals employed by or under the authority of the governing agency.

Every Idaho peace officer or individual holding POST certification falls under the authority of the POST Council. Under IDAPA 11.11.01.91.02, Rules of Peace Officer Standards and Training Council, all certificates issued by POST are the property of the POST Council. When POST decertifies an officer, all certifications are revoked.

Officers under investigation for conduct alleged to be in violation of POST ethical and conduct standards will be provided an administrative (Garrity) warning prior to being interviewed, and interviews will occur at the most efficient and effective time during the POST investigation. By applying this administrative tool, and in coercing statements, those who are provided the warning are protected from criminal prosecution using the information obtained in from such coerced interview statements. After being provided an administrative warning, individuals do not have a Constitutional right to refuse to answer questions, and must answer questions truthfully. If the individual provides false information after being given an administrative warning, additional administrative charges can be rendered against the individual.

This procedure has resulted in an expedited decertification process. In addition to the investigatory use of an administrative warning, should POST cases go to an administrative hearing, officers may be subject to an additional administrative warning during their testimony before the hearing officer.

These procedural efforts have lead POST towards more effective action when responding to allegations of ethical misconduct against peace officers. Administrative warnings are only tools, and their use is designed to strengthen the administrative process while offering Fifth Amendment protection from incriminating statements during POST's investigatory and hearing process.



Recent Articles Advocating Law Enforcement Professionalism

“What Every Police Chief Should Know About Electronic Control Devices,” *Craig E. Ferrell Jr., Deputy Director, Major Cities Chiefs General Counsel, Chiefs Command/Legal Services, Houston Police Department, Houston, Texas, The Police Chief, December 2010, p.12*

“Sexualized and Derogatory Language in the Workplace,” *ISSN 1935-007, AELE Monthly Law Journal, 2011 (2) AELA Mo. L. J. 201, Employment Law Section, February 2011*
<http://www.aele.org/lae/2011all02/2011-02MLJ201.pdf>

“Understanding the Psychology of Police Misconduct,” *Brian D. Fitch, The Police Chief, January 2011, pg: 24–27, <http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/naylor/CPIM0111/#/24>*

Justice Delayed Is Justice Denied: A Call For Rethinking The Way Departments Present Criminal Prosecutions Against Their Own Members,” *Michael P. Stone, Esq., American Police Beat, February 2011, <http://apbweb.com/court-rulings-news-menu-100/1227-justice-delayed-is-justice-denied-a-call-for-rethinking-the-way-departments-present-criminal-prosecutions-of-their-own-members.html>*

POST Character Form

The POST Council has reinstated the Drug/Honesty Form into the certification application process in an effort intended to compliment an agency's background investigation procedures. The POST form is now called **“Disclosure Form: Character”**. After a lapse in use and with some modifications, the form has been reintroduced as a method to determine, to some degree, an applicant's “Character” and bring some recognition to POST's IDAPA Rule 11.11.01.054. on CHARACTER, *“The POST Council may take into consideration the commission of any act or offense involving moral turpitude to ensure an applicant is of good moral character and warrants the public trust. The purpose of this requirement is to prohibit persons who engage in dishonest, unprofessional, unethical, or immoral conduct from becoming law enforcement officers, and to protect against acts or conduct which may endanger the safety and welfare of the public.”* The form will be included in all POST applications for peace officer certification. The POST Council will continue to refine guidelines for the use of the form. Staff will collaborate with the Waiver Hearing Board, if unable waive disclosures.

Idaho Peace Officer Standards and Training
700 South Stratford Drive
Meridian, Idaho 83642
Tel. (208) 884-7250, Fax (208) 884-7295

INTEGRITY BULLETIN
A PUBLICATION OF POST'S
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

William L. Flink
POST Division Administrator
Michael Dillon
Manager, Office of Professional Responsibility
Tel. (208) 884-7324
Fax (208) 884-7295
mike.dillon@post.idaho.gov

The Idaho Legislature formally established the Idaho Peace Officers Standards and Training Council (POST Council) for the purpose, among others, of setting requirements for employment, retention, and training of peace officers, including formulating standards of moral character, and other such matters as relate to the competence and reliability of peace officers. The POST Council also has the power to decertify peace officers upon findings that a peace officer is in violation of certain specified standards, including criminal offenses, or violation of any of the standards of conduct as established by the Council's Code of Ethics. Idaho Code also requires that when a peace officer resigns his employment or is terminated as a result of any disciplinary action, the employing law enforcement agency shall report the employment action to the POST Council within 30 days.

—IDAPA 11, Title 11, Chapter 01

POST's Office of Professional Responsibility

The Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) is one of three bureaus within the Idaho Division of Peace Officer Standards and Training. OPR is staffed by OPR Manager Mike Dillon, former FBI Supervisory Special Agent, and ten contract investigators from throughout the State of Idaho. All of the investigators are former federal, state and local law enforcement officers. POST investigators endeavor to complete thorough, competent investigations to ensure the entire story is presented during the reporting of allegations against peace officers and others we certify. It is a mainstay of POST's mission to maintain an ethical and lawful law enforcement profession for the people of Idaho.



Demonstrating Moral Leadership

As you know, leadership is about leading others and influencing them to behave a particular way. Moral leadership requires you to always look at what is right and lead others towards that. Moral choices come from a person's character as well, they do not always come about by rational thinking. This makes moral leadership more difficult, as there is a personal characteristic that must be evident to onlookers to believe choices are in fact moral ones. Directions that a moral leader takes do not always please the most people, and so it is often counter to what people think a leader ought to do. Leading by popularity and influence alone will not typically create a moral path, and the sacrifices that must be made around moral dilemmas are often costly ones in terms of popularity, fame or wealth.

With morality formed by different sets of values and principles, it is often difficult to truly have agreed upon standards, and so moral dilemmas do not always have a clear right and a clear wrong. Moral dilemmas also often face a decision where there are two competing goods. One must choose based on the greater good, in this case defined by their own principles and standards.

However challenging moral leadership may seem, it also brings about an opportunity to be a leader of morality. Can you look at your decisions and actions and say that you do so by a moral standard? Do you demonstrate decisions based on what you know to be right regardless of the circumstances or influence it might bring about? Let me suggest that you start with considering your own moral ground. What principles do you want to demonstrate when leading? Are those principles known to your followers? Would your decisions be based on what is right for others? Do your decisions promote respect to others and do you practice servant leadership? It's these types of actions that most would agree are for the greater good and for what is right.

An excerpt from "Do You Demonstrate Moral Leadership", LearnThis, Mike King, August 10, 2009, <http://learnthis.ca/2009/08/do-you-demonstrate-moral-leadership/>

The fact that man knows right from wrong proves his intellectual superiority to other creatures; but the fact that he can do wrong proves his moral inferiority to any creature that cannot.

~Mark Twain