POLICE OFFICER CERTIFICATION REVOCATION INFORMATION SHARING: NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER DECERTIFICATION DATABASE

2009 SURVEY OF POST AGENCIES REGARDING CERTIFICATION PRACTICES

RAYMOND A. FRANKLIN
MATTHEW HICKMAN
MARC HILLER

JULY, 2009

Performing Organization:	**Sponsoring Organization:**
International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST) 6852 4th Street Sykesville, Maryland 21784	U.S. Department of Justice – Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Assistance 810 7th Street NW Washington, DC 20531

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 2
CERTIFICATION, REVOCATION AND INFORMATION SHARING 3
SURVEY METHODOLOGY 5
KEY FINDINGS 6
SURVEY RESULTS BY QUESTION 9
SURVEY RESULTS BY STATE 18
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 45
APPENDICES 47
APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTER
APPENDIX B – SURVEY DISTRIBUTION LIST

INTRODUCTION

The 2009 Survey of POST Agencies Regarding Certification Practices was administered as part of the USDOJ funded Police Officer Certification Revocation Information Sharing: National Public Safety Officer Decertification Database project of the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST). The survey was conducted by graduate students enrolled in the 'Criminal Justice Research Methods' course in the Department of Criminal Justice at Seattle University, under the direction of SU Professor Matt Hickman.

The purpose of the Decertification Database project is to reduce interstate itinerancy of peace officers who have been decertified for cause (i.e., misconduct, either criminally adjudicated or administratively sanctioned). The project proposes to facilitate interstate access to information retained by peace officer standards and training (POST) agencies within the United States.

An important part of the project effort is to establish current information regarding state certification practices, methods of information management, and to identify impediments to the sharing of revocation action related information. Other project activities include the convening of a national symposium and development and operation of a pilot interstate database system.

The 2009 survey follows a similar 2005 effort conducted under the auspices of the National Decertification Index project funded by Grant No. 2005-DD-BX-1119 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

CERTIFICATION, REVOCATION AND INFORMATION SHARING

Certification is the process by which law enforcement officers are licensed in their respective jurisdictions, establishing the satisfaction of selection, training and continuing performance standards. While most states currently provide such a system of licensure, no comprehensive, national study has yet been performed of these processes.

Decertification is the loss of certification for a variety of reasons, which vary among the several states. Revocation, or decertification for cause, is generally understood to mean the loss of certification due to misconduct, through the action of a state POST Board or Commission. Again, no comprehensive survey of authority and practice in this regard has ever been performed.

POST agencies, in the furtherance of these tasks, maintain record keeping systems. A variety of means have been devised, ranging from manual cards to elaborate, commercially available electronic database management systems. Regardless of the method employed, POST agencies generally do an adequate job of identifying prior loss of certification and thus prevent in-state rehire of problem officers. Unfortunately, no formal system has existed for the automated interchange of such information among the states, thus preventing rehire in another state. This informational shortcoming has long been recognized and several solutions have been proposed. IADLEST has taken a leading role with the establishment of its Peace Officer Registry Committee, which has responsibility for developing a nationally accessible database to serve as a clearinghouse for persons decertified as law enforcement officers for cause.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Law Enforcement and Correctional Officers Employment Registration Act of 1996 proposed a comprehensive national registry for all police officers. Introduced in the 104th Congress as S. 492 by Sen. Bob Graham (D. Fl). and H.R. 3263 by Rep. Harry Johnson (D. Fl) the bill enjoyed the endorsement of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) and IACP, however was never reported out of committee. In spite of this failure, FDLE initiated a National Officer Clearinghouse pilot program. Promoted as a voluntary and non-intrusive pointer system, it attracted some interest and participation before being terminated in 2000 in the light of a newly unveiled IADLEST effort. In June of 1999, the database contained some 129,224 records.

An IADLEST sponsored pilot effort commenced in July of 1999, under the auspices of the Peace Officer Registry Committee and within the scope of the POSTNet Information Access and Exchange System, a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice - Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS). Designed as a decertification pointer system, operation commenced in February of 2000. In early 2000, the DOJ Office of Justice Programs expressed interest in supporting the development of a comprehensive, fully operational, national certification data repository. IADLEST responded with a grant application, largely organized by the Idaho Peace Officer Standards and Training Council. It was subsequently disapproved.

While COPS Office funding of the IADLEST POST-Net Information System effort was renewed in 2002, the new cooperative agreement specifically excluded continued operation and development of the National Decertification Index component. COPS cited unspecified legal concerns as the reason for the decision. IADLEST has independently continued the NDI pilot effort, although additional development has been significantly limited.

In 2004, the Bureau of Justice Assistance expressed interest in supporting the study of existing certification information management practices, issues of data sharing and management, and further development of the pilot system. IADLEST responded with a comprehensive grant application. On September 16, 2005, the Bureau of Justice Assistance approved the current grant.

In 2006, the Bureau of Justice Assistance renewed funding for the Police Officer Certification Revocation Information Sharing Initiative. Operations have continued through no-cost extensions of the current funding.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The present survey included all U.S. peace officer standards and training (POST) agencies. Currently, all states with the exception of Hawaii maintain POST commissions, boards or equivalent entities. The Honolulu Police Department, the largest law enforcement entity in that state, provided a survey response. Additionally, the District of Columbia Police Training and Standards Board was surveyed.

An e-mail pre-notification of the survey was sent out to the directors of all POST agencies (or equivalent) on April 15, 2009, and a hard-copy of the survey was mailed via U.S. Postal Service on the same day. Sixty-three percent of the surveys were returned within 4 weeks of the initial mail-out. A follow up e-mail encouraging directors to respond to the survey was sent on May 13, 2008. Telephone, fax, and e-mail follow-up with non-responding agencies continued over the course of approximately 45 days thereafter. Data collection was completed on June 30, 2009. The response rate was 100%.

Raw data were transmitted electronically to Raymond A. Franklin, Project Director. Quantification and analysis of data were then conducted utilizing both survey management data processing applications and manual calculation methods.

KEY FINDINGS

CERTIFICATION AND REVOCATION AUTHORITY AND ACTIVITY

Forty-five POST entities reported having the authority to certify or license law enforcement officers. All except the New Jersey Police Training Commission and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services reported the ability to revoke that license. The most common basis for revocation was felony conviction. Thirty-six entities also reported the authority to revoke for conviction of certain misdemeanors. Twenty-six reporting agencies reported the ability to administratively revoke a certificate for misconduct. Thirty-one states also reported the authority to temporarily suspend a certificate. All POST agencies, with the exception of the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board, reported that officers were afforded due process through hearing or appeal.

According to the 2000 IADLEST Sourcebook, a periodic study of POST agency data, 43 of the current POST agencies were established between 1959 and 1976. Rarely, has revocation authority existed from POST inception. Approximately half of all POSTs with revocation authority gained it in the 1970s, with inception ranging from 1967 to 2005.

A bare majority (23) of states with certification authority reported that certain personnel were excepted from the state certification process. These personnel often included elected sheriffs, and other less common exceptions include chiefs of police, state police and reserve officers.

Three respondents, the North Carolina Criminal Justice Education and Training Standards Commission, the South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy and the Rhode Island Municipal Police Training Academy reported that another state agency had authority to certify and decertify certain classes of law enforcement officers (the North Carolina Sheriffs Education and Training Standards Commission, the Providence Police Department [Providence law enforcement officers only] and the South Carolina State Law Enforcement Division, respectively).

Many of the agencies surveyed reported the authority to certify other public safety personnel. Twenty-three had the authority to certify correctional officers, 21 certify parole/probation personnel and 15 certify dispatchers or police communications personnel.

Since the inception of revocation authority, over 19,100 law enforcement officers had their certificates revoked for misconduct by U.S. POST agencies. In 2008 alone, over 1,500 officers were revoked for cause.

Over 16,000 of the identified revocations were conducted in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina and Texas. All other states provided approximately 3,100 actions.

CERTIFICATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

A majority of states (61 percent) reported use of an agency developed data management system to support the certification function. Thirty-two percent reported use of a commercial automated process (commonly the Skills Manager Personal Computer application marketed by Crown Pointe Software). Twenty percent reported the use of a manual card based system. Only the Arkansas Law Enforcement Training Academy and the Mississippi Peace Officer Standards and Training Board reported use of a card based system to the exclusion of a secondary automated data processing system since the previous survey.

The use of Social Security Number as a certification identifier decreased 26% from 2005 to 2009. The use of non-SSN related number or variation or modification of SSN increased 14% and 12% respectively over the four year period.

Forty respondents reported retention of records of denial of initial certification.

The vast majority of respondents with certification authority reported indefinite record retention requirements.

REVOCATION INFORMATION SHARING

Of those agencies with revocation authority, only one (the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services) reported a legislative prohibition to the sharing of revocation information.

Twenty-four POST agencies reported current data entry participation in the current pilot database, an increase of 16% from 2005. A 20% increase in the number of agencies currently querying the database was also reported. Notably, ten POST agencies reported routine query of the existing database system and nineteen agencies reported occasional query of the system, a 7% and 18% respective increase from 2005.

SURVEY RESULTS – BY QUESTION

Section A – Certification and Revocation Authority and Activity

Does your agency certify law enforcement officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005**
No	6	11.8	+2%
Yes	45	88.2	-2%
Total	51	100.0	

Forty-five of the 51 agencies surveyed (88%) indicated that their agency certifies law enforcement officers. **West Virginia no longer certifies their law enforcement officers.

Does your agency have the authority to revoke certification for cause?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	7	13.7	+2%
Yes	44	86.3	0%
Total	51	100.0	

What are the bases for revocation? Felony conviction

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	1	2.3	0%
Yes	43	97.7	0%
Total	44	100.0	

What are the bases for revocation? Misdemeanor Conviction

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	8	18.2	-27%
Yes	36	81.8	+27%
Total	44	100.0	

What are the bases for revocation? Administratively for misconduct

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	18	40.9	0%
Yes	26	59.1	0%
Total	44	100.0	

What are the bases for revocation? Failure to meet training/qualification requirements

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	15	34.1	-34%
Yes	29	65.9	+34%
Total	44	100.0	

What are the bases for revocation? Termination of employment

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	28	63.6	-0%
Yes	16	36.4	+0%
Total	44	100.0	

Forty-four agencies (or 86%) reported having the authority to revoke officer certification for cause. Among those 44 agencies, the bases for revocation included: Felony conviction (98% of agencies), misdemeanor conviction (82%), administratively for misconduct (59%), failure to meet training/qualification requirements (66%), and termination of employment (36%).

Statistics

	How many officers have had their certification revoked since authority was granted?	How many officers have had their certification revoked during CY 2008?
#	31	43
Missing	13	1
Sum	19139	1556

Thirty-one of the 44 agencies having authority to revoke certification were able to report the total number of officers who had their certification revoked since authority was granted. In sum, these agencies reported more than 19,000 officers whose certification had been revoked. During Calendar Year 2008, more than 1,500 officers had their certification revoked.

Do officers have the right to a hearing or appeal of revocation action?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	1	2.3	0%
Yes	43	97.7	0%
Total	44	100.0	

In all but one of the agencies having the authority to revoke certification, officers had the right to a hearing or appeal of the revocation action.

Can your agency temporarily suspend certification?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	13	29.5	+4%
Yes	31	70.5	-4%
Total	44	100.0	

Thirty-one of the agencies having the authority to revoke certification (or 71%) are able to temporarily suspend officer certification.

Are certain law enforcement officers excluded from certification requirements?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	21	47.7	-2%
Yes	23	52.3	+2%
Total	44	100.0	

In a little over half of the agencies having the authority to revoke certification, certain officers are excluded from certification requirements. These typically included elected Sheriffs and other heads of law enforcement agencies.

Does another state agency also certify/revoke law enforcement officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	42	95.5	0%
Yes	2	4.5	0%
Total	44	100.0	

In just two of the states having a POST agency with authority to revoke certification, another agency also had the authority to certify/revoke law enforcement officers.

Does your agency certify: Correctional Officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	28	54.9	-8%
Yes	23	45.1	+8%
Total	51	100.0	

Does your agency certify: Parole/Probation Officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	30	58.8	
Yes	21	41.2	0%
Total	51	100.0	

Does your agency certify: Private Security Officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	46	90.2	
Yes	5	9.8	+2%
Total	51	100.0	

Does your agency certify: Communications Personnel/Dispatchers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	36	70.6	
Yes	15	29.4	+8%
Total	51	100.0	

In addition to (or instead of) law enforcement officers, several agencies also certify other types of personnel. Twenty-three agencies (or 45%) certify correctional officers, 21 agencies (or 41%) certify parole/probation officers, 5 agencies (or 10%) certify private security officers, and 15 agencies (or 29%) certify communications personnel or dispatchers.

Section B – Certification Information Management

Does your agency use the following method: Card based manual system?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	35	79.5	-8%
Yes	9	20.5	+8%
Total	44	100.0	

Does your agency use the following method: Agency developed electronic data management system?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	17	38.6	0%
Yes	27	61.4	0%
Total	44	100.0	

Does your agency use the following method: Commercial electronic data management system

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	30	68.2	-2%
Yes	14	31.8	+2%
Total	44	100.0	

With regard to information management, most agencies (61%) relied on an agency-developed electronic data management system, followed by a commercial off-the-shelf product (32%), and/or card-based manual system (21%). (Agencies could select more than one option).

Does your agency number certification records for identification using?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
Social Security Number (SSN)	12	27.3	-26%
A variation or modification of SSN	6	13.6	+12%
A non-SSN related number	24	54.5	+14%
Agency does not number certification records for identification	2	4.5	+0%
Total	44	100.0	

The most common method for numbering certification records was a non-SSN related number (55%), followed by the officers SSN (27%). Fourteen percent of agencies used a variation or modification of the officer's SSN. NOTE: Some agencies reported using multiple methods.

How long are record maintained by your agency?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
Indefinitely	37	84.1	-11%
Specific time period	7	15.9	+11%
Total	44	100.0	

Eighty-four percent of agencies having authority to revoke certification reported maintaining certification records indefinitely.

Does your agency issue wallet cards or other pocket-sized proof of certification for officers?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	30	68.2	0%
Yes	14	31.8	0%
Total	44	100.0	

About a third (32%) of agencies having authority to revoke certification reported issuing wallet cards or other pocket-sized proof of certification for officers.

Does your agency maintain records of denial of initial certification?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	7	15.9	+7%
Yes	37	84.1	-7%
Total	44	100.0	

Eighty-four percent of agencies having authority to revoke certification reported that they maintain records of denial of initial certification.

Section C – Revocation Information Sharing

Is your agency legislatively prohibited from sharing revocation information?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	43	97.7	+11%
Yes	1	2.3	-11%
Total	44	100.0	

Only one agency having authority to revoke certification reported that they were legislatively prohibited from sharing revocation information.

Does your agency publish revocation actions?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	22	50.0	0%
Yes	22	50.0	0%
Total	44	100.0	

If yes to C3, Newspaper/Public Media?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	18	81.8	N/A
Yes	4	18.2	N/A
Total	22	100.0	

If yes to C3, Online?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	12	54.5	N/A
Yes	10	45.5	N/A
Total	22	100.0	

If yes to C3, Agency Publication?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	11	50.0	N/A
Yes	11	50.0	N/A
Total	22	100.0	

Half of agencies having authority to revoke certification publish their revocation actions. Among those agencies that publish revocation actions, 50% published the actions in an agency publication, 46% published actions online, and 18% published in newspapers or other public media. (Agencies could list multiple outlets).

Does your agency contribute to the IADLEST National Decertification Index (NDI)?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	20	45.5	-16%
Yes	24	54.5	+16%
Total	44	100.0	

Just over half (55%) of agencies having authority to revoke certification reported that they contribute to the IADLEST National Decertification Index (NDI).

Does your agency query the current IADLEST NDI?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
Routinely	10	22.7	+7%
Occasionally	19	43.2	+18%
Never	15	34.1	-25%
Total	44	100.0	

Two-thirds of agencies having authority to revoke certification reported either occasionally (43%) or routinely (23%) querying the current IADLEST NDI.

Does your agency issue NDI query-only accounts to law enforcement units under your jurisdiction?

	# of Agencies	Percent	% Change from 2005
No	38	86.4	N/A
Yes	5	11.4	N/A
Total	43	97.7	
Missing	1	2.3	
Total	44	100.0	

Five agencies having authority to revoke certification reported that they issue NDI query-only accounts to law enforcement units under their jurisdiction.

SURVEY RESULTS – BY STATE

Question A – 1: Does your agency certify law enforcement officers?

Alaska	Yes
Alabama	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
District of Columbia	No
Delaware	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	No
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	Yes
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	Yes
Massachusetts	No
Maryland	Yes
Maine	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Montana	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	Yes
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
West Virginia	No
Wyoming	Yes

Question A – 2: Does your agency have the authority to revoke certification for cause?

Alaska	Yes
Alabama	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
District of Columbia	No
Delaware	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	No
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	Yes
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	Yes
Massachusetts	No
Maryland	Yes
Maine	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Montana	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	No
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	No
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
West Virginia	Yes
Wyoming	Yes

Question A – 3: What are the bases of revocation? Check all that apply.

	Felony Conviction	Any Misdemeanor Conviction	Certain Misdemeanor Convictions	Administratively for misconduct	Failure to meet training requirements	Termination of employment
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Alabama	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Arizona	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Colorado	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
District of	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Florida	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Iowa	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Kansas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Massachusetts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Maine	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Missouri	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montana	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Nebraska	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Nevada	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oregon	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Utah	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Vermont	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Washington	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Wisconsin	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

Question A – 3: Continued

	Other	Explain
Alaska	No	
Alabama	No	
Arkansas	No	
Arizona	Yes	
California	NA	
Colorado	No	
Connecticut	Yes	PERJURY; FALSE STATEMENT; TAMPERING W/EVIDENCE
District of	NA	
Delaware	No	
Florida	No	
Georgia	No	
Hawaii	NA	
Iowa	No	
Idaho	Yes	CODE OF CONDUCT / ETHICS
Illinois	No	
Indiana	Yes	OBTAIN CERTIFICATION BY FALSE INFORMATION
Kansas	No	
Kentucky	Yes	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
Louisiana	No	
Massachusetts	NA	
Maryland	No	
Maine	Yes	HAVING SEX WITH A VICTIM OF DV IF THE OFFICER WAS THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER AND IF IT
Michigan	Yes	FRAUD/MATERIALLY FALSE STATEMENTS MADE DURING THE LICENSING PROCESS
Minnesota	No	
Missouri	No	
Mississippi	No	
Montana	No	
North Carolina	Yes	LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER
North Dakota	No	
Nebraska	Yes	NEGLECT OF DUTY; PHYSICAL, MENTAL, EMOTIONAL INCAPACITY
New Hampshire	No	
New Jersey	NA	
New Mexico	No	
Nevada	Yes	ADDICTION/USE/POSESSION DRUGS; WILLFUL FALSIFICATION ON APP FOR CERTIFICATION;
New York	NA	
Ohio	No	
Oklahoma	No	
Oregon	No	
Pennsylvania	No	
Rhode Island	NA	
South Carolina	No	
South Dakota	Yes	FIRED FOR CAUSE
Tennessee	No	
Texas	No	
Utah	No	
Vermont	No	
Virginia	No	
Washington	No	
Wisconsin	No	
West Virginia	No	
Wyoming	No	

Question A – 4: In what year did your agency gain the authority to revoke certification?

Alaska	1972
Alabama	1995
Arkansas	1981
Arizona	1968
California	1979
Colorado	1975
Connecticut	1969
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	DK
Florida	1981
Georgia	1970
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	1985
Idaho	1970
Illinois	1999
Indiana	2007
Kansas	BLANK
Kentucky	1998
Louisiana	1999
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	1966
Maine	1991
Michigan	1998
Minnesota	1978
Missouri	1993
Mississippi	1981
Montana	2007
North Carolina	1973
North Dakota	1989
Nebraska	1984
New Hampshire	1971
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	1960
Nevada	1987
New York	NA
Ohio	1997
Oklahoma	1988
Oregon	1969
Pennsylvania	1974
Rhode Island	NA
South Carolina	1976
South Dakota	DK
Tennessee	1982
Texas	1985
Utah	1967
Vermont	DK
Virginia	1991
Washington	2002
Wisconsin	1973
West Virginia	1982
Wyoming	1991

Question A – 5: How many officers have had certification revoked since authority was granted?

Alaska	DK
Alabama	162
Arkansas	97
Arizona	500
California	533
Colorado	DK
Connecticut	30
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	DK
Florida	5183
Georgia	6252
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	83
Idaho	181
Illinois	135
Indiana	4
Kansas	82
Kentucky	10
Louisiana	DK
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	2
Maine	75
Michigan	119
Minnesota	175
Missouri	345
Mississippi	59
Montana	6
North Carolina	2570
North Dakota	88
Nebraska	34
New Hampshire	DK
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	DK
Nevada	34
New York	NA
Ohio	220
Oklahoma	113
Oregon	148
Pennsylvania	DK
Rhode Island	NA
South Carolina	DK
South Dakota	DK
Tennessee	264
Texas	2000
Utah	DK
Vermont	10
Virginia	3
Washington	104
Wisconsin	DK
West Virginia	DK
Wyoming	85

Question A – 6: How many officers had their certification revoked during calendar year 2008?

Alaska	4
Alabama	23
Arkansas	15
Arizona	35
California	0
Colorado	23
Connecticut	1
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	10
Florida	182
Georgia	455
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	8
Idaho	35
Illinois	15
Indiana	2
Kansas	5
Kentucky	3
Louisiana	0
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	1
Maine	14
Michigan	22
Minnesota	10
Missouri	23
Mississippi	3
Montana	6
North Carolina	109
North Dakota	0
Nebraska	1
New Hampshire	15
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	21
Nevada	2
New York	NA
Ohio	7
Oklahoma	0
Oregon	76
Pennsylvania	1
Rhode Island	NA
South Carolina	13
South Dakota	8
Tennessee	35
Texas	300
Utah	33
Vermont	0
Virginia	0
Washington	22
Wisconsin	7
West Virginia	DK
Wyoming	11

Question A – 7: Are revoked officers afforded due process through hearing or appeal?

Alaska	Yes
Alabama	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	Yes
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	No
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	Yes
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	Yes
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Montana	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	NA
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	NA
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
West Virginia	Yes
Wyoming	Yes

Question A – 8: Can your agency temporarily suspend certification?

Alaska	No
Alabama	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	No
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	No
Illinois	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	Yes
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	No
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Montana	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	NA
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	NA
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	No
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	No
Virginia	No
Washington	No
Wisconsin	No
West Virginia	Yes
Wyoming	Yes

Question A – 9: Are certain law enforcement officers excluded from certification requirements?

Alaska	No	
Alabama	Yes	ELECTED OFFICIALS, I.E. SHERIFFS
Arkansas	Yes	SHERIFFS (ELECTED OFFICIAL)
Arizona	Yes	AN ELECTED SHERIFF IS EXEMPT (THERE ARE 15 SHERIFFS IN ARIZONA)
California	Yes	
Colorado	No	
Connecticut	Yes	STATE POLICE; STATE MARSHALL'S
District of Columbia	NA	
Delaware	No	
Florida	Yes	SHERIFFS ONLY BUT ALL 67 ARE CERTIFIED
Georgia	No	
Hawaii	NA	
Iowa	No	
Idaho	Yes	DIRECTOR OF STATE POLICE; SHERIFFS
Illinois	Yes	COUNTY SHERIFFS
Indiana	No	
Kansas	No	
Kentucky	Yes	SHERIFF - ELECTED OFFICIAL
Louisiana	Yes	HEAD OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
Massachusetts	NA	
Maryland	Yes	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY CEO AND DEPUTY CEO ARE EXEMPT (IE, CHIEF AND DEP SHERIFF, SHERIFF AND CHIEF DEPUTY, SUPERINTENDANT AND DEPUTY SUPERINTENDANT)
Maine	No	
Michigan	No	
Minnesota	No	
Missouri	No	IN THE BEGINNING OF POST EXISTENCE THERE WERE SOME EXEMPTIONS BUT NOT ANYMORE
Mississippi	Yes	ELECTED SHERIFFS, CHIEFS, AND CONSTABLES
Montana	Yes	SHERIFFS
North Carolina	Yes	SHERIFFS
North Dakota	No	
Nebraska	No	
New Hampshire	Yes	SHERIFFS
New Jersey	NA	
New Mexico	No	
Nevada	Yes	DIRECTORS OF DEPT OF CORRECTIONS, DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
New York	NA	
Ohio	Yes	STATE HIGHWAY PATROL IS NOT CERTIFIED BY THE OHIO PEACE OFFICER TRAINING COMMISSION
Oklahoma	No	
Oregon	No	
Pennsylvania	Yes	STATE POLICE, DEPUTY SHERIFFS, PARK RANGERS, SCHOOL POLICE, UNIVERSITY POLICE FROM PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Rhode Island	NA	
South Carolina	No	
South Dakota	No	
Tennessee	Yes	SOME STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS
Texas	No	
Utah	No	
Vermont	No	
Virginia	Yes	SHERIFFS
Washington	Yes	ELECTED SHERIFFS
Wisconsin	Yes	ELECTED SHERIFFS, CONSTABLES, OR MARSHALS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO OBTAIN CERTIFICATION
West Virginia	Yes	HEADS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES NOT REQUIRED TO BE CERTIFIED OFFICERS
Wyoming	Yes	CAN BE ADMINISTRATIVE SHERIFFS OR CHIEFS. MUST BE CERTIFIED IF A PEACE OFFICER.

Question A – 10: Does another state agency also certify/revoke law enforcement officers?

Alaska	No	
Alabama	No	
Arkansas	No	
Arizona	No	
California	No	
Colorado	No	
Connecticut	No	
District of Columbia	NA	
Delaware	No	
Florida	No	
Georgia	No	
Hawaii	No	
Iowa	No	
Idaho	No	
Illinois	No	
Indiana	No	
Kansas	No	
Kentucky	No	
Louisiana	No	
Massachusetts	NA	
Maryland	No	
Maine	No	
Michigan	No	
Minnesota	No	
Missouri	No	
Mississippi	No	
Montana	No	
North Carolina	Yes	the nc sheriffs' standards commission certifies deputy sheriffs and may sanction them as well.
North Dakota	No	
Nebraska	No	
New Hampshire	No	
New Jersey	No	
New Mexico	No	
Nevada	No	
New York	No	
Ohio	No	
Oklahoma	No	
Oregon	No	
Pennsylvania	No	
Rhode Island	Yes	providence police department - providence only; ri state police - risp only with few exceptions
South Carolina	Yes	south carolina state law enforcement division (sled)
South Dakota	No	
Tennessee	No	
Texas	No	
Utah	No	
Vermont	No	
Virginia	No	
Washington	No	
Wisconsin	No	
West Virginia	No	
Wyoming	No	

Question A – 11: Does your agency also certify:

	Correctional Officers	Parole/ Probation	Private Security	Communications Personnel/ Dispatch	Other	Other
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Arizona	Yes	No	No	No	No	
California	No	No	No	No	No	
Colorado	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Connecticut	Yes	No	No	No	No	
District of Columbia	No	No	No	No	No	
Delaware	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Hawaii	No	No	No	No	No	
Iowa	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	jailers
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	juv corrections / state/county juv probation; county detention; k-9; marine deputy;
Illinois	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Indiana	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Kansas	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Kentucky	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	court security officers
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Massachusetts	No	No	No	No	No	
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Maine	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	harbor masters; court security
Michigan	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Minnesota	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Missouri	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Mississippi	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	local jail officers / juvenile detention officers
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	per statute
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	juvenile justice & local confinement officers
North Dakota	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Nebraska	Yes	No	No	No	No	
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
New Mexico	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Nevada	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	certificates verify training only - k-9 included
Oklahoma	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	fire / private investigators
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Rhode Island	No	No	No	No	No	campus police
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	class 3 leos - limited duty officers with limited enforcement powers such as court security, local code enforcement
South Dakota	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Tennessee	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Texas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Vermont	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	jail / courtroom security / civil process servers
Washington	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Wisconsin	Yes	No	No	No	No	jail officers
West Virginia	No	No	No	No	No	
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	detention officers / coroners

Question A – 12: Additional information or comments:

Alaska	
Alabama	
Arkansas	
Arizona	
California	since 2004, post is no longer able to revoke or cancel a certificate [see letter attached to survey]
Colorado	
Connecticut	
District of Columbia	
Delaware	
Florida	
Georgia	a6a: 2,206 - application denied (not included in # above); a6b: 191 - application denied
Hawaii	
Iowa	a6a: 83 + 3 suspensions; a6b: fy '08
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	a4: 2 or more misdemeanors
Kansas	
Kentucky	a6a: 10 - 12; a6b: 3-4
Louisiana	
Massachusetts	
Maryland	decertification action is very infrequent as termination of employment for any reason automatically and immediately ends certification
Maine	the maine criminal justice academy has other options to choose from besides decertifications such as suspensions of up to 3 years plus waivers with conditions.
Michigan	
Minnesota	a6a: 150 - 175; a6b: 5-10; note: minnesota uses the term "license" instead of certify
Missouri	please contact
Mississippi	when an officer is terminated, the certification becomes inactive. action is not taken on the certification until an agency requests the certification.
Montana	i have attached our administrative rules for further clarification. also please note that council has been in existence since 1971, however it was an advisory council until the law was changed in 2007. from 1971-2007 all motions were then sent on to the b
North Carolina	the figures on previous page for suspensions and revocations do not include deputy sheriffs
North Dakota	
Nebraska	81-1403 nebr. revised statutes
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	a5: 1960's
Nevada	
New York	
Ohio	certificates attest to training only and do not, by themselves, authorize a person to function as a peace officer.
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	a9: state police are excluded because their standards exceed the training and certification standards followed by the commission.
Rhode Island	risp - certify ri capitol police by statute, post has no authority over risp and providence pd
South Carolina	
South Dakota	revocation is done after a hearing before the training commission
Tennessee	
Texas	a2: a: jailer; b: firearms only; a7: some - not felonies
Utah	a6a: started keeping electronic records in 2005 - 103 since 2005
Vermont	a5: prior to 1991
Virginia	a3: any decertification must come at the request of the agency administrator. we have no independent authority. a6a: less than 10
Washington	
Wisconsin	a6b: for training/qualification issues; wisconsin certification is dependant upon employment. once employment is terminated the officer is no longer certified. [see attachment to survey
West Virginia	a1, 3, 5: law enforcement training (let) subcommittee of the governor's committee on crime delinquency and correction makes that approval to certify and certification issued by the governor based on that
Wyoming	

Question B – 1: What methods do you use to manage the certification/ revocation function?

	Card based manual system	Agency Developed electronic data management system	Commercial electronic data management system	
Alaska	No	Yes	No	
Alabama	No	Yes	No	
Arkansas	Yes	No	No	
Arizona	No	Yes	No	
California	No	Yes	No	
Colorado	No	No	Yes	crown pointe
Connecticut	No	Yes	No	
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	
Delaware		Yes	Yes	no
Florida	No	Yes	No	
Georgia	No	Yes	No	
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	
Iowa	Yes	No	Yes	skills manager (crown point technologies)
Idaho	No	No	Yes	skills manager
Illinois	No	Yes	No	
Indiana	Yes	No	Yes	will be using acadis software by envisage
Kansas	No	Yes	No	
Kentucky	No	Yes	No	
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	No	
Massachusetts	NA	NA	NA	
Maryland	No	No	Yes	crown point skills manager
Maine	No	Yes	No	
Michigan	No	Yes	No	
Minnesota	No	Yes	No	
Missouri	Yes	Yes	No	
Mississippi	Yes	No	No	
Montana	No	Yes	No	
North Carolina	No	Yes	No	
North Dakota	No	No	Yes	skills manager
Nebraska	No	Yes	No	
New Hampshire	No	Yes	No	
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	No	
New Mexico	No	No	Yes	skills manager - crown pointe technologies
Nevada	No	No	Yes	crown pointe technologies skills manager
New York	No	No	Yes	
Ohio	No	Yes	No	
Oklahoma	No	Yes	No	
Oregon	No	No	Yes	envisage corporation
Pennsylvania	No	Yes	No	
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No	
South Carolina	No	No	Yes	law enforcement training system (lets) - logicalis (currently being used) acadis - envisage (transitioning to this system in fy 2010)
South Dakota	No	No	Yes	skills manager
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	No	
Texas	No	No	Yes	
Utah	No	No	No	
Vermont	No	No	Yes	crown pointe
Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	
Washington	No	Yes	No	
Wisconsin	No	No	Yes	crown pointe technologies / skills manager
West Virginia	No	Yes	No	
Wyoming	No	Yes	No	

Question B – 2: Certification records are numbered using:

	Method
Alaska	Social Security Number (SSN)
Alabama	A non-SSN related number
Arkansas	A non-SSN related number
Arizona	Social Security Number (SSN)
California	A non-SSN related number
Colorado	Social Security Number (SSN)
Connecticut	A variation or modification of SSN
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	A non-SSN related number
Florida	Social Security Number (SSN)
Georgia	A non-SSN related number
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	Agency does not number certification records for identification
Idaho	A variation or modification of SSN
Illinois	Social Security Number (SSN)
Indiana	A non-SSN related number
Kansas	A non-SSN related number
Kentucky	A non-SSN related number
Louisiana	Social Security Number (SSN)
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	A variation or modification of SSN
Maine	A non-SSN related number
Michigan	A non-SSN related number
Minnesota	A non-SSN related number
Missouri	A non-SSN related number
Mississippi	Social Security Number (SSN)
Montana	A non-SSN related number
North Carolina	A non-SSN related number
North Dakota	A non-SSN related number
Nebraska	A non-SSN related number
New Hampshire	Social Security Number (SSN)
New Jersey	Social Security Number (SSN)
New Mexico	A non-SSN related number
Nevada	A non-SSN related number
New York	Social Security Number (SSN)
Ohio	A non-SSN related number
Oklahoma	A non-SSN related number
Oregon	A non-SSN related number
Pennsylvania	A non-SSN related number
Rhode Island	A variation or modification of SSN
South Carolina	Social Security Number (SSN)
South Dakota	A non-SSN related number
Tennessee	A non-SSN related number
Texas	A variation or modification of SSN
Utah	A non-SSN related number
Vermont	A variation or modification of SSN
Virginia	Social Security Number (SSN)
Washington	Social Security Number (SSN)
Wisconsin	A variation or modification of SSN
West Virginia	Social Security Number (SSN)
Wyoming	Agency does not number certification records for identification

Question B – 3: How long are records maintained?

Alaska	Indefinitely	
Alabama	Specific time period	50 years
Arkansas	Indefinitely	
Arizona	Indefinitely	
California	Indefinitely	
Colorado	Indefinitely	
Connecticut	Indefinitely	
District of Columbia	NA	
Delaware	Indefinitely	
Florida	Indefinitely	
Georgia	Indefinitely	
Hawaii	NA	
Iowa	Specific time period	until age 75
Idaho	Indefinitely	
Illinois	Indefinitely	
Indiana	Indefinitely	
Kansas	Indefinitely	
Kentucky	Indefinitely	
Louisiana	Indefinitely	
Massachusetts	NA	
Maryland	Specific time period	records of certification are retained 10 years past the end of certification;
Maine	Indefinitely	
Michigan	Indefinitely	
Minnesota	Indefinitely	
Missouri	Indefinitely	
Mississippi	Indefinitely	
Montana	Specific time period	electronic indefinitely; paper 5 years beyond statutory requirement of tracking certification.
North Carolina	Indefinitely	indefinite electoncially; paper records maintained 5 years once certification is inactive, go to state records for 5 years, then destroyed
North Dakota	Indefinitely	
Nebraska	Indefinitely	
New Hampshire	Indefinitely	
New Jersey	Indefinitely	
New Mexico	Indefinitely	
Nevada	Indefinitely	
New York	Indefinitely	
Ohio	Indefinitely	
Oklahoma	Indefinitely	
Oregon	Specific time period	75 years
Pennsylvania	Indefinitely	
Rhode Island	Indefinitely	
South Carolina	Indefinitely	
South Dakota	Indefinitely	
Tennessee	Indefinitely	
Texas	Specific time period	40 years
Utah	Indefinitely	
Vermont	Indefinitely	
Virginia	Indefinitely	
Washington	Indefinitely	
Wisconsin	Specific time period	30 years
West Virginia	Indefinitely	
Wyoming	Indefinitely	

Question B – 4: Does your agency issue wallet cards or other pocket proof of certification?

Alaska	Yes
Alabama	No
Arkansas	No
Arizona	No
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	No
Florida	No
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	No
Idaho	No
Illinois	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	No
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	No
Michigan	No
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	No
Mississippi	No
Montana	No
North Carolina	No
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	No
New Hampshire	No
New Jersey	No
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	No
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	No
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	No
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	No
Virginia	No
Washington	No
Wisconsin	No
West Virginia	No
Wyoming	No

Question B - 5: Does your agency maintain records of denial of initial certification?

Alaska	Yes
Alabama	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	No
District of Columbia	NA
Delaware	Yes
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	Yes
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	No
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	Yes
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	No
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Montana	No
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	Yes
New Mexico	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New York	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	No
Virginia	No
Washington	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
West Virginia	Yes
Wyoming	No

Question B – 6: Additional information or comments:

Alaska	
Alabama	
Arkansas	
Arizona	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
District of Columbia	
Delaware	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Iowa	
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Massachusetts	
Maryland	b4: replaced annually
Maine	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Mississippi	
Montana	we are currently working on producing wallet cards for certification. we have the blank stock in our office, however we are waiting on the new data base before we begin printing.
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Nebraska	b5: 4 years
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
Nevada	
New York	
Ohio	none
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	no determination has been made concerning the amount of detail that can be released.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	extensive comments on survey return
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
Wisconsin	
West Virginia	
Wyoming	

Question C – 1: Is your agency legislatively prohibited from sharing revocation information?

Alaska	No
Alabama	No
Arkansas	No
Arizona	No
California	Yes
Colorado	No
Connecticut	No
District of Columbia	No
Delaware	No
Florida	No
Georgia	No
Hawaii	NA
Iowa	No
Idaho	No
Illinois	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	No
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	No
Maine	No
Michigan	No
Minnesota	No
Missouri	No
Mississippi	No
Montana	No
North Carolina	No
North Dakota	No
Nebraska	No
New Hampshire	No
New Jersey	NA
New Mexico	No
Nevada	No
New York	NA
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	No
South Dakota	No
Tennessee	No
Texas	No
Utah	No
Vermont	No
Virginia	Yes
Washington	No
Wisconsin	No
West Virginia	No
Wyoming	No

Question C – 2: Does your agency publish revocation actions?

State	Yes/No	Newspaper	Online	Agency Publication
Alaska	No	NA	NA	NA
Alabama	No	NA	NA	NA
Arkansas	Yes	No	Yes	No
Arizona	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
California	No	NA	NA	NA
Colorado	Yes	No	No	Yes
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	No	NA	NA	NA
Florida	Yes	No	No	Yes
Georgia	No	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA
Iowa	No	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	Yes	No	No	No
Illinois	No	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	Yes	No	Yes	No
Kansas	Yes	No	Yes	No
Kentucky	Yes	No	No	No
Louisiana	No	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	Yes	No	No	No
Maine	No	NA	NA	NA
Michigan	No	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	No	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	Yes	No	Yes	No
Mississippi	No	NA	NA	NA
Montana	Yes	No	No	Yes
North Carolina	No	NA	NA	NA
North Dakota	Yes	No	Yes	No
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
New Hampshire	No	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	No	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	No	NA	NA	NA
New York	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	No	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	No	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	Yes	No	No	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	Yes
Rhode Island	No	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	No	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	Yes	No	No	No
Tennessee	No	NA	NA	NA
Texas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Utah	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Vermont	No	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	No	NA	NA	NA
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	No	Yes	No
West Virginia	No	NA	NA	NA
Wyoming	Yes	No	No	Yes

Question C – 3: Does your agency contribute to the current IADLEST National Decertification Index (NDI)?

Alaska	No
Alabama	No
Arkansas	Yes
Arizona	Yes
California	No
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
District of Columbia	No
Delaware	No
Florida	Yes
Georgia	No
Hawaii	No
Iowa	Yes
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	No
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	No
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	No
Missouri	Yes
Mississippi	No
Montana	No
North Carolina	No
North Dakota	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
New Hampshire	No
New Jersey	No
New Mexico	No
Nevada	Yes
New York	No
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	No
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	No
Virginia	No
Washington	Yes
Wisconsin	No
West Virginia	Yes
Wyoming	No

Question C – 4: If your agency does NOT contribute to the IADLEST NDI, please state the reason.

Alaska	unaware - looking at that issue now.
Alabama	under consideration at this time
Arkansas	
Arizona	
California	agency does not have decertification authority
Colorado	
Connecticut	
District of Columbia	the dc post does not certify or decertify
Delaware	has not been approved by the Delaware council on police training
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Iowa	
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	will be in near future
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	unaware of
Massachusetts	
Maryland	
Maine	i do not know enough about it
Michigan	
Minnesota	has not felt need
Missouri	
Mississippi	law allows officer to reapply after revocation period of 2 years. board must revoke again or issue certification.
Montana	since both of us are new to the agency, we have not yet taken the time to get educated on its use. we will be happy to use the system when we learn how.
North Carolina	historically state has chosen not to participate. concerns center around ability to provide information from nc, what point in process it can be provided, and other legal concerns.
North Dakota	
Nebraska	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	agency does not have decertification authority
New Mexico	unaware of database and not authorized to log on
Nevada	
New York	no state authority to proactively share data
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	no revocation/decertification index
South Carolina	extensive comments on survey return
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	haven't decertified anyone since database brought up
Virginia	for practical purposes, we don't decertify anyone.
Washington	
Wisconsin	
West Virginia	
Wyoming	ray has sent me a password however i have not had time to look into the index nor add wyoming entries to the file.

Question C – 5: Does your agency query the current IADLEST National Decertification Index?

Alaska	Occasionally
Alabama	Never
Arkansas	Occasionally
Arizona	Routinely
California	Never
Colorado	Occasionally
Connecticut	Occasionally
District of Columbia	Never
Delaware	Never
Florida	Occasionally
Georgia	Never
Hawaii	Never
Iowa	Occasionally
Idaho	Routinely
Illinois	Never
Indiana	Occasionally
Kansas	Occasionally
Kentucky	Occasionally
Louisiana	Never
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Routinely
Maine	Never
Michigan	Occasionally
Minnesota	Occasionally
Missouri	Routinely
Mississippi	Never
Montana	Never
North Carolina	Never
North Dakota	Routinely
Nebraska	Occasionally
New Hampshire	Occasionally
New Jersey	Occasionally
New Mexico	Never
Nevada	Occasionally
New York	Occasionally
Ohio	Occasionally
Oklahoma	Routinely
Oregon	Routinely
Pennsylvania	Never
Rhode Island	Occasionally
South Carolina	Never
South Dakota	Occasionally
Tennessee	Routinely
Texas	Routinely
Utah	Occasionally
Vermont	Occasionally
Virginia	Never
Washington	Routinely
Wisconsin	Never
West Virginia	Occasionally
Wyoming	Never

Question C – 6: Does your agency issue NDI query-only accounts to LE units under your jurisdiction?

Alaska	No
Alabama	No
Arkansas	No
Arizona	No
California	No
Colorado	No
Connecticut	No
District of Columbia	No
Delaware	No
Florida	Yes
Georgia	No
Hawaii	No
Iowa	No
Idaho	No
Illinois	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	No
Massachusetts	NA
Maryland	Yes
Maine	No
Michigan	No
Minnesota	No
Missouri	No
Mississippi	No
Montana	No
North Carolina	No
North Dakota	No
Nebraska	No
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	No
New Mexico	No
Nevada	No
New York	No
Ohio	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	No
South Dakota	BLANK
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	No
Utah	No
Vermont	No
Virginia	No
Washington	No
Wisconsin	No
West Virginia	No
Wyoming	No

Question C – 7: Additional Information or Comments

Alaska	
Alabama	
Arkansas	
Arizona	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
District of Columbia	
Delaware	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Iowa	#6 query database on all out of state transfers
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Massachusetts	
Maryland	
Maine	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Mississippi	
Montana	again we need to be educated on the system.
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Nebraska	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
Nevada	
New York	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	c7: not yet, but considering
Virginia	
Washington	especially all out of state lateral applicants
Wisconsin	
West Virginia	
Wyoming	i am hoping to get on board with the ndi and then get the agencies on board with the query only accounts

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The updated survey provided a comprehensive view of current certification and revocation practices. Based on the survey data, several important insights have been gained. The following conclusions and recommendations are offered in furtherance of additional research, development and operational enhancement.

CONCLUSIONS

- Most states have the authority to both certify and decertify for cause law enforcement officers and other criminal justice personnel.
- A significant number of POST agencies additionally certify other public safety personnel.
- A significant population of officers sanctioned for misconduct exists and continues to expand.
- Basis for revocation varies greatly among the states.
- Use of the revocation sanction varies greatly by state.
- POST agencies generally believe that due process is afforded in the revocation process.
- In most cases, POST agencies are generally not prohibited from sharing revocation information.
- POST agencies often certify additional, non-police personnel.
- Disparate information management systems are utilized by U.S. POST agencies.
- Most POST agencies use the National Decertification Index to screen candidates for hire or certification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Reporting of revocation actions to the NDI should be contingent upon the availability of due process.
- Consideration should be given to the inclusion of decertified, non-police personnel such as communication personnel, correctional officers and parole/probation agents.
- NDI query results should clearly establish the exclusion of certain personnel from the state certification and thus revocation sanction.
- Secondary use of Social Security Numbers should be maintained by all POST agencies to assist in identification of prior certification.
- A standards based data management model should be implemented for use by POST agencies. Establishment of web based XML conformance would simplify data entry, data communications and query operations.
- All POST agencies and hiring entities should routinely query the NDI prior to certification as a law enforcement officer.
- The current NDI effort should be expanded to provide:
    - Enhancement of NDI to satisfy query demand access of up to 5,000 law enforcement agencies.
    - Comprehensive research to identify current state legislative and policy limitations on revocation for cause and information sharing.

    - Establishment of a national working group to guide the effort to expand participation and improve NDI system services.
    - Development of a model state statute, establishing certification, revocation and interstate data sharing authority for POST agencies.
- A permanent funding structure to support operation of the NDI should be identified.

International Association of Directors of
Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST)

2009 Survey of POST Agencies Regarding Certification Practices

April 15, 2009

Dear POST Director,

I am pleased to inform you that Seattle University will be assisting our Association in completing a follow-up survey to our previous 2005 Survey of POST Agencies regarding certification practices. The new survey will greatly assist us in advancing our National Decertification Index program. A summary report will be prepared and made available to all IADLEST member agencies.

Please take the time to complete the enclosed brief survey and return in the pre-addressed and stamped envelope by **May 8, 2009** to:

IADLEST Certification Survey
ATTN: Matthew J. Hickman
Department of Criminal Justice
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue / P.O. Box 222000
Seattle, WA 98122

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact me directly at (410) 875-3606 or rfranklin@iadlest.org.

With best regards,

Raymond A. Franklin
Project Director

Police Officer Certification Revocation Information Sharing
National Public Safety Officer Decertification Database
Grant #2005-DD-BX-1119

2009 Survey of POST Agencies Regarding Certification Practices

Definitions

Certification	Revocation
The state licensure or accreditation of peace officers, without which an individual may not legally perform the duties of a law enforcement officer.	The permanent removal for cause of law enforcement officer certification. Often referred to as decertification or cancellation.

Section A – Certification and Revocation Authority and Activity

1 Does your agency certify law enforcement officers?

❑ Yes ❑ No

2 Does your agency have the authority to revoke certification for cause?

❑ Yes ❑ No

3 What are the bases for revocation? Please check all that apply.

❑ Felony conviction

❑ Misdemeanor conviction ❑ Any ❑ Certain

❑ Administratively for misconduct

❑ Failure to meet training/qualification requirements

❑ Termination of employment

❑ Other .....

4 In what year did your agency gain the authority to revoke certification?

.....

5 How many officers have had certification revoked since authority was granted?

.....

6 How many officers had their certification revoked in 2008?

.....

7 Are officers afforded due process though hearing or appeal?

❑ Yes ❑ No

8 Can your agency temporarily suspend certification?

❑ Yes ❑ No

9 Are certain law enforcement officers excluded from certification requirements, e.g. Chiefs, Sheriffs, State Patrol?

❑ Yes (Identify below) ❑ No

.....

.....

10 Does another state agency also certify/revoke law enforcement officers?

❑ Yes (Explain below) ❑ No

.....

.....

.....

11 Does your agency also certify:

	Yes	No
Correctional Officers	❑	❑
Parole/Probation Officers	❑	❑
Private Security Officers	❑	❑
Communications Personnel/Dispatchers	❑	❑

Other .....

12 Additional information or comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section B – Certification Information Management

1 What methods do you use to manage the certification/revocation function? Please check all that apply.

- ❑ Card based manual system
- ❑ Agency developed electronic data management system
- ❑ Commercial electronic data management system

  Software name/manufacturer .....

- ❑ Other .....

2 Certification records are numbered using:

- ❑ Social Security Number (SSN)
- ❑ A variation or modification of SSN
- ❑ A non-SSN related number

3 How long are records maintained?

- ❑ Indefinitely
- ❑ .....

4 Does your agency issue wallet cards or other pocket proof of certification for officers?

❑ Yes ❑ No

5 Does your agency maintain records of denial of initial certification?

❑ Yes ❑ No

6 Additional information or comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section C – Revocation Information Sharing

1 Is your agency legislatively proscribed from sharing revocation information?

❑ No ❑ Yes ❑ Unknown

2 Are there other impediments to sharing revocation information? Please identify below.

.....

.....

.....

3 Does your agency publish revocation actions?

❑ Yes (Identify below) ❑ No

- ❑ Newspaper/Public Media
- ❑ Online
- ❑ Agency Publication
- ❑ Other (Please specify)

.....

4 Does your agency contribute to the current IADLEST National Decertification Index (NDI)?

❑ Yes ❑ No

5 If your agency does NOT contribute to the IADLEST NDI, please state the reason(s).

.....

.....

.....

6 Does your agency query the current IADLEST National Decertification Index?

❑ Routinely ❑ Occasionally ❑ Never

7 Does your agency issue NDI query-only accounts to law enforcement units under your jurisdiction?

❑ Yes ❑ No

8 Additional information or comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section D – Respondent Information

Name	Agency

Telephone	E-Mail Address

Please return the completed survey to:

IADLEST Certification Survey
Department of Criminal Justice
Seattle University
901 12th Street, P.O. Box 222000
Seattle, WA 98122

Respondent Name	Agency	Telephone	Email
Terry Vrabec	Alaska Police Standards	907-465-5523	terry.vrabec@alaska.gov
Alan Benefield	Alabama Peace Officers Standards And Training Commission	334-242-4045	apostc@apostc.alabama.gov
Brian Marshall	(Arkansas) Office Of Law Enforcement Standards	501-682-2143	brian.marshall@asp.arkansas.gov
Tom Hammarstrom	Arizona Post	602-223-2514	tomh@azpost.gov
Mike Dimiceli	California Post	916-227-2808	mike.dimiceli@post.ca.gov
John L Kammerzell	Colorado Post	303-866-4520	j.kzll@state.co.us
Thomas E Flaherty	Connecticut Post Council	203-238-6505	thomase.flaherty@po.state.ct.us
Jim Cronin	District Of Columbia Post	202-727-3468	jcronin@dc.gov
Capt Ralph Davis	Delaware Council On Police Training	302-739-5903	ralph.davis@state.de.us
Michael Crews	Florida Department Of Law Enforcement	850-410-8600	mikecrews@fdle.state.fl.us
Ryan Powell	Georgia Post Council	770-732-5802	ryanpowell@gapost.org
Susan Ballard	Honolulu Police Department	808-677-1474	sballard@honolulu.gov
Arlen Ciechanowski	Iowa Law Enforcement Academy	515-242-5357	arlen.ciechanowski@iowa.gov
Jeffry Black	Idaho Post	208-884-7251	jeff.black@post.idaho.gov
Sheila A Albright	Illinois Law Enforcement Training And Standards Board	217-782-4540	sheila.albright@illinois.gov
Rusty Goodpaster	Indiana Law Enforcement Academy	317-839-5191	rgoodpaster@ilea.in.gov
Steven Culp	Kansas City Post	316-832-9906	sculp@kscpost.org
Larry Ball	Kentucky Law Enforcement Council	859-622-6218	larry.ball@ky.gov
Robert Wertz	Louisiana Commission On Law Enforcement	225-925-3949	bobw@lcle.la.gov
Howard Lebowitz	Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Council	781-437-0304	howard.lebowitz@state.ma.us
Patrick L Bradley	Maryland Police And Corrections Training Commissions	410-875-3603	pbradley@dpscs.state.md.us
John B Rogers	Maine Criminal Justice Academy	207-877-8011	john.rogers@maine.gov
Lawrence J Jones	Michigan Commission On Law Enforcement Standards	517-322-5627	joneslj@michigan.gov
Daniel Glass	Minnesota Post Board	651-201-7784	dan.glass@state.mn.us
Kim Haddix	Missouri Post	573-751-3409	kim.haddix@dps.mo.gov
Robert Davis	Mississippi Post	601-987-3050	rdavis@mdps.state.ms.us
Wayne C Ternes	Montana Public Safety Officer Standards And Training Council	406-444-9976	wternes@mt.gov
Wayne Woodard	North Carolina Criminal Justice Training And Standards	919-716-6470	wwoodard@ncdoj.gov
Mark Sayler	North Dakota Post Board	701-328-5500	ms421@nd.gov
William Muldoon	Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center	308-385-6030	william.muldoon@nebraska.gov
Donald Vittum	New Hampshire Police Standards And Training	603-271-6673	dvittum@pstc.state.nh.us
Robert Melson	New Jersey Police Training Commission	609-984-0960	melsonr@njdcj.org
Art Ortiz	New Mexico Dps	505-827-9290	arthur.ortiz@state.nm.us
Ben West	Nevada Commission On Post	775-687-3348	bwest@post.state.nv.us
James Hogencamp	New York State Division Of Criminal Justice Services	518-485-1417	hogencampj@dcjs.state.ny.us
Ron Ferrell	Ohio Peace Officer Training Commission	740-845-2700	ronald.ferrell@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Janet Ingram	Oklahoma Council On Law Enforcement Education And Training	405-239-5158	jingram@cleet.state.ok.us
John Minnis	Oregon Dpsst	503-378-2043	john.minnis@state.or.us
John M Gallaher	Pennsylvania Municipal Police Officers Education And Training Commission	717-346-7749	jgallaher@state.pa.us
David A Ricciarelli	Rhode Island Municipal Police Academy	401-722-5808	dricciarelli@mail.ri.com
William Floyd	South Carolina Law Enforcement Training Council	803-896-7724	wafloyd@sccja.org
Jon Bierne	South Dakota Law Enforcement Training	605-773-3584	jon.bierne@state.sd.us
Brian Grisham	Tennesee Post Commission	615-741-4448	brian.grisham@tn.gov
Timothy Braaten	Texas Commission On Law Enforcement	512-936-7711	timothyb@tcleose.state.tx.us
Steven Winward	Utah Post	801-256-2326	swinward@utah.gov
R.J. Elrick	Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council	802-483-6228	rj.elrick@state.vt.us
Ronald Bessent	Virginia Dept Criminal Justice Services	804-786-7802	ron.bessent@dcjs.virginia.gov
Doug Blair	Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission	206-835-7332	dblair@cjtc.state.wa.us
Richard Williams	Wisconsin Doj - Training & Standards Bureau	608-266-7883	williamsrp@doj.state.wi.us
Chuck Sadler	West Virginia Division Of Criminal Justice Services	304-558-8814	charles.a.sadler@wv.gov
Betty Haukap	Wyoming Post	307-777-6619	bhauka@state.wy.us