

2005-DD-BX-1119

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

**2005 SURVEY OF POST AGENCIES REGARDING
CERTIFICATION PRACTICES**

Raymond A. Franklin

NOVEMBER, 2005

Performing Organization:

International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement
Standards and Training (IADLEST)
6852 4th Street
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

Sponsoring Organization:

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	8
SURVEY RESULTS BY STATE	12
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
APPENDICES.....	35
APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTER	
APPENDIX B – SURVEY DISTRIBUTION LIST	

INTRODUCTION

The 2005 Survey of POST Agencies Regarding Certification Practices was conducted 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 purpose of the project is to reduce interstate itinerancy of peace officers that were decertified for cause, that is misconduct, either criminally adjudicated or administratively sanctioned. The project proposes the facilitation of 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 the establishment of current information regarding state practices related to the certification of law enforcement officers, state methods of information management, and existing 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.

This project was supported 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 both 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 such certification for a variety of reasons, varying among the several states. Revocation, or decertification for cause is generally understood to mean the loss due to misconduct, through 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 solution methodologies have been proposed. IADLEST has taken a leading role with the establishment of its Peace Officer Registry Committee with responsibility to develop 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 Peace Officer Registry Committee of the Association 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 Database component. COPS cited unspecified legal concerns as the reason for the decision. IADLEST has independently continued the NDD 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 Office of Justice Assistance of the US Department of Justice approved the current grant. Based on a series of pre-approval cost letters, allowing the commencement of project operations, the survey was conducted.

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. The paper based survey was sent to each POST director for completion. The survey distribution list is attached as Appendix B. A preliminary review of submitted data was conducted and follow up contact with respondents provided for clarification of responses.

Quantification of data utilized both commercial survey management data processing applications and manual calculation methods.

KEY FINDINGS

CERTIFICATION AND REVOCATION AUTHORITY AND ACTIVITY

46 POST entities reported having the authority to certify or license law enforcement officers. All except the Rhode Island Municipal Police Training Academy and the Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council reported the ability to revoke that license. The most common basis for revocation was felony conviction. 29 entities also reported the authority to revoke for conviction of certain misdemeanors. 24 reporting agencies reported the ability to administratively revoke a certificate for misconduct. Notably, six respondents reported the ability to revoke for the conviction of any misdemeanor offense. 33 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 the affording of 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 (26) of respondents reported the exception of certain personnel from the state certification process. Often elected sheriffs, other less common exceptions include chiefs of police, state police and reserve officers.

Two respondents, the North Carolina Criminal Justice Education and Training Standards Commission and the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board, 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 and the Illinois State Police, respectively.

Many of the agencies surveyed reported the authority to certify other public safety personnel. 19 retain the authority to certify correctional officers, 21 certify parole/probation personnel and eleven certify dispatchers or police communications personnel.

Since the inception of revocation authority, over 19,000 law enforcement officers had their certificates revoked for misconduct by U.S. POST agencies. In 2004 alone, over 2000 officers were revoked for cause. This is generally consistent with the figure of 1,810 law enforcement officers reported to have had sanctions imposed in 1999, reported in the previously referenced 2000 IADLEST Sourcebook.

Over 13,000 of the identified revocations were conducted in California, Florida and Georgia. All other states provided approximately 6,000 actions.

CERTIFICATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

A small majority (53 percent) reported use of an agency developed data management system to support the certification function. 17 percent reported use of a commercial automated process, prevalently the Skills Manager Personal Computer application marketed by Crown Pointe Software. Ten 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.

Fully 29 POSTs reported use of Social Security Number or modification thereof as a certification identifier, although eight of that number used a non-SSN identifier also.

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

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

REVOCAION INFORMATION SHARING

Of those agencies with revocation authority, only three, the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center, the Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training and the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission reported a legislative proscription to the sharing of revocation information. Additionally, the California Commission of Peace Officer Standards and Training, the Delaware Council on Police Training and the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy responded that the information was unknown. In addition, the Colorado Peace Officer Standards and Training Board did not respond to this question. Interestingly, the Colorado POST Board, the Delaware Council, the Indiana Academy and the Kansas Training Center reported the publication of revocation actions. As such, a limitation on the inclusion of revocation actions in a central repository may only exist in three currently authorized decertifying agencies.

17 POST agencies reported current data entry participation in the current pilot database. Currently the database reflects participation of 19 state agencies. Immediately subsequent to the survey Maryland joined the system. Florida, historically a major data contributor to the system, has suspended data entry citing compatibility issues.

A variety of reasons for not participating were cited and are reproduced in the tabulation below. Several agencies reported current interest or action toward participation. Notably, all responding entities expressed willingness to consider participation.

Remarkably, only seven POST agencies reported routine query of the existing database system, significantly lower than the rate of data contribution. Eleven agencies reported occasional query of the system, with 29 reporting never having queried the system.

SURVEY RESULTS – BY QUESTION

Section A – Certification and Revocation Authority and Activity

1. Does your agency certify law enforcement officers?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	46	90.20%
No	5	9.80%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	44	86.27%
No	6	11.76%
No Comment	1	1.96%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Felony Conviction	43	84.31%
Misdemeanor Conviction (any)	6	11.76%
Misdemeanor Conviction (certain)	29	56.86%
Administratively for misconduct	24	47.06%
Failure to meet training/qualification requirements	29	56.86%
Termination of employment	14	27.45%
Other	16	31.37%

Questions 4 – 6 are open ended and therefore not quantified.

7. Are revoked officers afforded due process through hearing or appeal?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	43	84.31%
No	1	1.96%
No Comment	7	13.73%

8. Can your agency temporarily suspend certification?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	33	64.71%
No	14	27.45%
No Comment	4	7.84%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes (Identify below)	26	50.98%
No	20	39.22%
No Comment	5	9.80%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes (Explain below)	2	3.92%
No	45	88.24%
No Comment	4	7.84%

11. Does your agency also certify:

Choice	Count	Percent
Correctional Officers	19	37.25%
Parole/Probation Officers	21	41.18%
Private Security Officers	4	7.84%
Communications Personnel/Dispatchers	11	21.57%
Other	10	19.61%

Section B – Certification Information Management

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Card based manual system	5	9.80%
Agency developed electronic data management system	27	52.94%
Commercial electronic data management system	17	33.33%
Other	5	9.80%

2. Certification records are numbered using:

Choice	Count	Percent
Social Security Number (SSN)	28	54.90%
A variation or modification of SSN	1	1.96%
A non-SSN related number	23	45.10%

3. How long are records maintained?

Choice	Count	Percent
Indefinitely	42	82.35%
Other	3	5.88%
No Comment	6	11.76%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	17	33.33%
No	30	58.82%
No Comment	4	7.84%

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

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	40	78.43%
No	4	7.84%
No Comment	7	13.73%

Section C – Revocation Information Sharing

1. Is your agency legislatively proscribed from sharing revocation information?

Choice	Count	Percent
No	38	74.51%
Yes	3	5.88%
Unknown	3	5.88%
No Comment	7	13.73%

2. Does your agency publish revocation actions?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	22	43.14%
No	23	45.10%
No Comment	6	11.76%

3. Does your agency contribute to the current IADLEST National Decertification Database (NDD)?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	17	33.33%
No	28	54.90%
No Comment	6	11.76%

Question 4 is open ended and therefore not quantified.

5. Does your agency query the current IADLEST National Decertification Database?

Choice	Count	Percent
Routinely	7	13.73%
Occasionally	11	21.57%
Never	29	56.86%
No Comment	4	7.84%

6. Would you consider participation in an improved national revocation database?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	45	88.24%
No	0	0%
No Comment	6	11.76%

7. In your personal opinion, should query access to the database be made available to law enforcement hiring entities?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	44	86.27%
No	3	5.88%
No Comment	4	17.84%

SURVEY RESULTS – BY STATE

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

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

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

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

Question A – 3: Continued

	Other	Explain
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
DC		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois	Yes	see attachment <i>Fd. Note: Specifies felonies and misdemeanors.</i>
Indiana	Yes	Fraudulent application, not guilty verdict based on mental capacity
Iowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky	Yes	Not being able to possess firearm by federal law
Louisiana	Yes	Restriction of right to bear arms
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan	Yes	Misrepresentation or Fraud during application for certification
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri	Yes	Violate our order of probation. Violate any of our administrative rules. Mental condition including alcohol or substance abuse
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada	Yes	Gross misdemeanors and falsification of information to obtain certificate
New	Yes	Resignation in lieu of termination.
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North		
North Dakota		
Ohio	Yes	Misdemeanor: If charged with a felony, but pleads guilty to a misdemeanor pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement in which the person agrees to surrender the certificate.
Oklahoma		
Oregon	Yes	Violation of moral fitness standard. falsification
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South	Yes	Good character issues
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas	Yes	Cancellation of license(s), permanent/term voluntary surrender of license(s).
Utah	Yes	Misdemeanor conviction for domestic violence
Vermont		
Virginia	Yes	Must be requested by the chief or sheriff to de-certify or both
Washington	Yes	Failure to complete basic training, equivalency basic requirements of certification
West Virginia		
Wisconsin	Yes	For any reason including retirement.
Wyoming		

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

Alabama	1971 - Any felony conviction is a bar
Alaska	8/10/1973
Arizona	1968
Arkansas	1975
California	About 1973-1975
Colorado	Felonies- always (1974). Certain Misdemeanors since July 1, 2001
Connecticut	1982
Delaware	Since the Council on Police Training (COPT) inception <i>Ed. Note: 1969</i>
District of Columbia	
Florida	Approx. 1974
Georgia	1970
Hawaii	
Idaho	1974
Illinois	August 13, 1999 Public Act 91-495
Indiana	this year
Iowa	1986
Kansas	1982 (But only actively pursued since 1998 when full time investigator hired)
Kentucky	1998
Louisiana	1976
Maine	1984
Maryland	1966
Massachusetts	N/A
Michigan	1998
Minnesota	1978
Mississippi	1981 - enabling legislation
Missouri	1992
Montana	1994
Nebraska	Approximately 1991, actions didn't start until 1996
Nevada	1967
New Hampshire	1985
New Jersey	N/A
New Mexico	1978
New York	
North Carolina	1972
North Dakota	1989
Ohio	1997
Oklahoma	1988
Oregon	1969
Pennsylvania	1974
Rhode Island	N/A
South Carolina	1976
South Dakota	1975
Tennessee	1982
Texas	9/1/1969
Utah	1977
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	2002
West Virginia	Unknown
Wisconsin	1990
Wyoming	Always for Felony Conviction / 1991 for other than Felony

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

Alabama	72 since 1995 (no records prior to 1995)
Alaska	38
Arizona	656
Arkansas	59
California	5000 +/-
Colorado	88
Connecticut	26
Delaware	Unknown-records do not extend that far
District of Columbia	
Florida	Stats are not available – avg. approx. 260/yr. Since 1974. Ed Note: Current NDD submissions exceed 4,100.
Georgia	4,377
Hawaii	
Idaho	75
Illinois	86
Indiana	0
Iowa	39
Kansas	49
Kentucky	3
Louisiana	Unknown
Maine	109
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	N/A
Michigan	72
Minnesota	91
Mississippi	45
Missouri	263 including 27 permanent surrenders
Montana	68 revoked or suspended
Nebraska	26
Nevada	data unavailable at this time
New Hampshire	189
New Jersey	N/A
New Mexico	85
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	25
Ohio	145
Oklahoma	74
Oregon	over 200
Pennsylvania	exact number unknown
Rhode Island	N/A
South Carolina	not tracked
South Dakota	Unknown
Tennessee	UNK- records were not kept
Texas	Information not available.
Utah	312
Vermont	
Virginia	approximately 15
Washington	37
West Virginia	Unknown
Wisconsin	126
Wyoming	54

Question A – 6: How many officers had their certification revoked in 2004?

Alabama	4
Alaska	2
Arizona	45
Arkansas	6
California	0
Colorado	16
Connecticut	2
Delaware	2
District of Columbia	
Florida	257
Georgia	540- revoked, 30-surrenders
Hawaii	
Idaho	16
Illinois	17
Indiana	0
Iowa	1
Kansas	4
Kentucky	None
Louisiana	2
Maine	9
Maryland	0
Massachusetts	N/A
Michigan	Eight
Minnesota	3
Mississippi	4
Missouri	28 including 14 permanent surrenders
Montana	19 revoked or suspended
Nebraska	1 in 2004, 3 in 2005 to date
Nevada	4
New Hampshire	20
New Jersey	N/A
New Mexico	9
New York	
North Carolina	123 suspended (indefinitely or not less than 5 years) or revoked
North Dakota	2
Ohio	21
Oklahoma	Six
Oregon	62
Pennsylvania	One
Rhode Island	N/A
South Carolina	14
South Dakota	7
Tennessee	49 decertified, 18 suspended
Texas	49 revocations, 20 cancellations, 39 permanent surrenders - 108 total
Utah	17
Vermont	
Virginia	One
Washington	12
West Virginia	5 in the year 2005
Wisconsin	8
Wyoming	3

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

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

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

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

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

Alabama	Yes	Elected officials are exempt, appointed members of the Governor's cabinet
Alaska	No	
Arizona	Yes	Sheriffs- only the elected sheriff, all deputies must be certified
Arkansas	Yes	Sheriffs
California	No	
Colorado	Yes	Denver city and county sheriff deputies
Connecticut	Yes	State Police, Marshall's, State's Attorney Inspectors
Delaware	No	
District of Columbia		
Florida	Yes	Only sheriffs have enforcement authority and are exempt by the Florida constitution; Chiefs are not required to be certified but have no enforcement authority if not certified
Georgia	No	
Hawaii		
Idaho	Yes	Any elected official (sheriff), deputies serving civil process, director of Idaho state police, parking or animal control officers
Illinois	Yes	Illinois State Police - Has own merit board. Sheriff's - are elected officials - not required to have basic training – However, most have a corrections or law enforcement background.
Indiana	No	
Iowa	No	
Kansas	No	
Kentucky	Yes	Sheriffs are not required to be certified, but may choose to do so
Louisiana	Yes	Chiefs and Sheriffs
Maine	No	
Maryland	Yes	Heads of Law Enforcement Agencies, Deputy Head of Agency (eg Deputy Sheriff, Deputy Chief)
Massachusetts		N/A
Michigan	Yes	Elected Sheriffs
Minnesota	No	
Mississippi	Yes	Sheriffs, elected chiefs, constables
Missouri	No	
Montana	Yes	Sheriffs
Nebraska	No	
Nevada	Yes	
New Hampshire	No	
New Jersey		
New Mexico	Yes	Sheriffs
New York		
North Carolina	Yes	Sheriffs of North Carolina's 100 counties
North Dakota	No	
Ohio	Yes	Ohio State Highway Patrol Trooper's certification and training is conducted by the Superintendent with approval of the director of public safety. Chiefs of Police who do not function as peace officers.
Oklahoma	No	
Oregon	Yes	Reserve officers
Pennsylvania	Yes	State Police, Sheriffs, Park Rangers
Rhode Island	Yes	Providence P.D. has their own Police Academy and specific certificate. R.I. State Police has their own Police Academy and specific certificate. R.I. Sheriffs (Court Security mostly) – they also train their own.
South Carolina	Yes	Sheriffs
South Dakota	No	
Tennessee	Yes	State officers
Texas	No	
Utah	No	
Vermont	Yes	Training requirements are "optional" for elected officials.
Virginia	No	
Washington	No	
West Virginia	Yes	Heads of Law Enforcement Agencies
Wisconsin	Yes	Elected Officers (Sheriffs and Constables)
Wyoming	No	

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

Alabama	No	
Alaska	No	
Arizona	No	
Arkansas	No	
California	No	
Colorado	No	
Connecticut	No	
Delaware	No	
District of Columbia		
Florida	No	
Georgia	No	
Hawaii		
Idaho	No	
Illinois	Yes	Illinois State Police - Has own merit board
Indiana	No	
Iowa	No	
Kansas	No	
Kentucky	No	
Louisiana	No	
Maine	No	
Maryland	No	
Massachusetts	No	
Michigan	No	
Minnesota	No	
Mississippi	No	
Missouri	No	
Montana	No	
Nebraska	No	
Nevada	No	
New Hampshire	No	
New Jersey		
New Mexico	No	
New York		
North Carolina	Yes	N.C. Sheriff's Education and Training Standards Commission
North Dakota	No	
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	No	
Washington	No	
West Virginia	No	
Wisconsin	No	
Wyoming	No	

Question A – 11: Does your agency also certify:

	Correctional Officers	Parole/ Probation	Private Security	Communications Personnel/ Dispatch	Other
Alabama	Yes	Yes			
Alaska	Yes	Yes			
Arizona					
Arkansas	Yes	Yes			
California					
Colorado		Yes			
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District Columbia					
Florida	Yes	Yes			
Georgia	Yes	Yes		Yes	Juvenile Corrections : Jailors
Hawaii					
Idaho	Yes	Yes		Yes	Juvenile detention, Juvenile Probation Officers
Illinois	Yes				
Indiana					
Iowa				Yes	Parole/Probation officers with sworn status
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana	Yes	Yes			
Maine	Yes				Harbor Masters, Court Security Officers, Capitol Security, Shellfish Wardens
Maryland	Yes	Yes			Juvenile Justice Personnel
Massachusetts					
Michigan			Yes		Private Security Officers with arrest authority only
Minnesota					
Mississippi		Yes		Yes	Local jail officers
Missouri					
Montana	Yes	Yes		Yes	Juvenile Probation, Livestock Brand Inspectors, Detention Officers, Motor Carrier Services Officers
Nebraska					
Nevada	Yes	Yes			
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes			
New Jersey					
New Mexico		Yes		Yes	
New York					
North Carolina	Yes	Yes			Juvenile Justice Officers, Local Confinement Personnel (local jailors). (Sheriff's Commission certifies communications personnel)
North Dakota		Yes			
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes		Canine, Bailiff, Jailors
Oklahoma		Yes			
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina		Yes		Yes	
South Dakota				Yes	Canine Handling
Tennessee					
Texas	Yes				
Utah	Yes	Yes		Yes	
Vermont					
Virginia			Yes		Private security is in a different section of the agency which does licensing of companies and registering of personnel
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					Local Jail/Secure (Juvenile) Detention Officers
Wyoming	Yes			Yes	Detention Officers (County Jails), Coroners and Deputies

Question A – 12: Additional information or comments:

Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	AZ Post approves correctional officer employment standards and basic curriculum, but does not "certify" correctional officers
Arkansas	
California	Since 1-1-04, we may not revoke/cancel certification. We may only annotate the record in our database "not eligible to be a peace officer in CA" and so inform the employing agency. This is the result of a change in the law.
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board certifies the following : Law Enforcement Officers - Full time and Part time, County Correctional Officers - Full time, Court Security Officers
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Michigan	MCOLES has had discussions with stateholder groups regarding expanding revocation to certain misdemeanors - no action at this time.
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	New Jersey requires compulsory training of law enforcement officers, which results in the issuance of a certification of training. We do not have the more comprehensive licensure requirement which includes certification and decertification.
New Mexico	
New York	The state of New York does not license police officers or peace officers. State law does require successful completion or basic training for police and peace officers. State law also requires each police and peace officer to be registered with the DCJS. Officer discipline is handled by the employing agency.
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	Rhode Island Department of Corrections does it's own training.
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	All requests for de-certification must originate with the chief of police, sheriff, or regional jail administrator. We have no authority to initiate any such request on our own.
Washington	
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	
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	
Alabama		Yes		
Alaska		Yes		
Arizona		Yes		
Arkansas	Yes			
California		Yes		
Colorado			Yes	Crown Pointe Software
Connecticut		Yes		
Delaware		Yes		
District Columbia				
Florida			Yes	
Georgia		Yes		Case File
Hawaii				
Idaho			Yes	Crown Pointe and Skills Management
Illinois		Yes		
Indiana		Yes		
Iowa			Yes	Skills Manager (Ed. Note: Crown Pointe)
Kansas			Yes	Created in-house in filemaker
Kentucky		Yes		
Louisiana				None at this point
Maine		Yes	Yes	Pathlore Learning Management System
Maryland			Yes	Crown Pointe "Skills Master"
Massachusetts				
Michigan			Yes	Northrup Grumman (Michigan Information and Tracking Network)
Minnesota		Yes		
Mississippi	Yes			
Missouri		Yes		
Montana		Yes		
Nebraska		Yes		
Nevada			Yes	Crown Pointe
New Hampshire		Yes		
New Jersey				
New Mexico			Yes	Skills Manager and Crown Pointe Technologies
New York			Yes	Ingenium - CLICK2LEARN.COM
North Carolina		Yes		
North Dakota			Yes	Skills Manager - Crown Pointe
Ohio	Yes	Yes		
Oklahoma		Yes		
Oregon			Yes	Microsoft Access
Pennsylvania				Independent vendor developed electronic data management system
Rhode Island				Certificate issued to graduates (copies kept on file)
South Carolina		Yes	Yes	Law Enforcement Training System (LETS), Logicalis - Division of Data Tech. - Washington State
South Dakota		Yes		
Tennessee	Yes	Yes		
Texas		Yes	Yes	
Utah			Yes	Crown Pointe/Training Manager
Vermont			Yes	Crown Pointe
Virginia		Yes		
Washington		Yes		
West Virginia		Yes		
Wisconsin			Yes	Skills Manager by Crown Pointe Technologies.
Wyoming				

Question B – 2: Certification records are numbered using:

	SSN	Modified SSN	Non-SSN
Alabama			Yes
Alaska			
Arizona	Yes		
Arkansas			Yes
California	Yes		Yes
Colorado	Yes		
Connecticut			Yes
Delaware			Yes
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			Yes
Hawaii			
Idaho	Yes		
Illinois	Yes		
Indiana	Yes		Yes
Iowa			Yes
Kansas	Yes		
Kentucky			Yes
Louisiana			
Maine	Yes		Yes
Maryland	Yes		
Massachusetts			
Michigan	Yes		Yes
Minnesota			Yes
Mississippi	Yes		Yes
Missouri	Yes		
Montana	Yes		
Nebraska	Yes		
Nevada	Yes		Yes
New Hampshire			Yes
New Jersey			
New Mexico	Yes		
New York	Yes		
North Carolina	Yes		
North Dakota	Yes		Yes
Ohio	Yes		
Oklahoma	Yes		
Oregon			Yes
Pennsylvania			Yes
Rhode Island			Yes
South Carolina	Yes		
South Dakota			Yes
Tennessee	Yes		
Texas	Yes		Yes
Utah			
Vermont		Yes	
Virginia	Yes		
Washington	Yes		
West Virginia	Yes		
Wisconsin	Yes		
Wyoming			Yes

Question B – 3: How long are records maintained?

Alabama	Indefinitely	
Alaska	Indefinitely	
Arizona	Indefinitely	
Arkansas	Indefinitely	
California	Indefinitely	
Colorado		
Connecticut	Indefinitely	
Delaware	Indefinitely	
District of Columbia		
Florida	Indefinitely	
Georgia	Indefinitely	
Hawaii		
Idaho	Indefinitely	
Illinois	Indefinitely	
Indiana	Indefinitely	
Iowa	Indefinitely	
Kansas	Indefinitely	
Kentucky	Indefinitely	
Louisiana	Indefinitely	
Maine	Indefinitely	
Maryland	Indefinitely	
Massachusetts		
Michigan	Indefinitely	
Minnesota	Indefinitely	
Mississippi	Indefinitely	
Missouri	Indefinitely	
Montana	Indefinitely	
Nebraska	Indefinitely	
Nevada	Indefinitely	
New Hampshire	Indefinitely	
New Jersey		
New Mexico	Indefinitely	
New York	Indefinitely	
North Carolina		Maintain for 5 years from date of separation, then sent to Archives; decertified officer's records are kept indefinitely
North Dakota	Indefinitely	
Ohio	Indefinitely	
Oklahoma	Indefinitely	
Oregon		75 years for officer files
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		40 years by Rhode Island law
South Carolina	Indefinitely	Electronic records maintained for length of officers career - life. Most routine paper records are returned to department
South Dakota	Indefinitely	
Tennessee	Indefinitely	
Texas	Indefinitely	
Utah	Indefinitely	
Vermont	Indefinitely	
Virginia	Indefinitely	
Washington	Indefinitely	
West Virginia	Indefinitely	
Wisconsin	Indefinitely	
Wyoming	Indefinitely	

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

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

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

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

Question B – 6: Additional information or comments:

Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	If the officer fails the Basic exam these records are maintained indefinitely.
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Michigan	Our Information System has the <u>ability</u> to issue wallet cards. We currently issue Basic Training Certificates as licenses. Statute requires the return of the certificate upon demand.
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	Under # 4, wall diplomas are issued
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	Cannot deny initial certification as long as requirements of law are met.
Washington	
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	Certification records are available at www.wilenet.org (A secure web site)
Wyoming	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alabama	We are checking on how to start this now
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	Legal advice (being reviewed again now) is such that disclosure violates CA peace officer confidentiality laws.
Colorado	
Connecticut	We were told to wait by IADLEST
Delaware	Unaware of the database. Never proposed.
District of Columbia	
Florida	Initially provided information, but compatibility issues arose & no more has been provided
Georgia	We have never been asked to contribute. Approximately 7 years ago we shared info about our data but that was it.
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	Participation if optional
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	Moving in that direction.
Kentucky	Not a good reason - been too busy doing other things - poor excuse!
Louisiana	Haven't been asked / didn't know
Maine	Unsure of the process. Concern about the current system.
Maryland	Insufficient records, MD "non-certification" upon termination of employment may confuse database
Massachusetts	
Michigan	We are interested and considering participating
Minnesota	The issue is on the agenda for the July 2005 POST board meeting
Mississippi	Working on web based system; state law allows revoked officer a new hearing after 2 years.
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	I plan to look into contributing to NDD in near future.
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	Council recommendation.
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	Choice and preference of legal counsel and administrative leadership
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	Use of previous member identification and password not available.
Utah	
Vermont	Because we can't currently decertify-we are working to get rules in place to allow same!
Virginia	The individuals have been imprisoned and unavailable for any employment.
Washington	Legislative prohibition
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	Database info could easily be confused with decertification for other reasons. (Beyond Wisconsin decertification)
Wyoming	Final clearance not gained - working on it.

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

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

Question C – 6: Would you consider participation in an improved national revocation database?

Alabama	Yes
Alaska	Yes
Arizona	Yes
Arkansas	Yes
California	Yes
Colorado	Yes
Connecticut	Yes
Delaware	Yes
District of Columbia	
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	
Idaho	Yes
Illinois	Yes
Indiana	Yes
Iowa	Yes
Kansas	Yes
Kentucky	Yes
Louisiana	Yes
Maine	Yes
Maryland	Yes
Massachusetts	
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Montana	Yes
Nebraska	Yes
Nevada	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes
New Jersey	
New Mexico	Yes
New York	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma	Yes
Oregon	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	Yes
South Dakota	Yes
Tennessee	Yes
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Vermont	Yes
Virginia	Yes
Washington	
West Virginia	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes
Wyoming	Yes

Question C – 7: In your personal opinion, should query access to the database be made available to law enforcement hiring entities?

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

Question C – 8: Additional information or comments:

Alabama	
Alaska	Most agencies work out "deals" with officers to just go away. Consequently a database is only going to be of minimal use.
Arizona	Have not yet queried the database, we will in the future
Arkansas	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
District of Columbia	
Florida	FDLE does not query the database because in FL the local agencies are responsible for their own backgrounds. That is why we need #7 above.
Georgia	Should only be available to state certifying entity
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	Access to database that does not require full IADLEST membership fees and annually renewed
Massachusetts	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	It may be beneficial to require a query of the NDD as part of the background process
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	Rhode Island is still in the dark ages!
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	Although Washington State would like to participate, we are still working to resolve legal issues regarding the privacy of decertification files.
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The incident 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.
- Generally, responding POST personnel do not oppose the availability of database information by law enforcement hiring entities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Reporting of revocation actions to the NDD should be contingent upon the availability of due process.
- The NDD should consider inclusion of records of initial denial of certification as well as those of temporary suspension. In addition, consideration should be given to the inclusion of decertified, non-police personnel such as correctional officers and parole/probation agents.
- The NDD should either provide a minimum detail of the basis of the revocation action specifying felony conviction, misdemeanor commission, etc., or include an effective disclaimer regarding variability of possible basis of action.
- NDD 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.
- Given the large number of revocation actions by certain states, a method of bulk data entry should be provided. Alternatively, state controlled linking of existing state databases with the central index should be considered.
- A standards based data management model should be proposed for use by POST agencies. Establishment of a web based XML conformance plan would simplify data entry, data communications and query operations.

- All POST agencies should routinely query the NDD prior to certification as a law enforcement officer.
- Query access by law enforcement hiring entities, such as police departments, should be considered.



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

**Police Officer Certification Revocation Information Sharing
National Public Safety Officer Decertification Database**

2005 Survey of POST Agencies

June 1, 2005

Dear POST Director,

I am pleased to inform you of our success in securing funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the US Department of Justice for the further development of our National Decertification Database. The new project will maintain our current effort and result in an improved and more secure decertification pointer system. An essential task of the current project is this survey of all state POST agencies regarding current certification and revocation practices, policies and procedures. A summary report will be prepared and made available to all IADLEST member agencies.

Please take the time to complete the survey and return to me by June 30 at:

Raymond A. Franklin
IADLEST Project Director
Public Safety Education and Training Center
6852 4th Street
Sykesville, MD 21784

A stamped and pre-addressed envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact me directly at 410-875-3606 or mail@rayfranklin.com.

With best regards,

Raymond A. Franklin
Project Director

2005 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 2004?

.....

7 Are revoked officers afforded due process through 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parole/Probation Officers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Security Officers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communications Personnel/Dispatchers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 Does your agency publish revocation actions?

- Yes No

3 Does your agency contribute to the current IADLEST National Decertification Database (NDD)?

- Yes No

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

.....

.....

.....

5 Does your agency query the current IADLEST National Decertification Database?

- Routinely Occasionally Never

6 Would you consider participation in an improved national revocation database?

- Yes No

7 In your personal opinion, should query access to the database be made available to law enforcement hiring entities?

- Yes No

8 Additional information or comments:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Section D – Respondent Information

Name	Agency
Telephone	E-Mail Address

Please return the completed survey to:

Raymond A. Franklin
IADLEST Project Director
Public Safety Education and Training Center
6852 4th Street
Sykesville, MD 21784

APPENDIX B – SURVEY DISTRIBUTION LIST

R. Alan Benefield, Chief
Alabama Police Officers Standards and Training
P.O. Box 300075
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-0075

Jim Meehan, Acting Director
Alaska Police Standards
4500 Diplomacy Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Thomas Hammarstrom, Executive Director
Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training
2543 East University Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Terry Bolton, Executive Director
Arkansas Law Enforcement Training Academy
P.O. Box 3106
East Camden, Arkansas 71701

Kenneth J. O'Brien,
Executive Director
California Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training
1601 Alhambra Blvd.
Sacramento, California 95816

John Kammerzell, Executive Director
Colorado Police Officers Standards and Training
1525 Sherman Ave., 5th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203

Thomas Flaherty, Director
Police Standards and Training
285 Preston Avenue
Meriden, Connecticut 06450-4891

Joan Weiss, Executive Director
District of Columbia Police Training and Standards Board
300 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 5031
Washington, DC 20001

Harry W. Downes
Director of Training
Delaware State Police Training
1453 North DuPont Highway
Dover, Delaware 19901-0430

Bill Hutson, Director
Georgia Peace Officers Standards and Training Council
5000 Austell Power Springs Road, Suite 261
Austell, Georgia 30106

Michael Crews, Program Director
Florida Department of Law Enforcement
P.O. Box 1489
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1489

Robert Prasser
Honolulu Police Department
801 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Michael N. Becar,
Executive Director
Idaho Peace Officer Standards and Training
P.O. Box 700
Meridian, Idaho 83680-0700

Thomas J. Jurkanin, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board
600 S. Second Street, Suite 300
Springfield, Illinois 62704-2542

E. A. "Penny" Westfall, Director
Iowa Law Enforcement Academy
P.O. Box 130
Johnston, Iowa 50131-0130

Scott C. Mellinger, Executive Director
Indiana Law Enforcement Training
5402 Sugar Grove, P.O. Box 313
Plainfield, Indiana 46168-0313

Ed H. Pavey, Director
Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center
P.O. Box 647
Hutchinson, Kansas 67504-0647

John Bizzack, Commissioner
Kentucky Department of Criminal Justice Training
521 Lancaster Rd., Funderburk Bldg.
Richmond, Kentucky 40475-3137

Michael Ranatza, Executive Director
Louisiana Police Officers Standards and Training Council
1885 Wooddale Blvd., Room 208
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

John B. Rogers, Director
Criminal Justice Academy
15 Oak Grove Road
Vassalboro, Maine 04989

Patrick Bradley, Executive Director
Maryland Police and Correctional Training Commissions
6852 4th Street
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

Dennis Pinkham, Executive Director
Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Council
484 Shea Memorial Drive South
Weymouth, Massachusetts 02190

Raymond Beach, Jr., Executive Director
Commission on Law Enforcement Standards
7426 North Canal Road
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Neil Melton, Executive Director
Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training
1600 University Ave., Suite 200
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104-3825

Robert D. Davis, Executive Director
Board of Law Enforcement Standards and Training
3750 I-55 Frontage Road,
North Jackson, Mississippi 39211

Jeremy Spratt, Program Manager
Missouri Peace Officer Standards and Training
P.O. Box 749
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0749

Allen Horsfall, Executive Director
Montana Police Officers Standards and Training
P.O. Box 201408
Helena, Montana 59620-1408

Steve Lamken, Director
Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center
3600 North Academy Road
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801-0403

Richard Clark, Executive Director
Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training
5587 Wai Pai Shone Avenue
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Keith H. Lohmann, Director
Police Standards and Training
17 Institute Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-7413

Donald McCann, Chief
New Jersey Police Services Section
P.O. Box 085
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0085

Thomas D. Lyon, Director
Department of Public Safety Training and Recruiting Division
4491 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507-9721

James R. DeLapp, Deputy Commissioner OPS
New York Division of Criminal Justice Services
4 Tower Place
Albany, New York 12203-3764

D. Scott Perry, Director
North Carolina Criminal Justice Education and Training
P.O. Box 149
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mark Gilbertson, Executive Secretary
North Dakota Police Officers Standards and Training Board
P.O. Box 1054
Bismarck, North Dakota 58502-1054

Steve Schierholt, Executive Director
Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy
P.O. 309
London, Ohio 43140

Jeanie Nelson, Ph.D., Director
Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training
P.O. Box 11476
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73136-0476

John Minnis, Director
Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
550 North Monmouth Ave.
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

John Gallaher,
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Municipal Police Officers Education and Training Commission
8002 Bretz Drive
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17112-9748

Glenford Shibley, Acting Director
Police Academy
Flanagan Campus 1762
Louisquisset Pike
Lincoln, Rhode Island 02865

William R. Neill, Deputy Director
South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy
P.O. Box 1993
Blythewood, South Carolina 29206-1993

Bryan Gortmaker, Training Administrator
Rol Kebach Criminal Justice Training Center
East Highway 34, 500 East Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-7070

Mark Bracy, Director
Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Academy
3025 Lebanon Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37214-2217

Jim Dozier, J.D., Ph.D.
Executive Director
Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education
6330 U.S. Hwy 290 East, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78723

Robert W. Morris, Acting Director
Peace Officer Standards and Training
Post Office Box 141775
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-1775

R.J. Elrick, Executive Director
Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council
317 Sanatorium Road
Pittsford, Vermont 05763

George Gotschalk, Chief
Standards and Training
Department of Criminal Justice Services
805 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Michael Parsons, Ph.D., Executive Director
Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission
19010 1st Ave.
South Burien, Washington 98148

Chuck Sadler, Executive Director
Criminal Justice and Highway Safety
1204 Kanawha Blvd.
East Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Dennis Hanson, Director
Wisconsin Training and Standards Bureau
P.O. Box 7070
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7070

Donald Pierson, Executive Director
Wyoming Peace Officers Standards and Training
1710 Pacific Ave.
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002