Register Now for the Upcoming Contemporary Issues and Ethics Conference (March 24-26, 2010)

It is time to register for the annual ILEA “Contemporary Issues and Ethics” conference to be held at the Center for American and International Law in Plano, Texas from March 24-26, 2010. This year the theme is “Leadership in a Cyberworld: Management Challenges in the Information Age.”

Given our rapidly changing universe of information technology and information management, today’s leaders must confront a growing number of ethical, strategic, tactical and operational challenges.

For example, what are the ethics of using an analysis of a police or corrections officer’s Facebook to make determinations concerning their continued employability? How might police agencies take advantage of electronic networks to make the community safer? Are there “best practices” for governing employee use of social networking sites? What are the limits of free speech in cyberspace? Are concerns about social networking affecting the hiring and background processes?

The ILEA has called together a distinguished faculty of law enforcement leaders, information technology experts, government specialists and academic authorities to address these challenges, issues and questions during this conference. Topics will include:

- **“Managing a ‘Connected’ Agency**
  Chief John Stacey
  Bellevue Police Department, NE

- **Electronic Vetting**
  Dr. Howard Timm
  U.S. Department of Defense, Monterey, CA

- **Videos, Tweets and Other Off-Duty Postings: First Amendment Free Speech**
  Ms. Laura L. Scarry, Attorney at Law
  Chicago, IL

- **“Second Life”: Perils and Pearls**
  Corporal Roy Alston
  Dallas Police Department, TX

- **“Humanity’ in Cyberspace**
  Ms. Kim Young
  The Forest and the Trees, Dallas, TX

Dr. Dan Primozic, Associate Director
Institute for Law Enforcement Administration
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Online Training: What is the ROI?
Mr. Tim Freesmeyer
Etico Solutions, Macomb, IL

Cybersecurity Issues
Mr. Michael Morris
FBI, North Texas Regional Computer Forensics Lab, Dallas, TX

Managing the Use of Social Networks
Ms. Lauri Stevens
New England Institute of Art, Boston, MA and Principal, LAwS Communications

Ethics Trainers Roundtable
Providing an opportunity to share and learn techniques and strategies for teaching ethics in the law enforcement and corrections communities for graduates of the Ethics Train-the-Trainer course.

The keynote speaker for the conference will be Daphne Levenson, Executive Director of the Gulf States Regional Center for Public Safety Innovations. She will address the growing impact of social networking sites on real-world activities, and the ways in which proactive leaders can actively guide the ethical use of new technologies and information sharing.

We will also present Chief Mark Field of the Wheaton Police Department, IL with the Ethics Achievement Award. In December 2000, Chief Field and his leadership team took the courageous step of shaping the department into a values-based organization which eliminated 755 traditional rules and regulations and replaced them with a Statement of Quality and a set of 8 core principles that would guide the organization into the future. We will present this Ethics Achievement Award to Chief Field for his exemplary demonstration of ethical leadership at a formal conference ceremony on March 25.

For more information and the chance to register for the conference, visit the ILEA web site at www.theILEA.org

As a reminder, agencies holding organizational membership in the Center for Law Enforcement Ethics may send one person to the conference at no cost. In addition, persons holding individual memberships in the Ethics Center may attend at a reduced rate.

This conference provides 14 hours of TCLEOSE credit for law enforcement officers from the State of Texas.
There is at least one person in the world of ethical leadership that walks the talk. And no, he is not in the law enforcement or corrections professions (although there are plenty of people in those professions that walk the talk there as well). His name is G.T. “Buck” Smith and he is the president of Davis and Elkins College, a small liberal arts college near the Monongahela National Forest in the Appalacchians.

According to Scott Carlson, who wrote about Mr. Smith for the Chronicle of Higher Education, “Buck” is a turnaround magician for the college who took the college from the abyss of going out of business to a winning institution of higher learning seven times the size it was when he took the helm about two years ago. What are his secrets? What is his magic?

The short answer is authentic leadership – living ethical leadership. What do I mean by that? I mean those qualities and virtues of leadership that we teach here at ILEA, “lived out” in the everyday context of the workplace. But it is simple and elegant the way Buck describes it:

“The underlying thing for me is relationships – hardly anything important happens that doesn’t have to do with relationships... It’s getting to know people, being interested in them... Life is built on genuine relationships, when trust and integrity are without question. When that is there, there are no limits.”

That summarizes virtually all the ethical leadership lessons the ILEA tries to impart to the participants in its programs. Sometimes we have referred to this approach as “servant leadership.” Sometimes I have tried to capture it in an acronym: IPS (It’s the People, Stupid). It is easy to talk about, but very difficult to live, especially consistently, as a matter of personal integrity and character.

Buck does not draw a salary (it would be about one hundred thirty thousand dollars a year) but instead works for nothing. He does this because he knows that the college is in tight financial circumstances. Not many could afford to do that kind of thing for their organizations. Even fewer would do it even if they could. That’s part of being a good servant. It shows that he is not in it for the dough.

Evidently, he is also a master fund-raiser. He has never asked for a gift. He merely tells the true story about the college and the donors volunteer their money. Carlson maintains that Buck “seems to maintain a belief that if you are honest and you believe in people, good things will rain down.”

Apparently it has been raining quite a bit around his college.

He is interested in everybody on campus, and off campus: “it didn’t matter what position the person was in or how much money he made. Everyone had intrinsic value.”

This personal approach – as opposed to the impersonal approach of mass-mailing – is seen also in the way the college recruits new students and retains old ones. Recruiters now travel in person to many more college fairs and high school visits, personal responses to inquiries are the rule of the day (many times from the president himself), and the president, his cabinet, the faculty and staff are all authentically accessible through cell phone numbers and email addresses. President Smith starts his day at 4 a.m. and works until midnight many nights. It seems that the personal approach surely takes a lot of time, energy, and self-sacrifice. But, again, Buck is not in it for the money. It is his life — his passion. As he says it (and evidently means it): “It’s not a job, it’s a mission. I wouldn’t do it if it was a job.”

During our days here at the ILEA, we have had the pleasure of meeting more than a few police and corrections professionals, especially some in leadership positions, who feel the same way as Buck does … the “job” is not a job, but rather, is at their living core. It tends to show.

---
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The “Hidden” Ethics Curriculum

by Dan Primozic

I am inspired to write this article from a great article by David A. Hoekema. Hoekema points out that, on a college campus each and every person teaches ethics whether they realize it or not. Presidents, administrators, deans, department chairs, professors, staff, counselors, leaders of student organizations, BPOC’s (“big people on campus”), the popular, the highly visible, and even the invisible and anonymous all model some form of morality (or, too often, immorality) either deliberately or unintentionally. There was an old phrase for this in pedagogy called the “hidden curriculum”: or those non-content items that one teaches in a classroom which, nonetheless, become a powerful part of what is taught — sometimes more powerful than the content that is deliberately presented. Hoekema maintains that:

The first and most prominent group [of unacknowledged ethicists] consists of the professors standing in front of their classrooms. Whether consciously or unconsciously, whether systematically or haphazardly, they serve as moral guides to students... Students learn what it means to disagree forcefully but respectfully, and they observe how much of how little concern their instructors show when a student is unable to grasp critical concepts. Professors teach students about morality by the ways in which they grade tests, structure assignments, and respond to student complaints... [Students] can see the difference between a dedicated teacher and one who is merely earning a paycheck, between an insincere and a genuine commitment to students’ intellectual and personal welfare.

After having worked in the field of higher education for a long while, I cannot but agree with Hoekema on this and only wish I realized the truth of it more fully and responsibly than I have. I might have acted differently — and much better — on many occasions.

But, now, I wonder if this also applies to the professions of law enforcement and corrections? Surely it does. And the sooner we realize it the better off we will be. What I have in mind here is not innovative nor is it new to what we teach here at ILEA.

We often teach the idea that there is true leadership at all levels of a criminal justice agency: from the Chief to the unsworn dispatcher. People follow those whom they admire, respect, or those whom they are forced to follow by the organizational reporting structure of their workplace. If that is true — and we are convinced that it is true — then all of these people, at all of these levels, are teaching each other something and are learning leadership lessons from one another. It is as if all of us are saying to each other: “look and see how this should be done” (regardless of what “this” refers to).

If we see “ethics” clearly and concretely, then we know that word refers to saying or doing things in the right way, for the right reasons, at the right time. So what we are teaching each other by what we say and what we do is “look and see how to do this in the right way, for the right reasons, and at the right time.” That means that Hoekema is correct when he sees everyone in a workplace as an “unacknowledged ethicist.”

When it comes to the acknowledged leaders of law enforcement and corrections organizations — the chiefs and sheriffs — the onus of being ethical, moral and right in what we say and do as much as is humanly possible is incredibly heavy and obvious. The boss sets the ethical tone for the organization and the people within it not just in policies, not just in memos, emails, directives and disciplinary actions, but just as importantly, in whether and how they talk and deal with their personnel, with community members and with suspects. What kind of man or woman is at the helm? People wonder about that and watch out for that. Clearly, the modeling of moral behavior and speech is exceptionally important at this level of leadership. If it does not happen there, it is less likely that it will surface anywhere in the organization. My sympathies go out to the boss. You must get this idea and get it right.

Frankly, as one glides downwards or laterally through the organizational chart, there is not a position or a job that this message does not apply to. Deputy chiefs and undersheriffs, commanders, lieutenants, sergeants, officers, dispatchers all teach all the time by speaking, doing
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and living. The only question is what the moral quality is of that, concrete, real-world instruction.

The ethical trickle down continues throughout the organizational chart, but can also take a sharp detour into the necessity for those who find themselves admired, awarded, being thought “cool” and worthy of emulation to know that they too have a moral responsibility to teach ethical leadership. People like you and they want to be like you, and some of them will do just that. You will teach them something either way – right or wrong, good or bad — because people want to learn from you and, therefore, actually do learn from you.

The fact is that we are, all of us, always teaching and learning from each other no matter where we are or who we are. Again, the only question here is what we are leaning and how good or bad it is.

On the Nobility of the Obscure

by Dan Primozic

If I fulfill this oath and do not violate it, may it be granted to me to enjoy life, and art, being honored with fame among all men for all time to come . . .

Even when I was younger, as I taught Biomedical Ethics to health care professionals in colleges and universities, I would stagger at the arrogance and almost comic ambition of the words above that come from the oath that ancient physicians swore before fully entering into the profession of medicine: “being honored with fame among all men for all time to come.” Perhaps my reaction to that human desire for fame, honor and immortality of reputation is merely idiosyncratic. I am sometimes convinced that it must be so.

I think that all of us begin our conscious lives, especially of working lives, with thoughts of magnificent achievement, extremely significant contributions to our fields and to humanity itself, if not to the world and all of its creatures, rivers and stones. Some people become widely known, widely read, wealthy, famous, sought after, pursued ruthlessly by the paparazzi, hounded, revered, rewarded, and most importantly it seems, remembered and honored for durable and lengthy periods of time. Most of us do not experience this kind of recognition. But do all of us desire it nonetheless (either blatantly or secretly)? Do we all wish to be known for our noble deeds and then rewarded for them with prizes and adulation? I think that this human drive is so strong that many of us will pursue even that which is ignoble to get it. Pick up a newspaper (sorry – click on your favorite internet news source) and see if what I am saying is not the case.

Hence, whether or not this fame and honor is desired is beyond question: it is. But does that mean that it necessarily is desirable? This is the fallacy that John Stewart Mill, in his System of Logic, tries to indicate to us: that just because something is desired does not necessarily mean that thing is desirable. Perhaps, like the long list of people who desired to smoke cigarettes for most of their lives, we find that practice was, in the end,
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undesirable after all. Maybe fame and honor and recognition are like smoking in this regard?

And if we take seriously Jim Stovall famous saying from his book, You Don’t Have to Be Blind to See: “having integrity is doing the right thing in a situation, even if nobody is watching and nobody will ever know,” then perhaps my suspicion concerning the nobility and thus, the moral desirability of “fame and honor among all for all time” is warranted.

There is a more ancient warning against the false promises of the fame and notoriety gained for what we say and do that comes down to us from a thinker named Epicurus. He said that:

Some men want to become famous and respected, believing that this is the way to acquire security against [other] men. Thus if the life of such men is secure, then they acquire the natural good; but if it is not secure, they do not have that for the sake of which they strove from the beginning according to what is naturally congenial... The purest security is that which comes from a quiet life and withdrawal from the many, although a certain degree of security from other men does come by means of the power to repel [attacks] and by means of prosperity. ii

When it comes to looking at the “security” (and privacy) that the recognized and famous possess, I think it clear that they do not gain it from their notoriety. It seems to me that direct opposite becomes the case for those that achieve high visibility among us, to the point where they, themselves, wonder if it is all really worth it when they are incessantly interviewed by the media (in whose interest it is to propel the famous, the noble and also the ignoble to higher and higher relief). The question concerning whether they might enjoy their fame, high repute and honors after they die is, of course, still entirely an open one about which I will not here comment.

While there is nothing intrinsically evil or bad in gaining this kind of notoriety, it still seems that there is something even more honorable about doing the right, the good, and the beautiful in an invisible, anonymous and obscure fashion, without regard to being noticed widely or eternally for it. Although my ancestors were not famous and were unnoticed and obscure even in their own time, those few who did know them attested that they were good men and women of solid moral fiber. And that is good and noble enough for me. And perhaps someday if that kind of “award” and recognition is bestowed upon me by those few who really know me, I should be more than grateful for it.

________________________________________

i The Hippocratic Oath, the latter part of the fourth century B.C.E.