

Karen's Ethical Interview: October 23, 2011

Assignment #2, Group C:

1. What is your profession and how long have you been doing it?

Dave Reichart: Federal Police Officer on the force for 35 years.

2. What made you want to go into your profession?

Basically it was due to economics and timing. Not too many jobs at the time, the pay and career opportunities and pension were attractive.

3. Is there a "Code of Ethics" that governs your profession? If so, do you ever refer to it for guidance or support?

Yes there is a code for both morals and ethics when hiring a member that come into play. You need to show character, integrity and accountability as part of your personality when hiring. In this profession, you're governed by policy and peer pressure that keeps you in line. All governed by law of the RCMP "Federal Act" which can be enforced even "off" duty and can be applied for example: slanderous gossip occurs. **Using the code for guidance or support?** He wasn't sure if this meant for himself or for others but answered: Yes, it defines what he should or shouldn't be doing. If it fits within good moral character it helps to define your borders within a situation.

4. Can you tell me about an ethical dilemma/situation that you have encountered in your professional career?

Yes, where I had a member caught stealing things which was unethical and his actions were governed by the RCMP act and also by our criminal code. All our moral ethics and values are covered by every aspect. I reported it and officially recorded it so it wasn't forgotten, a file was created and an investigation was started and it went through the criminal system where there was no interference nor bias.

5. How many people were involved with this particular ethical issue? Who? How many people were involved with coming to an ethical solution?

Around 6 initially then they end up going to criminal court and then after convicted they go into the RCMP act and he went thru their own court and there he was found guilty and dismissed from his career. No warning was given to this member due to being compromised such if he ever had to lead another case in court. He couldn't be trusted if this were allowed.

6. In the end, how was the issue resolved? Was everyone involved pleased with the outcome?

It was resolved with the person being unethical was held accountable and treated as an example and precedence for any other employee. This member was held accountable to himself and to

others paying the bills on the public purse.

7. How long did it take to resolve this dilemma?

About 2 years! When you deal with courts, it's not fast. This person has the rights as any other person and innocent until proven guilty. After representation, it takes time.

8. Who would investigate and make the decision to hold you accountable if you were caught/reported for behaving unethically?

Basically what happens in our outfit if a complaint is made and we have a department which takes care of personnel issues where someone is investigated "internals" and investigation is made then to higher commands and upper levels to see if charges are to be made on the "civil" side. Then on the "criminal" side it goes to the prosecutors side or "crown" with a prosecutor who then decides the likelihood of a conviction. The crown decides to prosecute or not but doesn't negate these charges as this person is still held accountable under the RCMP act based on precedence.

9. What might be the ramifications of an unethical act?

Basically the act is held accountable on every level. Anything could be counselled or charged and then through the system fined, suspended or even retraining- ie: homophobic may not fine but it's unethical to act this way so this member could be sent on a cultural type sensitivity course.

10. What type of situation would compel you to report an unethical situation?

Anything that compromises the person, integrity of the job or causes any ramifications or if a member of the public is unfairly treated. You have to uphold the core values and you know these values because they're trained in your brain. I remember them this way: "Hi-CRAP": which means: Honesty, Integrity, Compassion, Respect, Accountability and Professionalism. These are the "core values" and all your decisions and stuff is based on this, and if anything goes against this, it could be a problem with integrity. The person themselves has to be held accountable and not to allow the situation to persist but allow the person the ability to change such as providing education, thru a fine or anyway you can to change their behaviour. A speeding ticket is a form of education and hopefully as a result you won't perform this behaviour again and if reoccurs then you may need a course or education to counsel you on safe driving. If you choose not to change your behaviour through these options, then you are terminated. If this behaviour continues then it's unethical because you compromise the safety of others. If you choose not to modify your behaviour then you're terminated. Before you're fired, there's a performance discrepancy model. A discrepancy consists of what you're doing and what the policy expects from you as the responsible employer. You should be given the opportunity to change and courses offered to help you change. If change doesn't happen then there may be medical or psychological disorders. For example if a policeman continues to steal, this could be a psychological disorder asking for help, or could be from personal or financial stress. The unethical problem could be from the organization itself. Have to look at the totality or overview

of the whole situation. This is the benefit of an outsider looking in at the situation, an “independent” person to evaluate the situation or evaluate the unethical dilemma which the police force fortunately has.