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1. Purpose

1.1 The IACP Police Psychological Services Section (PPSS) developed these guidelines for use by public safety agencies, agency executives, and consulting psychologists as well as other professionals who are charged with the responsibility of providing consultation in one or more of the domains of police psychology (i.e., operations, intervention, assessment, and consultation). ¹

1.2 Although guidelines are not binding, they serve as guiding principles and provide a framework for psychologists to conduct their professional practice. These guidelines are not intended to take precedence over any federal, state, or local laws.

2. Limitations

2.1 These guidelines reflect the consensus-based professional consultation practices of PPSS members. These guidelines are not intended to establish a rigid standard of practice for consultation.

2.2 The decision as to what is or is not done in a particular instance is ultimately the responsibility of each agency and consulting psychologist, provided it conforms to all pertinent local, state, and federal statutes, regulations, and case law and is consistent with the ethical standards of the psychologist’s profession.

2.3 These guidelines are written to apply to agencies within the jurisdiction of the United States and, as such, might require modification for use by agencies in other countries.

3. Definition

3.1 Consulting police psychologists provide analysis, consultation, and assistance to police and public safety operations, supervisors, managers, groups, and other organizations for the purpose of improving group or organizational functioning and operational effectiveness. These activities include, but are not limited to, the development of performance appraisal systems; organizational development; executive consultation; management consultation; supervisor consultation; process consultation; assessment-related consultation; operations-related consultation (e.g., crisis and hostage negotiation teams, criminal intelligence, investigative consultation, threat assessment, indirect assessment, psychological autopsies); consultation in educational and training programs; intervention-related consultation; mediation; individual and cultural diversity consultation; implementation of multirater feedback systems; and emergency consultation concerning persons with serious mental illness.

¹ These guidelines are informed by the American Psychological Association’s Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. They are aspirational in intent and might not be applicable in every professional situation.
4. Roles and Boundaries

4.1 Consulting police psychologists operate ethically and within the boundaries of their competence. Consulting police psychologists provide services to their clients in a manner consistent with their education, training, and experience in the field of police psychology and undertake ongoing efforts to develop and maintain their competence in accordance with current research, theory, and practice.

4.2 In their professional actions, consulting police psychologists seek to safeguard the welfare and rights of those with whom they interact professionally and other affected persons (e.g., vulnerable third parties) and agencies. Ethical concerns are at their highest when psychological expertise is employed to protect third parties but might also cause harm to the subject(s) of an intervention. The awareness, expectation, or intention of inflicting harm is in direct tension with the core ethical principles of beneficence and nonmaleficence. In such circumstances, consulting police psychologists must exercise reasonable judgment to minimize the harm to a subject while providing consultation designed to protect third parties (e.g., potential victims of the subject/society at large). Because police enforce the law and regulate behavior, consulting police psychologists are inexorably linked to police actions, so diligent attention to ethical obligations to both the potential victim(s) and the subject must be assiduously maintained.

4.3 Consulting police psychologists respect the basic rights of individuals who may be affected by the recommendations or services they provide and attempt to minimize harm to all parties. While the agency is ultimately responsible for identifying and implementing a course of action, the relationship between client and consulting police psychologist is a collaboration. Nonetheless, a consulting psychologist is independently responsible to conduct his or her activities within the ethical principles of the profession.

4.4 If, during the course of a consultation, the requests or demands of the agency with whom the psychologist is consulting are in conflict with the IACP-PPSS Consulting Police Psychologist Guidelines, the psychologist clarifies the nature of the conflict, makes known his or her commitment to those guidelines, and takes reasonable steps to resolve the conflict. Under no circumstances may a consulting police psychologist engage in any illegal or unethical behavior.

4.5 Consulting police psychologists may be asked to function professionally in roles where the client is the law enforcement agency. In such cases, police psychologists strive to clarify their roles and inform their agencies, colleagues, and the community of their ethical responsibility to consider and protect the rights of all parties to the consultation, including the client agency, potential crime victims, society at large, and subjects of an operation.

5. Integrity

5.1 Mindful that conflicts can emerge between the ethical standards or practice guidelines of psychologists and the needs of the police organization, the consulting police psychologist clarifies the nature of the relationship, the nature and limitations of the services to be provided, and the intended use of the information obtained. As consultants, the final decision with respect to the use of the information provided is the prerogative and responsibility of the agency for which the psychological consultation or service is being provided.
5.2 Consulting police psychologists exercise independent professional judgment, render objective opinions, and maintain awareness and sensitivity for concerns regarding inclusiveness, role differences, and respect for individual and cultural diversity.

5.3 Consulting police psychologists are sensitive to the problems inherent in multiple relationships while recognizing that requests often involve multiple relationships that can pose complex ethical dilemmas. A consulting police psychologist refrains from entering a multiple relationship if the multiple relationship could reasonably be expected to impair the psychologist’s objectivity, competence, or effectiveness in performing his or her functions as a psychologist, or otherwise risks exploitation or harm to the person with whom the professional relationship exists. Multiple relationships that would not reasonably be expected to cause impairment or risk exploitation or harm are not unethical.

5.4 If the consulting police psychologist finds that, due to unforeseen factors, a potentially harmful multiple relationship has arisen, the psychologist takes reasonable steps to resolve it with due regard for the best interests of the affected person and the agency.

5.5 Because some situations necessitate reliance upon collateral information and preclude direct assessment, consulting police psychologists frequently rely upon third-party information to inform an indirect assessment. Consulting police psychologists base their work on established scientific knowledge and generally accepted professional standards of the consultation question(s). When consulting police psychologists conduct indirect assessments, they identify the limitations of the reliability and validity of their opinions, regardless of the source of their data, and appropriately limit the nature and extent of their conclusions and recommendations.

5.6 When significantly complex ethical or legal dilemmas arise, consulting police psychologists seek counsel from colleagues with knowledge and experience in police psychology and/or the law.

6. Confidentiality and Privilege

6.1 Consulting police psychologists are aware of the laws and ethical standards pertaining to confidentiality and privilege and, whenever possible, take steps to ensure that all involved parties are likewise informed.

6.2 In addressing confidentiality and privilege, a consulting police psychologist considers applicable professional and ethical standards of conduct, the law, and the risk of harm to an individual versus the risk to public safety.

7. Methods and Procedures

7.1 Consulting police psychologists should be competent to conduct, evaluate, and/or utilize science-based research in their consultative activities.

7.2 Consulting police psychologists are familiar with relevant department procedures and pertinent local, state, and federal laws.
7.3 Consulting police psychologists work with other professionals, as necessary, to serve their clients effectively and appropriately.

7.4 Consulting police psychologists may partner with a multidisciplinary team to gather, coordinate, and assess information or share knowledge and experience with the goal of facilitating an ethical, practical, and successful outcome.

7.5 Consulting police psychologists articulate the limits of the services they are providing to their client agencies including the behavioral boundaries informed by their ethical commitments. When consulting about educational programs, methods of interventions, organizational and/or operational suggestions, consulting police psychologists disclose the known potential negative effects of the recommendations they provide.

7.6 Consulting police psychologists endeavor to evaluate the effectiveness of their consultations for the purpose of enhancing future service to their client agencies.
Selected References Relevant to Operations Consultations


**Selected References Relevant to Officer-Involved Shootings**


---

**Selected Case Law Relevant to SWAT Consultations**

1. **Government Liability and Training**

2. **4th Amendment Search and Seizure**
   - Mlodzinski v. Lewis, 648 F.3d 24 (1st Cir. 2011)

3. **Miranda Protections**
   - U.S. v. Mesa, 638 F.2d 582 (3rd Cir. 1980)

4. **Immunity**
   - Christiansen v. City of Tulsa # 02-5135, 332 F.3d 1270 (10th Cir. 2003).

5. **Property Damage and Utilization of Chemical Agents and Flash-Bangs**
   - Escobedo v. Bender, 600 F.3d 770 (7th Cir. 2010)

6. **Electronic Surveillance**
   - Title III, 18 U.S.C. 2510 et seq.

7. **Media**
   - Branzburg v. Hayes, 408 U.S. 665 (1972)
Selected References Relevant to Education and Training Police in De-escalation with the Mentally Ill


Selected Case Law Relevant to Education and Training Police in De-escalation with Mentally Ill


3. Deorle v. Rutherford, 272 F.3d 1272, 1277 (9th Cir. 2001)
