

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

<https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board>

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 10, 2025 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Subcommittee Members Present: Co-Chairs Manjusha Kulkarni and Ronaldo Villeda, and Members Angela Sierra, Darren Greene, LaWanda Hawkins, and Brian Kennedy

Subcommittee Members Absent: Members Sean Thuilliez and Rich Randolph

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Kulkarni called the meeting to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each POST Subcommittee (herein Subcommittee) member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 19, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Villeda motioned to adopt the minutes from the August 19, 2024 subcommittee meeting, and Member Sierra seconded. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners assisted with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Members Greene, Kennedy, Sierra, and Co-Chairs Kulkarni and Villeda
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Hawkins

With five Ayes and one Abstain, the meeting minutes were approved.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAG Alexander Simpson reported to the Subcommittee that the 2025 RIPA Report was published and welcomed the Subcommittee to review the CARE Community Briefing recording that was recorded on January 21, 2025.

5. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2026 REPORT

DOJ Retired Annuitant Aisha Marton-Walton gave an overview of the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 with relation to the POST Subcommittee. The POST Commission and the Board are two state level entities created by the Legislature and must work together. Penal Code section 13519.4 was amended to include curriculum requirements so that the POST Commission could develop courses to include racial and identity profiling courses to serve officers. At a minimum, these training courses must discuss the requirements listed in Cal. Pen. Code, § 13519.4 (h), including:

- The prohibition against racial or identity profiling in Penal Code section 13519.4, subdivision (f);

- Obligations of peace officers to prevent, report, and respond to discriminatory or biased practices by fellow peace officers;
- Prescribe evidence-based patterns, practices, and protocols that prevent racial or identity profiling;
- Provide an overview of the history and role of the civil and human rights movement and struggles and their impact on law enforcement;
- Identify racial, identity, and cultural differences among residents in a local community;
- Review perspectives of diverse constituency groups and experts on particular racial and identity police-community relations issues in a local area; and
- Discuss negative impact of intentional and implicit biases, prejudices, and stereotyping on effective law enforcement.

The POST Subcommittee has three subcommittee meetings a year, engages and discusses at the four full Board meetings on topics covered in subcommittee meetings, reviews POST courses on racial and identity profiling, and evaluates the latest research in the POST section of the RIPA Report.

Since the existence of the enactment of the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015, the POST Subcommittee has reviewed the following courses:

- Basic Academy Learning Domain #3 Principled Policing in the Community Academy;
- Basic Academy Learning Domain #42 Cultural Diversity and Discrimination Academy;
- Principled Policing: Implicit Bias and Procedural Justice In-Service Officers;
- Bias and Racial Profiling Video In-Service Officers;
- Report Beyond Bias Racial and Identity Profiling Online;
- PSP: Strategic Communications In-Service Officers; and
- MOT – Racial Profiling Train-the-Trainer.

DAG Danielle Elliott reviewed the 2025 Report. The POST Subcommittee participated in the development of POST guidelines for POST Training mandates. In August 2023, POST agreed to develop racial and identity profiling guidelines as a standalone document and included Board members in their development. Subcommittee members participated in two workshops in May and October 2024 hosted by POST. The draft guidelines presented by POST had two parts: (1) instructor guidelines and (2) optional course curriculum. The instructor guidelines include guidelines for instructor preparations for the course. POST used the POST-certified training course for the optional course curriculum. At the second workshop in October, POST said the guidelines would only serve as a template, five-hour optional course for advanced officer training. The Board believes the guidelines should serve as more than an optional training tool and will continue to work with POST to develop these guidelines.

In the 2025 Report, the DOJ looked at emerging research in law enforcement training to eliminate racial identity profiling and bias. In the studies they reviewed, they found that while short-term training does reduce implicit bias, trainees return to a baseline level after a couple of months. To create a lasting impact to reduce disparities, research recommend weaving this anti-bias intervention into the entire culture of police departments.

The 2025 Report included recommendations that the Legislature:

- Require more frequent, evaluated and evidence-based training on racial and identity profiling more than once every five years, and at a minimum of every three years;
- Require law enforcement supervisors and field training officers receive specialized training on eliminating racial and identity profiling within their departments;
- Require POST-certified courses on racial and identity profiling to be revised to include ways to prevent behavior that could lead to officer decertification for serious misconduct under SB 2;
- Amend the law to increase funding and allow for additional stakeholders, beyond the MOT, to present additional options for the racial and identity profiling training to law enforcement officers;
- Fund an independent study, under the guidance of the RIPA Board and conducted by academic researchers, that assesses the efficacy of POST's racial and identity profiling training on officers' attitudes, prejudices, and enforcement outcomes; and
- Provide funding and require POST to report annually on specific training outcome and performance measures. POST should consider looking at implicit bias metrics before and after the trainings to evaluate its effectiveness.

The 2025 Report also included recommendations to POST regarding measuring and improving course outcomes:

- Evaluate the academic research underpinning trainings during its course certification process;
- Revise the process for evaluating law enforcement training, in course certification and its quality assessment plans, to include additional course criteria that incorporate training outcomes based on officer actions and behavior in the field; and
- Formally evaluate Learning Domain 3 and Learning Domain 42 in the Regular Basic Course comprehensive module tests.

DAG Elliott concluded the presentation.

Member Sierra asked if the slides are available to the Subcommittee. DAG Elliott stated that she would ensure that Subcommittee members have the presentation materials.

DAG Elliott provided an overview of the framework for the 2026 RIPA Report:

(1) Review of published POST Guidelines

DAG Elliott stated the 2026 Report will include a review of published POST guidelines, which are forthcoming.

Member Sierra reported on the meetings she and fellow Board Co-Chair Guerrero had with POST in recent months. Under RIPA, the Board and POST are required to work together, so it is imperative to develop a working relationship. From their meetings with POST, it is clear to Member Sierra that POST wants to enhance their working relationship with the Board. In November, POST invited full Board Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra and DOJ staff to meet at

POST headquarters. Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra were able to learn more about POST and exchange ideas. Managers from the following POST units gave presentations to Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra about their roles within POST:

- Training Unit: The Training Unit includes training for new recruits, including Learning Domains 43 and 42 (cultural diversity and discrimination domain). The unit is also involved in the development and maintenance of basic training programs. There are 41 presenters for basic training throughout the state, who must undergo testing to be certified as a presenter. The Training Unit also updates their workplace and audits at least one of those presenters per month.
- Strategic Communications and Research Unit: This unit develops, validates, and manages the personnel selection test for law enforcement agencies. POST has a rule of looking at background investigations for agencies after they are concluded.
- Training and Delivery Compliance Unit: This unit certifies all of the POST-certified infield training courses that a law enforcement agency may conduct. They have certified about 900 presenters statewide for infield training courses. These infield training courses cover a wide range of courses, and the Training and Delivery Compliance Unit reviews course outlines on a two-year basis.
- Training Program Services Unit: This unit is responsible for developing law enforcement curriculum for all law enforcement officers.
- POST Learning, Technology, and Resources Unit: This unit oversees a learning portal on the POST website for peace officers in California. There are approximately 102 active training courses on the portal. Approximately 120,000 peace officers in California have access to those courses. This unit also develops the mandatory bias and racial profiling refresher courses that must be taken every five years, which must be led by a certified trainer.
- Management Counseling and Projects Unit: This unit provides various management-related services to law enforcement agencies, including management studies, peace officer feasibility studies, team building workshops, and field management training.
- Peace Officer Standards and Accountability Unit: This unit was created by SB 2, the recent law that established the ability to revoke a peace officer's certification if an act of serious misconduct is found to occur.

Member Sierra reported that she and Co-Chair Guerrero had an opportunity to present to POST about the guidelines, as well as the Board's recommendations to evaluate effectiveness of POST-certified training courses. They expressed a desire to enhance Board communications with POST and improve the Board's working relationship with POST moving forward.

Member Sierra reported that the high-level takeaways from the meeting with POST are that POST is involved with a large number of projects despite their relatively small staff of 210 people, as of last November. There was discussion of about the applicability of the racial and profiling guidelines. At the time of the November 12, 2024 meeting, it was still under advisement whether the guidelines were optional or mandatory. With respect to the effectiveness of POST-certified training, it appears POST does not have a regulatory oversight role over law

enforcement agency training outside of POST-certified courses, but they are open to discussing how POST-certified trainings can be analyzed for effectiveness. This discussion would not only be for methods of effectiveness, but which agency is best equipped to conduct that evaluation. Should it be law enforcement agencies or a third party? If it is POST, what are the practical challenges, given their non-regulatory role?

Member Sierra stated that she and Co-Chair Guerrero had a follow-up meeting with POST in February. She stated it would be helpful to have these periodic meetings with POST to explore areas they believe it would be helpful for the Board to consider and to ensure communication goes both ways.

She stated that the Subcommittee and full Board should unify their comments on POST-certified trainings before presenting to POST. They should comment together instead of sequentially.

Member Sierra also stated the RIPA full Board and Subcommittee meetings have a different schedule than the POST Commission meetings. She stated that moving forward, they should think about the schedule in advance, if POST will present to the Commission, so that they can have feedback before or after meetings.

Member Sierra stated that the main takeaway is that the goal is to continue work closely together to have as an effective relationship as possible.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Board Co-Chairs Sierra and Guerrero for their work, and raised two issues for discussion: (1) In terms of scheduling, it would be helpful if the Subcommittee could get regular updates on RIPA recommendations from POST to see if POST agrees or disagrees, as well as how they incorporate those recommendations into their trainings; and (2) Several Subcommittee members attended the subject matter training last October. Co-Chair Kulkarni perceived confusion and misunderstanding about RIPA among the people who led these trainings. She stated that if they are confused, then that information gets out to everyday officers of what RIPA data means or how it is used. For example, officers thought that all their identifying information would be included with RIPA data. However, it is not, as it is provided in aggregate. There is other misinformation that is problematic. It would be good to get this cleared up in future meetings with POST. RIPA depends on trust, understanding, and no one looks for specific information on officers to terminate them. The aggregate data is collected to understand the impact on marginalized communities.

Member Sierra stated that she understood they recently received POST responses to the recommendations the RIPA Board made to POST and that it would be presented at the next Subcommittee.

DAG Elliott stated that last week, POST presented their response to the RIPA Recommendations and the DOJ will present the responses at a future meeting, as they have not had time to review them.

Member Sierra stated that if POST disagreed with a recommendation, it should not be the end of the story. In the meantime, there may be alternatives to explore with POST for the same or similar outcomes. It would be a good opportunity to do work together, so it should not be the end

of the work on that topic. They have yet to see POST's written response to recommendation regarding the effectiveness of training. If the response is challenging, she encourages the Subcommittee to work with POST, invite them to talk to the Subcommittee, and explore alternatives.

With respect with the confusion about the role of RIPA Board, Member Sierra stated that during the November 12, 2024 meeting with POST, she and Co-Chair Guerrero did spend time reviewing the Board's role, legislative mandate, and legislative reasons they work together with POST. With respect to subject matter training, it is a good idea to attend meetings with other law enforcement agencies to communicate their role and address any miscommunications. Because POST works with a large number of agencies and representatives, there is a challenge in that the agencies have not had direct experience with the Board.

DAG Elliott stated that at the November 12, 2024 workshop, there were many different law enforcement officers from throughout the state. Therefore, the issue is not just meeting with the POST Commission, but also how it is disseminated from the top to bottom. Field training is essential to this. In the 2025 RIPA Report, the Board included recommendations of more specialized training for supervisors to get information to their line officers about why the RIPA data is being used, how it is used, etc.

Co-Chair Villeda asked what these meetings with POST will look like moving forward and how often they would be.

Member Sierra stated that they would be periodic, and with her and Co-Chair Guerrero. She stated they will continue to present on behalf of the Board at the POST Commission meeting. They will also invite POST representatives to the RIPA Subcommittee meetings. There is not a specific calendar, but it will be periodic throughout the year.

DAG Elliott continued to present an overview of the framework for the 2026 RIPA Report:

(2) POST Response to 2025 Report Recommendations

(3) Begin Field Training Course Review

a. 2026 - Focus on education

b. 2027 - Review course materials

DAG Elliott stated that the field training course is the last POST-mandated course for review. In the guidelines workshop, subject matter experts identified that field training officers have tremendous influence on shaping the behaviors of basic cadet graduates. Evaluating POST training courses is critical to understanding the context and regulation of peace officer training in California.

Field training is a continuation of the basic academy. Basic academy training is 664 hours and field training is 440 hours and a minimum of 10 weeks under POST regulations. Field training is essentially to transition from custody assignment to the performance of law enforcement, uniformed patrol duties of the employing department. Newly assigned officers and deputies must receive this training in the field on actual calls for service, where they can learn from officers with practical patrol experience. To make a new-officer field training as effective as possible,

they are assigned to a field training officer (FTO). This FTO is an experienced officer selected and trained to conduct this type of training. The trainee is then evaluated by the FTO and is monitored by the FTO supervisor through daily and/or weekly reviews. They receive constant feedback. According to the POST Field Training Program guide, it is “the most effective influence on the future direction of the department.” That is why it is the most important course for the Board to review, as previous recommendations have aimed to create department-wide and cultural shifts. Field training is the way to make that cultural shift.

To ensure that the field training program is reviewed as thoroughly as possible, DAG Elliott proposed a two-year review. The 2026 Report would focus on education and gaining practical understanding of the role of the field training officer and the program. This could look like a presentation during a Subcommittee meeting regarding the influence of the field training program in shaping officer’s and a department’s views in eliminating the specific policing methods identified as leading to racial and identity profiling. Ideally, the expert would have prior law enforcement experience conducting field training and is someone who understands the goals of AB 953. Another focus would be to look at other models of field training outside of California – whether internationally or from other states.

In the 2027 Report, the Subcommittee would analyze and review the actual materials of the POST Field Training Program guide. There are 18 competencies within this program, and POST identified competency six (community relations/professional demeanor) as the portion the Subcommittee would review—specifically, POST directed the Board to review competencies 6.3 (cultural diversity) and 6.4 (racial profiling). There will be a focus on the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the field training program’s effects on shaping officer’s actions and behaviors to eliminate profiling.

The two-year focus on field training is important to get a good sense of how the training happens both on the ground and academically, from a research perspective and from experience of the officers that have participated in this training, to identify which ways to make improvements to eliminate racial identity and profiling.

Member Sierra asked if the Subcommittee would also look at courses field training officers must complete, especially to the extent that the topics are related to RIPA. Are they part of the coursework they would be looking at?

DAG Elliott stated ideally, yes. Several people they have spoken to, including subject matter experts, identified the training received by those field training officers as really critical to the success of the field training program. The short answer is yes; she would encourage the Subcommittee to look into that and include in their evaluation.

Member Sierra said that splitting the evaluation into two years makes a lot of sense, because of the breadth of field training and on the job training. If the first year is education before delving into course materials, it would be helpful for the first year to get an overview presentation of how it is done in California done before drilling into the courses.

DAG Elliott agreed. She stated that having those split into two years meant that in the 2026 Report there would not be line edits into the materials themselves. Instead, they would be learning holistically about field training programs and how it is done in California.

Co-Chair Kulkarni stated she agreed with Member Sierra and appreciated the two-year approach.

DAG Elliott added that the 2026 Report will include recommendations to POST and the Legislature, as required by the RIPA statute. The Board hopes to engage with POST earlier in the recommendation process to gain additional feedback and input on their recommendation and any impediments to that implementation, so that the recommendations can be modified as needed and the Board can engage with POST more effectively.

(4) Legislative and POST Recommendations

DAG Elliott asked the Subcommittee for any topics they would like to see covered in the 2026 Report.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Kulkarni opened the floor to public comment.

Karen Glover, Professor of Sociology at California State University San Marcos placed a public comment in the MS Teams Chat Log:

“Here is a link to an important study about police culture and socialization...though not specific to field training it is about the academy.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0891241608330092>”

7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

DAG Elliott asked for confirmation from the Subcommittee that the ideas presented are acceptable for the 2026 RIPA Report.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked if any members of the Subcommittee have questions or comments, what the best way to handle them.

DAG Elliott stated that members of the Subcommittee can contact DOJ with individual questions and comments.

8. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked the Subcommittee and members of the public for their attendance and adjourned the meeting.