

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)
<https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board>

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 12, 2026, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Manjusha Kulkarni and Ronaldo Villeda, and Members Angela Sierra, Sean Thuilliez, Wade Forde, Rich Randolph, LaWanda Hawkins, and Jose Alatorre (on behalf of Sean Duryee)

Board Members Absent: None

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Kulkarni called the meeting of the POST Training and Recruitment Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Subcommittee member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Villeda moved to vote to approve the meeting minutes. Member Sierra seconded the motion. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners assisted with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Kulkarni and Villeda and Members Alatorre, Forde, Hawkins, Randolph, and Sierra
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Thuilliez

With seven ayes and one abstention, the meeting minutes were approved as presented.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A. DOJ Presentation on Field Training Program Review

DOJ Staff Services Manager I Aisha Martin-Walton introduced herself, along with DAG Marisol Leon and DOJ consultants Dr. Rebecca Hetey and retired Sacramento Chief of Police Daniel Hahn, as the presenters for the Field Training Program review.

Ms. Martin-Walton stated that the statute, AB 953, directs the California POST Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) to consult with the RIPA Board regarding the development of training for all peace officers incorporating prescribed evidence-based patterns and practices and protocols that prevent racial and identity profiling. This can be found in California Penal Code section 13519.4, subdivision (h). Since RIPA's enactment, the Board has reviewed seven POST-certified courses and made recommendations to align those courses with the RIPA Board's goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling.

Ms. Martin-Walton explained that, for purposes of the Board’s education and continued work on the Field Training Program (FTP), DOJ will go over six items today:

- 1) The overview from the 2026 RIPA Report;
- 2) The two-year review goals, guidelines, and questions;
- 3) The series of materials that the Board will be analyzing for the review;
- 4) The proposed timeline for this work;
- 5) An orientation and actual review by the consultants, who will walk the Board through how to use the rubric form they've designed to aid the Board in conducting the FTP review; and
- 6) The presentation will close with questions and group discussion.

Ms. Martin-Walton noted that the California Legislature provides the RIPA Board with authority to review the effectiveness of training courses certified by POST, in changing officers’ behavior and eliminating racial identity profiling by sworn officers. Effective training is an essential component towards eliminating the pernicious practice of racial and identity profiling by law enforcement.

Mr. Martin-Walton explained that, in the 2026 RIPA Report (Report), the RIPA Board began its two-year review of Competency Six (“Community Relations/Professional Demeanor”) in the POST FTP, which is one of eighteen competency areas in the program. POST has represented that the most effective way for junior officer bias to be measured and tested is through the FTP, given the link between bias and racial and identity profiling. During the first year of review, the Board worked with two experts (Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn) to better understand what the POST FTP entails. This year, during the second phase of the review, the Board will continue working with the consultants and reviewing materials to develop explicit recommendations based on evidence-based research interventions and the statute.

Ms. Martin-Walton stated that evaluating the POST-certified field training courses are critical to understanding the content and regulation of peace officer training in California. The FTP is the only identified course remaining for the Board's review from its first series of review courses at this time. Following its completion of the FTP review, the Board will continue its ongoing statutory responsibility by revisiting previously reviewed racial and identity related courses and any updates and revisions by POST.

Regarding the FTP, Ms. Martin-Walton stated that field training is a continuation of the basic Academy. The Academy itself is 664 hours, and field training is 400 hours with a minimum requirement of 10 weeks. Under POST regulation, field training is intended to facilitate a peace officer’s transition from the Academy — which is often a classroom setting — into the performance of actual general law enforcement patrol duties by the employing law enforcement agency. Newly assigned officers and deputies must receive additional training in the field on actual calls for service and learn from officers with practical experience and specialized training. The Field Training Officer (FTO) is an officer that is experienced, selected, and trained to be a FTO. The trainee is then evaluated by the FTO and monitored by a field training supervisor or coordinator through daily or weekly reviews. According to the POST Field Training guide, field training is the most effective in influencing the future direction of a department. The law

enforcement FTP not only develops individual officers, but also reflects the philosophy of the department and impacts the community it serves.

Ms. Martin-Walton reminded the Board that they conducted their review of the FTP last year and, this year in 2027, they will be providing recommendations to improve the FTP and the curriculum materials.

DAG Marisol Leon presented the next section of the DOJ update. DAG Leon reiterated that, last year, the POST Subcommittee along with the consultants reviewed what the FTP entailed, and this year the Subcommittee will review of the FTP and provide some recommendations. She noted that last year, the Subcommittee identified the following guiding questions for Subcommittee members to use as they engage in their review:

- 1) What values does the FTP teach, and do these values align with the goals of AB 953?
- 2) How well do the FTP materials cover potential for bias and racial and identity profiling?
 - a. How do trainees learn about bias, reducing police tactics and community engagement?
 - b. How are trainees evaluated on eliminating bias and engaging with the community?
- 3) How well do the field training materials and training align with Academy training in LD 3 (“Principled Policing in the Community”) and/or LD 42 (“Cultural Diversity/Discrimination”)?

DAG Leon stated that, as will be shown later in the presentation, part of the materials the Subcommittee will have to review involve the template Daily Observation Report that FTOs use to evaluate the trainee.

DAG Leon explained that Subcommittee members will be provided with a packet of materials that the consultants have put together for their review. Since some members have just joined the Subcommittee and weren't involved in the review of the prior courses mentioned earlier in the presentation, DOJ wanted to provide all Subcommittee members with background materials that they can familiarize themselves with so they feel better equipped to engage in the review of Section 6 (which the consultants will discuss at greater length today). To conduct the assessment, Subcommittee members will be provided with the following background materials:

- 1) The text of the actual statute (Penal Code section 13519.4);
- 2) The full text of LD 3 (“Principled Policing in the Community”) from the Basic Academy, the related training and testing specifications for LD 3, and a summary of LD 3 prepared by the consultants, which is meant to help Board members navigate through the review;
- 3) The full text of LD 42 (“Cultural Diversity Discrimination”) from the Basic Academy, the related training and testing specifications for LD 42, and a summary of LD 42 prepared by the consultants;
- 4) A note on the POST Basic Academy Course Instructional System prepared by the consultants, so that all Subcommittee members engaging in this review have the same background understanding of what the Basic Academy entailed, which DAG Leon noted

is what all field training trainees have already done and completed before starting the FTP; and

- 5) An excerpt from last year's RIPA Report on the FTP.

DAG Leon noted that there is a lot of background information. The packet with background materials has a table of contents to better assist Subcommittee members navigate the different sections. With this background on the Basic Academy and what the FTP entails, it is the hope that the Subcommittee will feel better equipped to engage in this review.

In addition to the background materials, DAG Leon noted that the packet will also include three documents that will be your close reading documents, which the Subcommittee will need to focus on in reviewing the FTP:

- 1) The Field Training Program Guide from Volume I, Appendix 1 (“Standardized Evaluation Guidelines”). DAG Leon explained that the Subcommittee will be provided with all Standardized Evaluation Guidelines, not just Section 6, since the consultants determined others will also appear in the Board’s review of Section 6;
- 2) The Daily Observation Report that FTOs use to evaluate trainees on a regular basis during their FTP; and
- 3) Section 6 (“Community Relations/Professional Demeanor”) of the Field Training Program Manual Volume II, which DAG Leon noted is the most important part of the Subcommittee’s review and consists of 22 pages.

DAG Leon explained that all of these materials — the background materials on the Basic Academy and what the FTP entails, along with these three documents that the Subcommittee will be asked to do a closer reading of (in particular, Section 6) — are called the “Section 6 Packet.” The consultants will talk about the rubric they developed that will assist in reviewing Section 6.

DAG Leon explained that the Subcommittee will use this rubric for Section 6 to rate the different aspects of Section 6 across four dimensions, which the consultants will explain at length:

- 1) Compliance with the statute (PC 13519.4);
- 2) Continuity of content, which DAG Leon explained is why the Board is provided with background materials of the Basic Academy that are relevant to Section 6;
- 3) Inclusion of core values; and
- 4) Outcome-based training.

Next, DAG Leon provided an overview of the proposed timeline for the FTP review. In today’s meeting, the Subcommittee will receive an FTP orientation, which DAG Leon noted is incredibly important in setting the tone and expectations of all POST Subcommittee members who will engage in this FTP review. Later today, Subcommittee members will receive the packet. Then, from March 12th to May 15th, the Subcommittee will engage in an independent review of the FTP over the course of two months. The expectation is that each member of the POST Subcommittee will review the 22-page Section 6 document using the rubric, then fill out the rubric in accordance with the consultants’ explanations that will be provided later today, and provide DOJ with that written feedback within your copy of the rubric by May 15th. DAG Leon

noted that the first meeting of the full RIPA Board will take place on April 23rd, and on May 15th Subcommittee members are expected to provide their written feedback. Between May 15th and early June, DOJ will start drafting the chapter for next year's 2027 RIPA Report. The second POST Subcommittee meeting is expected to take place by mid-June. DOJ will invite POST to come and speak to the Board at that meeting, so that the Subcommittee can engage in a dialogue with POST about some of the Subcommittee's reflections and questions. In mid-to-late July, RIPA will have its second full board meeting, and in late July through August, the draft will be finalized using the discussion the Subcommittee will have with POST. In early September, the Subcommittee will review the FTP draft and have a discussion about the final draft, including any tweaks or additions that the Subcommittee might want to incorporate. Additionally, in September DOJ hopes to receive Subcommittee members' feedback on the AB 953 Guidelines, which the Subcommittee Co-Chairs will talk about later today. In mid-October, the RIPA Board will have its third meeting, and from September through October, the final draft will be ready with a focus on cite checking. The last RIPA Board meeting of the year is slated to take place in late November or early December of this year. The 2027 Report will be published next year on January 29th, 2027.

DAG Leon noted that this is the proposed timeline and there might be some tweaks and changes, but we hope to stick to these dates as much as possible, particularly getting all of the Subcommittee's feedback by May 15th.

DAG Leon next introduced the consultants, who will start the FTP Course Review Orientation, Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn.

B. Orientation for Field Training Program Review led by DOJ Consultants and Opportunity for Questions from Board Members

Dr. Hetey greeted the Subcommittee and noted that she and Chief Hahn gave a high level overview of the FTP in September. Today, they are going to dive deep into the topic.

Dr. Hetey noted that she is a Stanford-trained behavioral scientist. She spent more than a decade working directly with law enforcement agencies in California on various research and training initiatives that were all designed to improve police-community relations, reduce racial disparities, and help make policing practices and policies more equitable and more respectful. Dr. Hetey expressed that she is passionate about law enforcement training and really excited to be taking part in this exercise. Dr. Hetey next introduced Chief Hahn.

Chief Hahn shared that he was a police chief for the last 11 of his 34 years in law enforcement. His primary department was Sacramento Police Department, where he retired as police chief at the end of 2021. He is an adjunct professor at Sacramento State University and created a course that he teaches nationwide in implicit bias in history. He also teaches race and policing for the California Police Chiefs Association Leadership Program. Chief Hahn stated that he was honored to be part of this project because he believes training is a huge part of what law enforcement does every day, their mission, their objectives, and the culture of law enforcement and is part of what has professionalized law enforcement in California over the years.

Dr. Hetey explained that she and Chief Hahn are serving as the subject matter experts for California DOJ to assist the RIPA Board in conducting a course review of the FTP. The agenda for the day will include a quick overview of POST's FTP. Chief Hahn will share some of the

written materials that will be provided to the Subcommittee as it completes the course review. Dr. Hetey will introduce the rubric that they created to make the course review more systematic. Then, there will be a chance to practice using the rubric together and look over some of the training materials together to give the Subcommittee a flavor for what it feels like to use the rubric. Lastly, there will be time to answer questions and have a discussion together.

Chief Hahn began with an overview of the materials the Subcommittee will be provided with. He noted that the review packet will be very large, almost 400 pages long, but noted to not be scared since much, much smaller portions of the packets are needed to do the review. He asked the Subcommittee to keep in mind in, as they go through the review, that many law enforcement departments add additional training above and beyond what is required by POST. Additionally, the FTO is a huge part of the FTP, and every FTO brings their own experiences and training to their job as an FTO. We cannot evaluate that since every FTO is different, so as the Subcommittee goes through their review, Chief Hahn stated that the best way to look at this review is as evaluating the floor, or the consistent part throughout the state, that every trainee will get, knowing that trainees will get more than that depending on who their training officer is. What the Subcommittee is evaluating is what they definitely want every single trainee to get throughout the state of California.

He explained that the Subcommittee would be provided with Volume 1 (“Overview and Appendices”), which is broken into four sections and includes the Daily Observation Report. We will primarily focus on the second section (“Evaluation, Documentation, and Remedial Training”). The Subcommittee will also receive Volume 2, which is distinct from Volume 1 in the sense that there are more sections, but this is a form that is required to be filled out one time throughout a trainee’s FTP. Chief Hahn noted that it can be filled out more than once, but each rating category that has to be filled out at least once throughout the training, as opposed to the first section, Volume 1, where the Daily Observation Report is exactly what it sounds like and is filled out daily.

Chief Hahn explained that Volume 1, Appendix 1 contains all the Standard Evaluation Guidelines, which are the metrics FTOs utilize when evaluating the trainees during the FTP. The Subcommittee will focus primarily on Category 6 (“Relationship with Citizens/Community”), which will be covered in more detail later. Field Training Guide Volume I, Appendix 2 is the actual Daily Observation Report form. As the name indicates, this form is filled out every shift. The trainee signs the form, and the FTO fills it out. Chief Hahn noted that there will be a brief exercise later in this presentation on how to fill it out. Field Training Manual Volume II, Section 6 is the “Community Relations/Professional Demeanor” category. This is another evaluation form that is completed by the FTO and the trainee during the FTP. Chief Hahn explained that, unlike the Daily Observation Report, each one of the categories only needs to be filled out by a training officer and a trainee one time throughout their entire training. It can be filled out more than once, but it's required that each section has to be completed at least once.

Chief Hahn presented the a blank Daily Observation Report form, noting that there are 32 categories, the last of which is blank so that a department can fill in an additional category they feel is important in the training program. The form includes several categories that the Subcommittee might use later in the exercise, including attitude towards police work, integrity and ethics, leadership, and relationships with citizens and community.

Next, Chief Hahn explained the directions for rating under Appendix 1. The rating scale goes from one to seven, with one being “unacceptable” and seven being “superior.” If a training officer gives a trainee a one or a seven (the extremes on both ends), then they have to fill out a narrative on why they are giving these one or the other extremes. Per the directions, FTOs must rate the trainee pursuant to the language in the Standard Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs), which are measured against the standard of a competent solo officer. This is the only way that the objective evaluations will be accomplished. If each evaluator (which is the FTO) uses the same measuring devices (the SEGs), you should reach the intended outcome of a consistent FTP, which are the directions given to the FTOs.

Next, Chief Hahn explained that Volume 2 which has eighteen competencies or sections. As noted earlier, the one most relevant to the Subcommittee’s review is Section 6 (“Community Relations/Professional Demeanor”), but there are several other competencies such as search and seizure and report writing.

Dr. Hetey then explained how she and Chief Hahn created the rubric. They created the rubric so that it would be a tool that would help structure the process and make the Subcommittee’s course review of the FTP more systematic. The rubric will guide Subcommittee members as they review and make ratings of the various written materials, such as the Daily Observation Report and Section 6, which Chief Hahn introduced and which we will go through together in more detail. They developed this rubric by, first, taking a step back and thinking about how this course review is a way for the Board to help ensure that the relevant portions of the FTP not only align with California's legal commitments that come from PC 13519.4, but also the values that underlie the prohibition of racial and identity profiling. As such, they want filling out this rubric to prompt a close examination of what is currently contained in the FTP, but they also want it to be an aspirational exercise — what else could be included in the FTP to make sure that, at baseline, all new officers in the state are receiving adequate instruction on the topics that are described in PC 13519.4.

Dr. Hetey noted that they expect that all Subcommittee members will complete the course review, as it is important to hear as many of the Subcommittee’s voices and perspectives as possible. As DOJ mentioned before, the FTP is a crucial part of a police officer’s training. Therefore, any suggestions or recommendations that this Board makes could be very consequential. Dr. Hetey asked Subcommittee members to please not pass up this opportunity.

Dr. Hetey explained that the rubric four dimensions, which are:

- 1) Compliance with the statute;
- 2) Continuity of content;
- 3) Inclusion of core values; and
- 4) Outcome-based training.

For each dimension, there is a blurb to explain why this is an important facet to evaluate the relevant portions of the FTP.

Dr. Hetey next presented a blank rubric for Dimension 1: Compliance with PC 13519.4. She noted that each section has a blurb that explains why this is important. For example, here the rubric explains that:

“Law enforcement training must prepare officers to respond appropriately and effectively to situations that arise in the field. This includes a clear understanding of legal requirements and practical guidance for fulfilling them. PC 13519.4 mandates training on racial and cultural differences among California residents, including the prohibition of racial or identity profiling. This dimension assesses whether the reviewed portions of the field training program support these requirements.”

Dr. Hetey explained that, within each dimension, there are between two and seven specific rating tasks. Each rating task takes the form of a specific question. Usually, the question is whether something specific is present in the reviewed materials. The rating options are “Yes,” “Partially,” “No,” and “Not Applicable.” The Subcommittee can also use the “Not Applicable” option if they really feel like they cannot provide an informed rating for a given rating task. Dr. Hetey noted that, on the right of the rubric form, there is a space to describe the reason for choosing the specific rating and to provide support from the materials. She clarified that, by “Reason/Support for Rating,” they mean the citations, evidence, cues, and clues that Subcommittee members use from the materials as to why they gave that rating. This field is not intended to explain how the Subcommittee members feel about the material, which instead would go into the “Comments/Suggestions” box where Subcommittee members can talk about, for example, where they might be confused, where they like certain language, or where they wanted to see the materials go further.

Dr. Hetey stated that, at the outset, this review process might be both easier and harder than Subcommittee members imagine. The bulk of what will be reviewed, which is Section 6, is a little thin on content. One might say that it is more of a checklist than a curriculum. Because of that, choosing “No” or “Partially” for the ratings options does not mean it is a criticism of any individual agency or how any one FTO goes about this process. Rather, this is an assessment of the state-level guidance and what it does and does not provide. As the Subcommittee goes through the review of the FTP, they are being asked to confirm what is present and also what might be missing or insufficiently detailed.

Dr. Hetey read POST’s description of the FTP in Field Training Program Guide I: “This standardized POST Field Training Program has been developed through input from various departments and experts throughout the state and nation. It is not intended to be a stand-alone program. It is intended to set a minimum standard on which each department can build its own specific field training program. It is further intended to assist the process in which the trainee receives on-the-job instruction to complement or reinforce classroom Academy training.”

Dr. Hetey explained that, to be clear, the Subcommittee will be rating these written materials knowing that there is more to it, but also knowing that any third party cannot be sure what exactly that conversation would entail between an FTO and the trainee.

Next, she explained that the last page of the rubric contains a section where Subcommittee members can share any additional thoughts, observations, or suggestions they may have that were not already captured elsewhere in the rubric. There are spaces for question/comments/observations that are more general, for questions/comments directed specifically to POST, and a final section for comments/recommendations for the Legislature.

Dr. Hetey explained that the main part of the FTP review will mean Subcommittee members are rating Section 6. As stated earlier, DOJ will be send this packet to Subcommittee members. The packet is almost 400 pages. Dr. Hetey asked Subcommittee members to not be overwhelmed because these are background materials. The bulk of it is LD 3 and LD 42 from the Basic Academy, which together are over 300 pages. Those documents are included because POST refers to them in some of the FTP materials. Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn prepared summaries of LD 3 and LD 42, and those are only two pages each. The vast majority of what the Subcommittee will actually be reviewing is Section 6, which is 22 pages long, and they are going to go through a lot of it together today.

Next, Dr. Hetey presented Field Training Program Manual Volume 2, Section 6. This is a 22-page Microsoft Word document that guides instruction on the topic of community relations and professional demeanor. Within it, there are six subtopics: Community Relations and Service; Professional Demeanor and Communications; Cultural Diversity; Racial Profiling; Crime Prevention; and Community/Problem-Oriented Policing. Within each of these, there are a number of additional subtopics, which Dr. Hetey previewed in a visual presentation. She noted that this presentation would focus on topic 6.4 (Racial Profiling), then topic 6.2 (Professional Demeanor and Communication), and topic 6.3 (Cultural Diversity).

Dr. Hetey then explained the format of Section 6, using the Topic 6.4 Racial Profiling form as an example. She explained that, for each of the subtopics noted above, the actual content is at the top of the form. For example, the top of the form for topic 6.4.01 (“Racial Profiling and Penal Code section 13519.4”) states:

“The trainee will review and discuss Penal Code section 13519.4 and should perform effective police work based on behavioral observations.”

That this is the content. Under that are the references where POST is indicating other things that the trainee should be looking at (in this example: LD 3, LD 42, and the Penal Code, which is why those sources will be provided to Subcommittee members in the packet). Next, on the left, the FTO has space to document how and when this competency or skill was demonstrated by the trainee. The FTO has four boxes there to check for how the competency was demonstrated. Those options are: “Field Perform,” “Role Play,” “Written Test,” and “Verbal Test.” On the right side of the form, the FTO can fill in whether any remedial training was required and what form that took, using the same four options (Field Perform, Role Play, Written Test, and Verbal Test). The FTO can also provide comments, and the FTO fills out their name and the date to attest as to when this competency was demonstrated by the trainee. Below that, in the yellow sections toward the bottom, the FTO can refer to additional agency policies or procedures in Part A, and below that, in Part B, the FTO can refer to additional agency training details. Dr. Hetey clarified that the Subcommittee members and consultants will not know what those policies, procedures, or details are, but they can imagine that this is going to look different agency by agency and FTO by FTO. Dr. Hetey reiterated that, as Chief Hahn said, this form only needs to be completed once during the entire FTP. Subcommittee members will see this format repeated a few times.

Dr. Hetey read additional substantive content for the Subcommittee’s consideration: Topic 6.4.02 (“Profiling Behavior (Criminal Profiling vs. Racial Profiling)”) states: “The trainee shall explain why effective police work profiles a person's behavior and not a person's actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, gender identity or orientation, and more”; topic 6.4.03 (“Constitutional Amendments”) states: “The trainee shall explain the 4th and 14th Amendments of the U.S.

Constitution as they relate to cultural diversity/discrimination”; topic 6.4.04 (“Community History”) states: “The trainee shall discuss how the history of the community can have an effect on the community's relationship with their agency”; and Topic 6.4.05 (“Agency Policy”) states: “The trainee shall review and summarize the agency's policy regarding racial profiling.” She presented those statements on a single slide and noted that this is the extent of the POST material on racial profiling in the FTP.

Dr. Hetey noted that we do not know what goes on in response to those prompts. The FTO is selecting how that competency was demonstrated. They have the different options that were discussed earlier. We do not know what those tests look like. We do not know what “Role Perform” means. At some agencies, the agency itself might offer extensive PowerPoints, readings, or immersive exercises, but certainly some other agencies likely do go off of what you see here. She noted that, as Chief Hahn said, one way to approach the rubric and the review that the Subcommittee is doing is to think about the baseline that is being created for every officer in the state. In its current form and how these competencies are structured, it is nearly impossible for us to know what is going on between any particular FTO and particular training at any one of the 600+ law enforcement agencies across the state. The task here is to consider what the Subcommittee considers, at its most basic, an adequate guideline to make sure that the topics that are covered in the statute are in fact being transmitted to trainees across the state. Dr. Hetey expressed that Chief Hahn said it best when he said that people might get more but they will not get less.

Dr. Hetey noted that part of the rating task and part of the challenge of this is how to interpret the limited FTP content and how to make those ratings accordingly. This is a tough task, and the consultants will illustrate it in a moment. She noted that the comments and suggestions of the rubric become important here. Across the group of raters, what are the common themes that emerge in the feedback?

Next, Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn worked through the rubric to demonstrate what it feels like. Dr. Hetey explained that their responses are meant to be part of this exercise to illustrate how to use the rubric, and what they say does not necessarily represent their own personal thoughts. She also asked all Subcommittee members to do the course review to get a feel of what it is like.

For this illustration, the consultants referred to Dimension 1: Compliance with PC 13519.4. Before beginning, Chief Hahn asked Subcommittee members to keep in mind the forms Dr. Hetey presented. For this illustration, the direction is at the top of each rating category. He also noted that there is often more training that goes into a field trainee from the FTO. The department might give additional classes, but this is what you want to ensure every trainee — regardless of what department or part of the state they are in — gets. In other words, every trainee in an FTP, regardless of whether they're in Southern, Northern, or Central California, learns how to do DUI enforcement. For example: If they suspect somebody of drunk driving and pull them over, what tests do they give them? What results show them that this person is under the influence? What do they do after that? But, their training officer might have been a DUI officer in their previous assignment, and they understand how to test for narcotics instead of alcohol and how to do all sorts of extra things, so they are probably teaching additional things the trainee would not get if they had a different training officer. Every training officer has their own experience, so a trainee might have an FTO that is an instructor in implicit bias or racial profiling for the department and the trainee will get a little bit more than the standard training POST

prescribes. Chief Hahn also reiterated the request that all Subcommittee members participate in this evaluation because every person has their own experiences and how they see things, and it will be important to get all those perspectives as we conduct the evaluation. For example, Dr. Hetey's evaluation and Chief Hahn's evaluation will demonstrate that there is no wrong evaluation; everybody comes with their own perspective.

Role playing as "Rater A," Chief Hahn explained how a hypothetical evaluation of Dimension 1 would be documented. Under the rating task inquiring, "Do the reviewed materials clearly communicate and provide instruction on the legal mandate that peace officers 'shall not engage in racial or identity profiling' (PC 13519.4(f)),” Chief Hahn explained that, in this hypothetical review, "Rater A" would check the "Yes" box and under "Reason/Support for Rating," they could write:

“Under 6.4.01 in Volume 2, it states the direction provided for this rating is: The trainee will review and discuss Penal Code section 13519.4 and should perform effective police work based on behavioral observation;

Under 6.4.02, the direction provided is: The trainee shall explain why effective police work profiles a person's behavior and not a person's actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, gender identity or orientation and more; and

Under 6.4.05, the direction provided is: The trainee shall review and summarize the agency's policy regarding Racial Profiling.”

These would be the reasons supporting the hypothetical rating. Under the Comments/Suggestions section, "Rater A" could write:

“The description in 6.4.01, 6.4.02, and 6.4.05 all refer to 'Racial Profiling.' The descriptions could be more accurate by stating 'Racial or Identity Profiling.’

In Rating Category 6.4.01, the form could provide more explicit direction to the FTO and the Trainee, such as, 'Officers shall not engage in racial or identity profiling' and additional language from the penal code section such as, 'Racial or identity profiling alienates people from law enforcement, hinders community policing efforts, and causes law enforcement to lose credibility and trust among the people whom law enforcement is sworn to protect.' This would make it very clear what was to be covered between the FTO and trainee in this section. This would set the floor for the trainee's FTP regarding Racial or Identity Profiling.”

Next, Dr. Hetey role played as "Rater B," who gave the hypothetical rating of "Partially." Under Reason/Support for Rating, the rater could write:

“While the instructions for 6.4.01, 6.4.02, and 6.4.05 direct the trainee to 'review and discuss' Penal Code section 13519.4 and 'explain why effective police work profiles a person's behavior and not a person's actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, gender identity or orientation and more' and to 'review and summarize' the agency's policy 'regarding Racial Profiling,' third parties cannot know the exact content that was covered. Moreover, the phrase 'Racial Profiling' is used throughout and so the content provided at the state-level itself could be considered incomplete.”

Under Comments/Suggestions, “Rater B” could write:

“The descriptions in 6.4.01, 6.4.02, and 6.4.05 should refer to ‘Racial or Identity Profiling’ to be more in line with PC 13519.4.

The content could be more explicit, so it stands alone. An earlier version of 6.4 read: The trainee will review and discuss Penal Code 13519.4, which states in part, ‘Racial profiling... is the practice of detaining a suspect based on a broad set of criteria which casts suspicion on an entire class of people without any individual suspicion of the particular person being stopped.’ The trainee shall recognize that racial profiling:

- A. Is prohibited by law
- B. ‘Presents a great danger to the fundamental principles of a democratic society’
- C. ‘Is abhorrent and cannot be tolerated’
- D. Causes community distrust and harms police relations with the community
- E. May have legal consequences.”

Dr. Hetey directed Subcommittee members to practice using the following rubric prompt for Dimension 1: “Do the reviewed materials provide adequate instruction on ‘effective, noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties in a diverse racial, identity, and cultural environment’ (PC 13519.4(a))?” To avoid potentially biasing the group, Subcommittee members were asked to not share their thoughts at this time. The goal of this exercise was for Subcommittee members to practice using the rubric to get familiar with the materials and ask questions which can be discussed as a group.

Dr. Hetey showed the Subcommittee some of the content they would use to form their rating for this prompt, including all of 6.2 (Professional Demeanor and Communications) and all of 6.3 (Cultural Diversity). After reading through those materials, Dr. Hetey asked Subcommittee members to consider, over the next five minutes, what rating they would give to the question of whether the materials provide adequate instruction on effective non-combative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties in a diverse racial, identity, and cultural environment. She also asked Subcommittee members to note any questions that come up because there will be another practice exercise and there will be time to discuss as a group.

Subcommittee Member Forde asked a question about separation between officers’ personal and professional lives. For example, he could be negatively impacted by an officer in his community if he comes in contact with their social media, which would be their personal life. He is not sure how their private life associations or social media, for instance, impacts how officers are identified or received as a community peace officer. He wondered whether there is any relevance to it because should their professional life and their personal life have any impact on their particular role or contribution. He asked whether any of the officers present in this meeting would be able to clarify.

Member Randolph responded that this is an excellent question, and Pastor Forde is correct. Your personal and professional life are separate, but as peace officers, in the Academy and through the process, we cannot allow them to cross each other. His personal bias, if he has any, should not affect how he treats anyone; he treats everyone the same way, and that it outlined. Regarding social media, there are new laws in place now. Part of the POST standards are that social media is examined thoroughly as part of the background process, and it could be a disqualifier in the hiring process. Even after a person is hired, if their social media starts to have blurred lines and there is a complaint, it can cause problems as an employee. As an agency head, this is dealt with on a regular basis throughout the state.

Member Forde thanked Member Randolph for his response.

Dr. Hetey stated that many law enforcement agencies do have in department general orders stating something to the effect of, “Peace officers are meant to behave in an exemplary fashion at all times,” that they are members of the community, and that they do hold such a great influence. She asked Chief Hahn if that is correct.

Chief Hahn responded that, depending on the behavior or language a person uses in their private life, they could very well get fired as a tenure officer. But, in this context that they are talking about today, during the FTP, they are probationary employees, so their ability to be terminated because of something they do off duty, in relation to these sort of things, is much easier and most departments would get rid of them if they said something very inappropriate, especially when they are in training because they are on probation. Sometimes it is a little harder when they are tenured, but he has still seen officers get fired for their behavior off duty or their language if it is racist or something like that.

After Subcommittee members completed their individual practice evaluations, the consultants asked the Subcommittee to complete another practice exercise using Dimension 4 (Outcome-Based Training). Dr. Hetey read the material at the top of the form, which states: “To be effective, training must shape officers’ observable behavior in the field. Law enforcement training should clearly define the outcomes it aims to produce, especially those that support California’s goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling. This dimension assesses whether the Field Training Program identifies outcomes related to PC 13519.4 and provides clear instruction, guidance, and mechanisms to ensure trainees can demonstrate those behaviors in the field.” She noted that, for this dimension, the consultants offer expert analysis to provide Subcommittee members additional context. This is based on research from Dr. Hetey and her colleagues from Stanford. That analysis reads:

“Research shows that concepts like ‘respect’ can be translated into concrete behaviors that officers can be trained to demonstrate during police-community interactions (e.g., Voight et al., 2017; Camp et al., 2024).

PC 13519.4 requires training on:

- ‘effective, noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties in a diverse racial, identity, and cultural environment’ (Subsection (a))
- ‘fostering mutual respect and cooperation between law enforcement and members of all racial, identity, and cultural groups’ (Subsection (b))

These are not abstract ideals but actionable skills. They should be clearly defined as observable behaviors that trainees are explicitly taught and evaluated on in the field.”

She asked Subcommittee members to rate whether “trainees [are] explicitly evaluated on their ability to demonstrate ‘noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties’ in a diverse environment during field training as part of the Daily Observation Report (which includes the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines)?” She noted that, to assist with this practice evaluation, Chief Hahn will walk the Subcommittee through the Daily Observation Report and some of the SEGs so they can look for where some of that information might be contained.

Chief Hahn presented a close-up of the Daily Observation Report (DOR), showing a breakdown of ratings by category, including Category 2 (Attitude Toward Police Work). He stated that he will go over some of the things Subcommittee members will see in the SEGs. For that category, the SEGs define an “Unacceptable” rating as including “abuses authority, demonstrates little dedication to principles of the profession,” whereas a “Superior” rating in the SEGs includes “demonstrates concern for the fair and equitable enforcement of the law.” For Category 3 (Integrity/Ethics), an “Unacceptable” rating is partially described as “has little or no sense of accountability and/or responsibility to the department or community,” whereas a “Superior” rating includes “models responsibility for service and enhances public trust.” For Category 4 (Leadership), an “Unacceptable” rating consists of “does not prevent or reduce conflict, fails to show empathy,” and a “Superior” rating includes “consistently demonstrates trust, respect and assertiveness, composure, concern, and the ability to deescalate any situation.” Lastly, one of the more important categories the Subcommittee will review for several things is Category 6 (Relationships with Citizens/Community). Chief Hahn noted that the DOR includes a rating scale, with ratings of 1-2 on the left under “Unacceptable,” ratings 3-5 in the middle being “Acceptable,” and ratings 6-7 on the right being “Superior.” For Category 6, “Unacceptable” would include “is introverted, overly sympathetic, ineffective, prejudicial, and biased” and the trainee would be given a rating of 1 or 2 on the DOR rating scale. “Acceptable” for purposes of Category 6 would be “courteous, friendly, empathetic to citizens’ perception of problems, communicates in a professional and unbiased manner,” which would include a rating of the middle numbers of 3-5, and “Superior” includes “quickly established rapport, leaves people with a feeling that the officer is interested in serving them.” Chief Hahn noted that, as you can see, these SEGs give direction to the FTO and, as mentioned earlier, they really need to consistently stick to those SEGs so it is consistent across a trainee’s entire training program.

Chief Hahn presented the rest of the DOR form, which includes 32 rating categories and stated that, as you can see in Category 32, a department can add something else but POST directs them that there must be SEGs. If a department adds another rating category, they must have SEGs to go with that rating category so that it can be consistent throughout a trainee’s training.

Dr. Hetey noted that there are 32 categories in the DOR. The consultants want Subcommittee members to see the proportions: Categories 1 through 8 deal with the soft skills of how a trainee is showing up, whereas Categories 9 through 28 are more mechanical (including driving skills, use of maps, two on report writing, how they show up in the field, investigative skills, two about officer safety, two about the radio and how they’re able to listen and comprehend), and Categories 29 through 31 are more focused on performance, policies and procedure, knowledge of criminal statutes and procedure, etc. The Subcommittee should think about that (i.e., of the 32

categories, how many have to do with the way they are interacting with the public in a demeanor way).

Chief Hahn next presented a visual illustration of the SEGs from Appendix 1 for the topics he just went over (Topics 2, 3, 4, and 6) and noted that these will be provided to the Subcommittee in the packet. While the packet will be rather large, these are the areas the Subcommittee should focus on. Chief Hahn also noted that while the SEGs are fairly long, the Subcommittee only needs to focus on a few of them, not the whole packet for things like reporting writing. In other words, the Subcommittee will look at the SEGs for Topics 2, 3, 4, and 6 for this practice evaluation. Chief Hahn noted that every one of these categories will not be observed every day by an FTO and a trainee. So, some might not be applicable for that day because it was not observed, or the training officer could give a scenario that covers that area to be able to fill out that category that night.

Dr. Hetey asked Subcommittee members to practice completing the rubric over the next three to five minutes, to evaluate whether “trainees [are] explicitly evaluated on their ability to demonstrate ‘noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties’ in a diverse environment during field training as part of the Daily Observation Report (which includes the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines)?”

Chief Hahn reminded Subcommittee members that the DOR is filled out every shift that the trainee works, whereas the Volume 2 forms we previously did the exercise on are required to be filled out once throughout an entire trainee’s training so any FTO that covers that area could fill out one of those.

After five minutes, the consultants opened the floor for Subcommittee discussion and questions. Dr. Hetey asked the Subcommittee what the exercise was like, what came up for them, and what questions and comments they may have. She expressed curiosity to hear from Subcommittee members with law enforcement experience because, as they stated, one of the challenges is that this is like trying to judge a meeting based on only having gotten the agenda, so having sat through FTP themselves and knowing the richness that goes into that versus what it looks like on paper just based on POST guidelines is challenging. She expressed that, if any of the Subcommittee members with law enforcement experience care to speak to that, it would be helpful for the group.

Co-Chair Kulkarni stated that she had some questions or comments. With the initial piece regarding 6.2.02 through the different pieces of that, there are some questions that are really open-ended and unclear. For example, what even is meant by “culture”? What is one referring to? It says “the culture of the community.” There are multiple cultures depending on what you mean even in a community. For example, in the city of Long Beach, there would be significant populations of Cambodians and African Americans. It seemed like it was rather broad. Also, of course it is impossible to define every term, but what constitutes “disrespect”? Is that something that has been defined in the materials. That is something that could be different based on the individual. Co-Chair Kulkarni expressed that she felt there was a little bit of generalization that was happening and was not clear. When there is a lack of clarity it becomes difficult to fill out the rubric, and for officers it would also be hard to know when the training has been done whether the trainee has fulfilled those.

Dr. Hetey encouraged Co-Chair Kulkarni to write that in the Comments/Suggestion box of the rubric.

Co-Chair Villeda shared that, on paper, it does check a majority, if not all, of the boxes. It aligns with the idea of 13519.4, and it reads like a baseline for etiquette for how to interact with community members. It is teaching officers how to just have basic etiquette, but how does that training prepare an officer as they carry out their duties in an effective and noncombative way? He feels it is telling officers what not to do, such as not using profanity, no gestures, and no offensive terms, but how does it teach an officer what they should do in a real-life interaction? We talk about different cultures, different power dynamics, what is actually driving that decision-making.

Dr. Hetey asked Co-Chair Villeda to put this in the Comments/Suggestions box of the rubric.

Member Forde expressed that a question that impacted his processing was the question about being able to explain the history of the community and being able to express that. Is the idea that an officer can explain how the history, theoretically, of a community could play a part, or is it specific to an officer who, for example, may be assigned to the west side of San Bernardino and who has been subject to large-scale oppression, different situations that are specific to the west side of San Bernardino? Is it specific enough to say how does this particular area's history impact how they would serve its community? Is it a theoretical answer or a specific, location-based answer?

Chief Hahn responded that the direction an FTO gets is what you see. Depending on the interpretation of the FTO, they could take it in either one of those directions. But, one way to look at it is, last year the Board reviewed LD 3 which, in Chief Hahn's opinion, does a pretty good job talking about some of the historical things that have happened in our country, such as redlining, Jim Crow laws, Japanese internment camps, segregation, and things like that. So, you could look at it as what you want the FTP to do is: They have learned all those general topics in our country, then you could ask how did those play out in west San Bernardino or something like that — how did those sort of things occur in my community where I work, in my area that I work at? But, per the material the Subcommittee will read, the training officer interprets that.

Member Sierra asked whether the portions of the manual the Subcommittee is reviewing are for the FTO or for both the FTO and the trainee.

Chief Hahn responded that they both can see it. The trainee could look at the SEGs to understand how they are going to be judged or reviewed, but those are really the guidelines the FTO utilizes when they mark their DOR. For Volume 2, the direction is at the very top of each rating category, so they would look at that and then judge the trainee based on that.

Member Sierra clarified that the consultants have summarized part of the manual for the Subcommittee, but the manual is really for the training officer, correct?

Chief Hahn responded that this is correct. The manual just talks about the process of training. It does not talk specific to those rating categories. To make it very basic, it is basically a training manual of how to be a training officer.

Dr. Hetey clarified that we do not know if individual agencies are giving out workbooks, PowerPoints, or exercises for the trainee directly.

Co-Chair Villeda stated that “improper cultural response” feels a little vague. He asked how to give more concrete examples that really reflect a community setting because sometimes the tone or body language in different cultures might not be the same as ours. How do we train an officer to not confuse cultural expression or frustration as a threat or non-compliance? Then, regarding “explaining actions to citizens,” pulling directly from his own experience because he has been on the receiving end when it is not so professional, Co-Chair Villeda expressed that there is a loophole that law enforcement, in his opinion, sometimes tends to exploit. There is a way to be persuasive and misleading at the same time, or to manipulate and steer a situation, so if we are trying to reach a goal of mutual respect and cooperation, sometimes the lines between a consensual contact versus being detained can get blurred.

Dr. Hetey encouraged Co-Chair Villeda to write that down and acknowledged that he is heeding the call to have this be an aspirational exercise considering what training could look like and what they might want to be able to say about some of these particular topics.

Member Thuilliez stated that it sounds like Co-Chair Villeda wants to train police officers on how to interpret or stereotype different social groups because, unless he is misunderstanding what Co-Chair Villeda is saying, he is supposed to read their body language and then make an assumption based on their cultural background and what that means. He asked if that is what we want officers to do now.

Co-Chair Villeda asked if he was supposed to answer that or if it was a rhetorical question.

Member Thuilliez responded that it might be a counterpoint because he thought the point of RIPA was to remove biases and not to profile, and yet it sounds to him like Co-Chair Villeda is asking police officers to start profiling body language based on their cultural background to not misinterpret a threat or concern, so Member Thuilliez expressed that he might need help with this one.

Co-Chair Villeda stated that this was not his intent and what he was trying to say. For the purposes of engaging in discussion, Co-Chair Villeda re-explained what he said. In different communities, there are different cultural norms. For instance, a predominant one within Asian communities is that sometimes they avoid eye contact. So, when it comes to a law enforcement officer or a trainee encountering someone from that community, how are we training them to not perceive that as non-compliance? Or, in other instances, when Co-Chair Villeda has encountered law enforcement, he gets frustrated, and when he exhibits frustration, how do we train officers to not see that as a threat to them? Co-Chair Villeda stated that he is not here to undermine the point of RIPA, and he is a little confused how that point and topic of conversation led Member Thuilliez to that conclusion, but he hopes that he clarified what he was attempting to convey here.

Member Thuilliez responded that, if we were to agree about the Asian community and eye contact, not many police officers perceive that as a threat, but then we would need somebody to identify every single cultural movement specific to that group, then get that through POST, and then train every police officer in California what that group may do, so that seems quite impossible but off point.

Co-Chair Villeda responded that Member Thuilliez is taking his point a little bit too far. It is just for the point of the discussion, since the Subcommittee is discussing what they have just

reviewed, and also the assumption being that if the law enforcement officer is serving in that community, potentially the FTO might be from that community or they might be from that community, so he would assume that they would understand some of those cultural norms or differences.

Dr. Hetey noted that Section 6 references LD 3 and LD 42 of the Basic Academy, and those do talk about what, as Member Forde wrote in the chat, she would call “cultural competency”—that there are certain elements of culture that could impact how a police officer does their job. That is reference material that Dr. Hetey wanted to put out there.

Member Alatorre stated that he found this section a little bit hard. To the Chief’s point, since CHP is a state-wide agency, they have people that come from either a small community and then they have been thrust into a huge metropolitan community with a lot of different cultures and races that they have never interacted with. He thinks that comes with experience and learning how to talk to people. It is something that you don’t just learn on FTO. It is definitely going to take time to be able to learn these different social cues and learn how to talk to people, and that is something that Member Alatorre found tough with this section. To his point, if he grabs a kid from, say, Yreka and throw them in South LA, they are going to be exposed to a lot of different cultures that they have never been exposed to before coming from a small community, so it is hard to say they have to know exactly what the Hispanic, African American, or Asian communities’ cues are. He stated that, even though you learn it in theory going through the Academy in the different LDs, then you are actually exposed to it and you learn it as you go and become a little bit more tenured. Member Alatorre expressed that this is where he kind of struggled with this one. We are kind of asking someone, as they are learning all of these different things, are actually boots on the ground out there with their FTO, we are telling them not only do you have to learn all aspects of this job, but pick up on all these social cues and then remember them for all these different cultures.

Dr. Hetey asked Member Alatorre if there is something in his experience that helps a young trainee be open to learning about different cultures and different communities when they are on the job. She noted that, as Member Alatorre said, this takes time. Is there some sort of advice or something early on that they can be taught how to orient themselves to do to make that process easier over time?

Member Alatorre responded that he thinks people have to recognize their own biases. They have to put those aside, and then it is more about talking with their different FTOs that they have and learning the different communities and different areas of the state that they are policing. Again, it comes with time. Member Alatorre found, as he was contemplating this particular section, that it is a little bit tough to just thrust somebody into potentially a community that they are not familiar with and then rate them on it during the FTP to that extent.

Dr. Hetey noted that Member Alatorre is bringing up a good point: One size does not fit all, and POST is in this position of having to provide guidance for agencies across the state, but it varies certainly region to region so that is a needle that needs to be threaded here too.

Dr. Hetey asked the Subcommittee if they had any other comments, questions, or things they would like to share that came up doing these exercises together.

Member Sierra shared that one thing this conversation is making her think about is, as they are looking at this, to put themselves in the shoes of a new officer that is going to be maybe new to a department or new to a community. On this last hypothetical they were talking about, it may be appropriate here if an officer may not know this particular part of Los Angeles or the communities, but they are showing some self-awareness and perception and talking about things that would show this is a person who is going to, over time, see this as a value and become successful in this way. Member Sierra stated that it is helpful, at least for her, to think about if she were training somebody who is new to her department just after going through the Academy, what she would be looking for these types of skills.

Dr. Hetey added that it would be helpful to also consider what it is like to be the FTO, if they were put in a position of evaluating the trainee, as they discuss what it is like for culture to affect policy-community relations. Is the FTO prepared how to evaluate that conversation or behavior?

Member Hawkins asked, regarding the situation we are in right now with immigration and law enforcement, how they are being evaluated on that. She stated that this is major because a lot of people are scared to even report anything right now because of their status here. She asked how law enforcement is going to help the community in dealing with that issue.

Dr. Hetey acknowledged that this is a big question.

Chief Hahn responded that, to all this conversation, that is part of the challenge. Part of the challenge for POST in providing a standard training across the state is every community is a little different. It has to be consistent from a small department to a large department, from Northern California to Southern California, in terms of the standards. But there might be some middle ground in all the areas that everybody was talking about, for example continuation of things that happen in the Academy, as opposed to real specific things. For example, one of the sections in LD 3 and the Academy is Japanese camps during World War II. In his own town of Sacramento, they had one of those and there were parts of town where people were collected and taken there, so a trainee learned about Japanese concentration camps in the Academy. If that was in their area, they could be taken there and shown the impacts in that community and what happened — maybe not specific mannerisms or things like that, but a history of what a community has been through in their city, in their neighborhood, and some of the ramifications of that, such as lost money and things like that, in that specific town where that trainee was working.

Co-Chair Kulkarni stated that hopefully a number of those trainings are actually from those communities. Our desire, for most of us, is not simply that we are talking about solely white trainees who may not understand those communities, but actually that there be trainees from each and every community so that there is trust also. She also raised a comment from the chat and noted that the question is the openness to this framework, to understanding and taking the training is really critical. Where we see it not happening is really outright resistance. Certainly, if trainees are asking questions or seeking to take in and absorb the materials that are provided, that helps to meet the overall objectives. Resistance does not, so there is a lot of middle ground. She does not think anyone here is saying it is black and white, but that officers in this process will be open to learning, understanding the communities that they serve so that they can build the trust with those communities.

Co-Chair Kulkarni noted that the allotted time for this agenda item had run out and thanked Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn for their presentation and taking the Subcommittee through this exercise.

She expressed that it was really helpful and obviously generated a lot of great conversation. She hoped Subcommittee members could take this back when they provide the review. She expressed appreciation for all the great work the consultants have done and noted that this is quite detailed and really comprehensive.

5. CO-CHAIR DISCUSSION ON POST RIPA GUIDELINES AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Co-Chair Kulkarni stated that the next agenda item is Subcommittee discussion of the POST RIPA Guidelines. She noted that there are fifteen minutes allotted for this, and that Co-Chair Villeda agreed to lead this agenda item.

Co-Chair Villeda began by providing background information. He reminded the Subcommittee that Penal Code section 13519.4, subdivision (a) requires that the POST Commission develop and disseminate AB 953 Racial and Identity Profiling Guidelines and training for all peace officers. During the August 2023 POST Subcommittee meeting, POST agreed with the RIPA Board's recommendation to develop a separate set of guidelines for RIPA related courses. POST later hosted a series of workshops with Subcommittee members. A few Board members, including Co-Chair Villeda and Member Hawkins, attended and were part of that process on behalf of the Board. The last substantial updates to the RIPA-related Guidelines were tied to LD 3, LD 42, and the POST-certified Museum of Tolerance (MOT) Train the Trainer curriculum. POST based its AB 953 Guidelines updates on the framework established in the Train the Trainer curriculum. POST published these Guidelines on September 25, 2025, two years later.

Given their roles as Subcommittee Co-Chairs, Co-Chairs Villeda and Kulkarni had a chance to review the published Guidelines and wanted to share their initial thoughts with the Subcommittee today. Co-Chair Villeda noted that their feedback, as well as all of the Subcommittee members feedback, will be incorporated into the 2027 RIPA Board Report.

Co-Chair Villeda began the report of the Co-Chairs' feedback by noting that there is a positive comment: The Co-Chairs feel like the Guidelines do have some meaningful improvements, and they reflect years of feedback working with POST over the year. There is a stronger emphasis on community stakeholders, they are using RIPA data, and the legal obligations seem to be a little bit more fleshed out. Co-Chair Villeda expressed that they are not as black and white as they were when he came on the Board. Historical context also received an update, so there is more information there for law enforcement officers to get a good sense of the historical timeline as it pertains to policies, and the scenario-based training also received some significant updates. These Guidelines are supposed to assist law enforcement agencies to develop a four-hour training course for facilitators.

Co-Chair Villeda then shared that the Co-Chairs have some continued concerns: The Guidelines themselves are much narrower in scope than what the Board initially envisioned, and they read more as a course guidance product rather than a statewide, stand-alone guideline framework. Co-Chair Villeda stated that, back in 2023, their understanding was that POST had agreed to develop guidelines that were meant to apply to all POST-related racial identity profiling courses. Instead, the Guidelines approved and published by POST in September 2025 are described as facilitator guidelines for a four-hour, POST-certified course aimed at seasoned officers and supervisors. The published Guidelines are helpful and can be a part of a solution that we work towards together, but the Penal Code does require a refresher course every five years.

Co-Chair Villeda stated that POST did not make it clear how published Guidelines connect to refresher requirements or the rest of POST's racial identity profiling training and structure. There is no real direction on how these things are supposed to co-exist together. He stated that, if the larger framework does remain unclear, then obviously gaps in racial identity training are going to also continue. Further, if the Subcommittee does not emphasize or at least have a concrete definition from POST, we are going to continue to see gaps in how law enforcement officers are trained, and we are going to see that in the data year after year. He stated that improving one course format is much different than delivering a broader set of guidelines and framework with clear standards and implementation, which is what the Board requested back in 2023.

Co-Chair Villeda expressed that POST should not discard what is published. It just needs to be clear about what the document is and what it isn't and, most importantly, what work remains to establish this statewide framework. Co-Chair Villeda expressed that he and Co-Chair Kulkarni feel like POST should issue a clear statement for the record on whether the published Guidelines are either a 4-hour facilitator guide, if they are one piece of a larger system, or if this is being treated as compliance within the Penal Code and the guideline for the mandate. If it is intended to be one piece of a larger framework, then POST should disseminate an implementation plan that we can see and reference that explains how these Guidelines connect to a 5-year refresher requirement, how they will be used to update and harmonize other POST racial and identity courses, and what standards will be used to measure whether the related trainings are effective. Co-Chair Villeda expressed that he thinks there is still a missing component there that the Board had uplifted, and asked Co-Chair Kulkarni if she had anything to add.

Co-Chair Kulkarni responded that she did not and thought that was a great summary. She opened the floor to other Subcommittee members to offer feedback, which could then be used to inform the Subcommittee's decision about their plans for the 2027 Report. She also asked DOJ if there was anything to add or share in terms of framing this conversation.

DAG Leon clarified that after the field training review, the Subcommittee members will have an opportunity to read the Guidelines themselves, so this is not the end of this conversation. It is just the beginning and an introduction of what the Co-Chairs took away from their reflections.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked DAG Leon for that clarification and opened the floor for Subcommittee members' comments.

Co-Chair Villeda shared that he is happy to have a set of Guidelines, which have been a long time in the making.

Member Sierra expressed that it would be a great idea, after the Subcommittee is done with field training, if they all have an opportunity to look at the Guidelines, then they will be in a position to then talk about next steps. Maybe they can invite POST to come talk to the Subcommittee, but right now it is hard to comment substantively because they have not looked at the Guidelines, and as a group they all need to look at them so they can figure out what the Subcommittee would like to do or what additional information might be helpful.

Member Randolph thanked the Co-Chairs for bringing up some valid points. He asked to confirm that, in the Board's last meeting last year and in the final Report, it was reflected that they were making strides with POST and they were satisfied with where they were two or three years ago as opposed to now. He stated that POST staff have been responding and the Board has

been meeting with staff and asked if the Subcommittee is still good with that and if they are still going that path. He wanted to confirm for new members and people that are watching this meeting whether POST is responding, and he asked Co-Chair Villeda if the Guidelines were not there.

Co-Chair Kulkarni responded that it is one and then the other; it is really both scenarios. There have been some really meaningful improvements, and they are really glad to see those. She thinks there is just some work to be done and some clarifications to be had, especially when it comes to the refresher course, the legal framework, and such. It is all in progress, as the whole learning domains are themselves and as we all pull those up together. She asked if Co-Chair Villeda or Member Sierra had anything to add.

Member Sierra added that this is a really good point, and they do have a really good working relationship with POST. At the end of the day, they might not all agree on everything, but she thinks their relationship working together and their communications are really good and have been really strong. It may be that as the Subcommittee is able to turn to the Guidelines next, it may be that having a conversation with POST as a Subcommittee could be very helpful to discuss some of the remaining questions or concerns that Co-Chair Villeda brought up. They can have a conversation about that, to the extent the Subcommittee is in agreement with that. She expressed that, from her perspective, POST has been very open about hearing the Subcommittee's feedback, and they have had good two-way conversations.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked if the Subcommittee members had additional questions, comments, or feedback.

Member Randolph stated that he loved how DOJ brought in some subject matter experts and thought it was pretty powerful for Subcommittee members to actually complete some of the FTO paperwork. That is just a small fraction or a foundation of what is done in a patrol car or a briefing room throughout the state. He wondered if the Subcommittee and DOJ, if they are willing to do this today, would be open to them going to an academy and seeing the work being done as it relates to the three different learning domains. He stated that they all are in proximity of one of the police academies in the state, and not one academy would decline to allow a member of RIPA or DOJ to come visit. Whether it is the three or four domains they have talked about or any of the domain, it is so important and would give them more credibility with the Assembly and lawmakers. He asked Subcommittee members what they thought about that.

Member Forde stated that he has gone three times last year and once this year as part of the work that he does with another committee with the San Bernardino District Attorney. He stated that he loves it and thinks it is pretty cool.

Member Hawkins stated that she would love to go. She said that she has a great relationship with law enforcement within the Los Angeles County, but has never been invited.

Co-Chair Villeda stated that he would take the opportunity to go out there and see some of the learning domains in person. He also informed the Subcommittee that he asked DOJ to do a ride along with an LAPD officer, so he is taking Member Randolph's advice.

Member Randolph thanked Co-Chair Villeda and stated that is inspiring for him and expressed appreciation for the conversation today. He wondered, as a member of the Board, if it is possible for DOJ to create some type of structure. He is glad that Member Forde has been out there, but

stated that was as a guest watching. He stated that they need to walk through the doors of any academy as a member of this body. Those staff members and the academy command staff need to know what they are there for. They need to see more than just recruits doing their tests. They want to see instruction, and a lot of attention should be to that. They should have carte blanche, and he believes that they have the mechanics to make that happen. He is sure that if there was notification to POST, or if he can make this happen for everyone on this call right now and have it done by 5:00, but he is pitching it to the Subcommittee because it is the Co-Chairs' committee and he is just a guest here. He is just offering resources because he loves this movement that everyone here is interested in doing that. He thinks it would really be inspiring for law enforcement to have contact with the Subcommittee on this call.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Member Randolph for his offer and stated that DOJ probably needs to take it back and figure out how that happens. She also stated that one of the RIPA Board Co-Chairs, Member Sierra, is present and asked if she had any feedback or insight to share.

Member Sierra responded that she does think these are really good ideas. It would be helpful for the Co-Chairs and DOJ staff to come up with a proposal of what may work. She also noted that when POST invited the Subcommittee to come speak at their POST Commission meeting last year, and Member Sierra attended on behalf of the Board, there were comments made from the members of the board that they thought it would go a long way to the extent RIPA Board members could engage in ride-alongs, and especially if they are looking at trainings, in their view that would be very helpful as well. She stated that this is something for the Board to work on with DOJ staff and bring back some ideas to the Subcommittee.

Member Thuilliez stated that he appreciated the conversation and collaboration. Thinking about what Member Randolph said about coming to the academy, he suggested a reality-based scenario where, at night time, each RIPA member fills out the RIPA form for a simulated traffic stop on a vehicle with tinted windows. He stated that they have to try to guess what the perceived race is when it is midnight on a car with tinted windows, and they have to start guessing on the blind, and that data is obviously compiled and calculated and the reports produced. He expressed that, on top of that, this is what we put our trainees and officers through, and members of the Board would probably benefit from it.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked the Subcommittee members for their comments and asked DOJ if there were any actionable items in light of the conversation at this time.

DAG Manners stated that no formal vote is needed on this item, and since it seems like there is a consensus among the Subcommittee, DOJ can take this back and figure out a plan to work on this, which they will discuss with the Subcommittee Co-Chairs to get the plan in place. In the meantime, she encouraged Subcommittee members to let DOJ know, by email, if they have any other thoughts that might be relevant to this topic.

Co-Chair Kulkarni reminded the Subcommittee that, in the past, DOJ made an offer to folks that, if they were available to go on ride-alongs, they could. She asked if the Subcommittee had any other comments or questions regarding what they had laid out so far in terms of the Guidelines. Hearing none, she moved on to the next agenda item.

6. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2027 REPORT

Co-Chair Kulkarni moved to the next agenda item to briefly discuss the 2027 Report. She asked DOJ to remind the Subcommittee of the process for the discussion and they need from the Subcommittee.

DAG Leon responded that, as part of the 2027 RIPA Report, the bulk of POST chapter will be comprised of FTP review that the POST subcommittee members will undertake. The other part will be the Subcommittee's review of the AB 953 Guidelines discussed earlier today. This time is an opportunity for the Subcommittee to discuss if there is anything else they want the POST chapter to address this year. For example, the full RIPA Board has discussed immigration enforcement in relation to racial and identity profiling, and that is a theme other subcommittees are brainstorming. This agenda item is an opportunity for the Subcommittee to bring up other things that they think are relevant and could connect to the FTP and Guidelines review.

Co-Chair Kulkarni shared two comments: First, relating to immigration, one piece that is particularly relevant to RIPA is what has become know as the "Kavanaugh stop" because of comments made by Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh allowing for legalized discrimination in the use of race and identity as it pertains to ICE detentions. She stated that we have seen many, many individuals who are actually U.S. citizens but look like look like Co-Chair Villeda or herself be then detained just based on the color of their skin. Again, this is something that Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh has allowed for, saying that it is temporary even though many such individuals have been detained for days on end, completely incommunicado with family members. She noted that we learned of a blind gentleman, a Rohingya refugee, who was detained, then left on the street in the middle of the night in Buffalo, New York and then died. Co-Chair Kulkarni stated that she would like some discussion of this, if that is possible.

Co-Chair Kulkarni also noted that one thing that has come up in the course of the POST materials: As she understands it, there is a closed contract with the Museum of Tolerance that has not been made open in an open bidding process to other entities to conduct the Train the Trainer course and develop the curriculum. She would like to investigate that and potentially make recommendations to the Legislature about that. As she understands it, from previous DOJ staff, this was a legislative matter or decision, so since RIPA routinely makes recommendations to the Legislature this would be appropriate here as well.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked if Subcommittee members or DOJ staff had questions about either of her comments. Hearing none, she asked if there were any other comments, questions, or topics the Subcommittee would like to have included in the 2027 Report. Hearing none, she moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Kulkarni opened the floor to public comments.

Michelle Wittig called the Subcommittee's attention to a recommendation in the first annual RIPA Report on page 42. It suggests that community members be integrated into the classroom training of officers. She stated that there are lots of good reasons for that and particularly segments of the community that have perhaps experienced negative interactions with the police are especially recommended to be included. Maybe there is some place in the rubric for

evaluators that are looking at the course materials to see whether or not any of the law enforcement agencies are incorporating that recommendation.

Along that same line, Ms. Wittig stated that she thinks that what is being done here is a field training review of course materials or course outlines. She noted that, as Dr. Hetey pointed out, it does not delve into the validity or completeness of the content of the coursework, nor does it assess the fidelity of the delivery of the materials by the FTOs, and those are, of course, very, very important things to evaluate. In a way, calling this a field training program review might be a little bit of an overstatement because, even though it is very detailed and very impressive, it is an evaluation of course materials or course outlines, not of the validity of the concepts being communicated. For example, implicit bias is sometimes touted by consultants as a screening device. You take the Implicit Associations Test (IAT) and we are going to find out whether you have implicit bias. This is not what the originators or the researchers who know the literature are recommending ever be done. It is a self-reflection tool. It should not be used to evaluate officers. When they take the IAT, it is associations. It is not a measure of bias. Ms. Wittig does not want to see that assessment misused.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Ms. Wittig and asked if there were any other public comments.

DAG Manners reminded members of the public that if they had any thoughts after this meeting, they are welcome to submit written public comments to the AB 953 e-mail address and those will be circulated to the Board ahead of the next meeting.

Hearing no additional comments, Co-Chair Kulkarni moved to the next agenda item.

8. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Kulkarni opened the floor to discuss the Subcommittee's next steps. She asked DOJ if there were any immediate next steps they needed to discuss.

DAG Leon responded the Subcommittee will be receiving the packet that the consultants referenced and a copy of the rubric via e-mail to get started. As discussed, their deadline is May 15th. The Subcommittee had fruitful conversations earlier today, so DAG Leon asked the Subcommittee members jot some of those thoughts and reflections down because we want everyone's input and we want to be able to capture to nuance behind people's reflections. She thanked Subcommittee members in advance for taking this on.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked how much time is projected for completing the rubric and providing comments because it was said earlier today by the speakers that it could look rather intense and there are actually quite a bit of materials. She stated that it would be helpful for folks to know in advance of the deadline how much time generally would be expected to complete it and asked if DAG Leon had a sense of that, although it will vary a bit.

DAG Leon responded that it definitely will vary, but she would not wait until May 14th to start reviewing the materials because they can be intimidating. In terms of Section 6 and filling out the rubric, the Subcommittee got a small flavor for that today. Putting aside a couple of hours here and there to do this would be helpful. DAG Leon projected that it could take a total of maybe four to eight hours, but deferred to what the experts think.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked DAG Leon and asked if the experts were still on the line.

Dr. Hetey responded that she thinks it will vary, but it would take a couple of hours. She noted that they provided a lot of those background materials, such as the full LD 3 and LD 42, for those who want to dive deeper and see what Section 6 is following from the Basic Academy, but there is no requirement to go through that. She estimated it would take a couple hours (six to eight hours if they are really doing a deep dive of all of those background materials).

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Dr. Hetey and asked DOJ staff if there was anything else the Subcommittee needed to do. She noted that there is a full Board meeting on April 23rd and asked if the next POST Subcommittee meeting before the July full Board meeting had been set.

DAG Leon responded that the Subcommittee meeting will be in mid-June. DOJ will be surveying Subcommittee members so that there is a quorum, then send out the next date as soon as possible.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked DAG Leon and asked Subcommittee members to mark their calendars for April 23rd.

9. ADJOURN

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