

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2025 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

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

Subcommittee Members Absent: Members Rich Randolph, Kevin Mensen, and Brian Kennedy (retired)

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD 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. Co-Chair Kulkarni welcomed RIPA Board Member Souley Diallo as a guest speaker. Member Diallo introduced himself and expressed he was pleased to discuss his participation in the POST workshop with the Subcommittee.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 10, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

Member Sierra made a motion to adopt the minutes from the March 10, 2025 Subcommittee meeting, and Co-Chair Villeda seconded. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners assisted with the roll call vote:

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

With five Ayes, the meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAG Danielle Elliott stated that this is the second of the three Subcommittee meetings of the year. The next meeting of the full RIPA Board is on July 11, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DAG Elliott stated that the focus of this meeting is to hear from the POST representatives to better understand the context of POST's Field Training Program (FTP). DOJ will continue its work on reviewing the POST FTP throughout the year, and Subcommittee members will receive a draft report to review and discuss for the next Subcommittee meeting.

DAG Elliott also informed the Subcommittee that Subcommittee Member Pastor Brian Kennedy has resigned.

5. UPDATES BY BOARD MEMBERS SIERRA AND DIALLO

Member Sierra gave an overview of her meeting with POST representatives on April 9, 2025. She explained that the reason for the meeting was to improve and enhance communication between POST, the Subcommittee, and the full RIPA Board. Member Sierra explained that this would improve the analysis, research, and recommendations of the Subcommittee and facilitate communication between POST and the Subcommittee.

Member Sierra reported that, at the April 9 meeting, she discussed the following topics with POST representatives:

- POST's status with respect to promulgating the Racial and Identity Profiling Guidelines;
- POST's Assembly Bill (AB) 443 Workshop, the purpose of which was to create a definition of biased conduct;
- POST's responses to the Board's recommendations in the 2025 Report; and
- The status of prior Board recommendations that POST had previously agreed to implement.

Member Sierra also relayed that DAG Marisol Leon accompanied her at this workshop and was able to provide direct, positive-sounding feedback to POST at the AB 443 Workshop.

Lastly, Member Sierra stated that she and POST agreed for Member Sierra to speak to POST before the publication of this year's RIPA Report. Specifically, Member Sierra would attend the POST Commission meeting on September 9, 2025, to give POST the Board's likely recommendations, concerns, and questions. Having this background at this meeting would give the Subcommittee early feedback and information before final decisions are made in November or December for the RIPA Board's next report.

Member Sierra passed the presentation over to Member Diallo, but specified that the majority of what she presented would be described in further detail by the two guest presenters from POST.

Member Diallo explained that he was pleased to attend the POST AB 443 Workshop relating to the definition of "biased conduct," along with RIPA Board Co-Chair Andrea Guerrero. Both attended the AB 443 Workshop as subject matter experts (SMEs). They were accompanied by DAG Marisol Leon.

Member Diallo explained that, in the workshop, attendees came to a consensus on the following definition of biased conduct:

Any action or inaction by police officers, whether on or off-duty, that is motivated by bias, whether implicit or explicit, towards a person's actual or perceived protected class or characteristics.

Member Diallo explained that the workshop was a collaborative effort between many different SMEs. The majority of the SMEs attending had a background in law enforcement, whereas Members Diallo and Guerrero and DAG Leon represented the RIPA Board and its interests.

The workshop was divided into different sections where SMEs initially collaborated to establish draft language for the entire module. The different subsections were: 1) legal considerations

regarding the establishment of a legal definition pursuant to the statute; 2) definition of implicit and explicit bias; 3) building community partnerships; 4) background investigations; and 5) internal investigations.

Member Diallo felt that the RIPA Board's input was well-received, especially with respect to the first two domains in terms of the definition as well as the definition implicit and explicit bias. Members Diallo and Guerrero and DAG Leon were able to institute research-based recommendations, which Member Diallo believed was one of the most valuable roles they had as SMEs coming from RIPA, as the recommendations were ultimately adopted by the whole workshop-committee.

Member Diallo served on the "building community partnerships" section of the workshop, where the SMEs collaborated to develop both the communication outside of the department regarding what law enforcement would do regarding bias conduct and rooting out biased conduct, and a two-ended communication within the office in terms of the expectations for avoiding biased conduct.

Member Diallo's primary critique was directed at the lack of perspectives outside of law enforcement and attorneys. Member Diallo felt that having more input from community members would have improved the workshop, especially given that some of the focus was on building community partnerships. Member Diallo and the group had a vibrant discussion where he thought that all viewpoints were taken well, and even in areas where he wasn't the subject matter expert that initially participated in the subgroups, the full Board RIPA was able to give input on all areas of the workshop and input into the ultimate document that was passed on to POST. Overall, Member Diallo felt the workshop was a positive experience, the SMEs worked well together, the participation of the RIPA team was invaluable, and the RIPA Board made a substantial impact in terms of the ultimate outcome.

6. UPDATES AND INTRODUCTION OF FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM BY POST

Status of Adopted Recommendations

Co-Chair Kulkarni welcomed guest speakers from POST, Meagan Poulos and Stephen Crawford.

Meagan Poulos, POST Legislative Liaison & Public Information Officer, presented first. Ms. Poulos introduced herself as the RIPA Board liaison and stated that she has worked with many of the Subcommittee members in some capacity. Ms. Poulos described Stephen Crawford as the subject matter expert in "all things field training."

Ms. Poulos provided a general update on each past Board recommendation POST has agreed to support and detailed the current status of implementation. Starting with the 2023 RIPA Report, the first recommendation POST had agreed to support was to "offer guidance to local law enforcement agencies regarding social media investigations or inquiries in the hiring of dispatchers." Ms. Poulos explained that POST is in the process of adding the recommendation to their background investigations manual where those items occur, and they are looking to add that guidance into the AB 443 guidelines, so those will be in two separate places.

Second, POST agreed to publish any guidelines for racial and identity profiling related courses on the POST website. Ms. Poulos explained that POST was still working on implementing this recommendation, and has been conducting more internal review since its last meeting in April. POST has internally agreed to remove the section of the guidelines that has the expanded course outline for the Museum of Tolerance (MOT) course, and to remove the scenario activities. The guidelines are meant to be used for all racial and identity profiling courses. POST removed the specific Museum of Tolerance training for multiple reasons, largely because it should apply to all trainings. Ms. Poulos explained that POST has not published anything yet, and it is still working through those updates.

Next, regarding the 2023 recommendation on Regular Basic Course Learning Domain (LD) #42 - Cultural Diversity/Discrimination, The Academy, that “rather than its current focus on convincing officers that racial profiling is wrong, section two on racial and identity profiling should be evidence-based and thus focus on the significant amount of data and research showing that racial profiling is not an effective means of policing,” Ms. Poulos explained that POST has made these changes to the LD 42 workbook and should be reflected on POST’s website.

With respect to the recommendation that the course definition of LD 42 “should discuss racism and racial profiling, detail how they intersect, and should not characterize racial profiling as controversial,” Ms. Poulos confirmed that these recommendations have been implemented into the workbooks.

Lastly, the recommendation that the Museum of Tolerance “Train the Trainer” course “should refer to racial and identity profiling throughout the training rather than focus only on racial profiling” has been implemented.

Regarding the Board’s recommendations in the 2024 Board Report, Ms. Poulos informed the Subcommittee that POST was still working on the recommendation to “adopt protocols and publish separate training guidelines independent of the curriculum.” However, the second recommendation, to “incorporate accountability as a required topic in racial and identity profiling-related content in POST trainings,” has been implemented. POST has also received written confirmation from MOT that it was updating its course to include the Board’s recommendations, and that this update could be completed as soon as that week. Ms. Poulos stated that MOT is updating the videos it uses for its course, but those will take longer.

Ms. Poulos also discussed the recommendations in the 2025 RIPA Report. First, POST is still internally discussing the Board’s recommendation to “formally evaluate Learning Domain (LD) 3 and Learning Domain (LD) 42 in the Regular Basic Course comprehensive module tests,” but is looking for where they could add a testing component. Lastly, POST is currently reviewing the Board’s recommendation to “develop guidelines to assist law enforcement agencies in developing procedures to conduct adequate investigations into complaints alleging bias and guidelines that assist law enforcement agencies with aligning their policies with Penal Code section 13510.8,” in line with the 443 guidelines and some internal affairs guidelines that POST is also working on.

Co-Chair Kulkarni expressed appreciation for POST sharing this information and for the fact that there has been clear movement forward in implementing these changes because this continues to solidify the Board's relationship with POST and help POST do its job.

Updates to LD 3 & LD 42 Instructor's Guide – Activity 5

Ms. Poulos informed the Subcommittee that the POST Commission is meeting on June 4, 2025, to discuss one of the rulemaking items related to LD 3 and LD 42 related to updating POST's "Instructor's Guide to Learning Activities for Leadership, Ethics and Community Policing." The POST Commission approved this item at its last meeting. Many of the updates were largely grammar-related, or consisted of updating outdated content. In addition, POST added a new activity, Activity 5, regarding implicit and explicit bias. Ms. Poulos explained that POST created Activity 5 with the help of subject matter experts (SMEs), and would be presenting Activity 5 to the POST Commission in June for final approval.

In Activity 5, the instructor/facilitator informs students that they have survived a catastrophic event and must now survive on an uninhabited island for an unknown period of time. They can select five other individuals to take with them on the uninhabited island to help them survive. The instructor will provide limited information on a group of individuals to select from (for example: a doctor, addict, librarian, priest, a person with a disability, politician, attorney, pregnant mother with a three-year-old child, Navy SEAL, scientist). The facilitator will divide the students into groups and allow ten to fifteen minutes for the students to decide who they will select. Student groups will then conduct a group presentation on who they selected to help them survive on the island and why. After each group presents, the instructor/facilitator then provides additional context as to who those individuals are. For instance: the doctor has a doctorate in Education (EdD); the librarian is a volunteer firefighter; the priest is a reserve US Army officer; the Navy SEAL is a paraplegic; etc.

The facilitator then leads the discussion about how our lived experiences knowingly or unknowingly contribute to how we perceive individuals, form judgments, and make decisions about people when we have limited information. The facilitator can ask follow-up questions such as: "Having context to your selections, would you change your selection? Why?" and "How does knowing more about an individual help prevent generalizations, pre-judgments, and discriminant behavior?" Ms. Poulos explained that the purpose Activity 5 is to exemplify how individuals can be quick to make assumptions of others, and to foster a discussion on the negative consequences of assumptions.

Activity 5 of LD 42's Instructor's Guide can be found under the rulemaking section of POST's website: https://post.ca.gov/Portals/0/post_docs/regulationnotices/2025/2025-20_TPRA_1005-1007-1008-1059_Adopted_IGLA.pdf#page=233

Field Training Program Overview

POST Consultant Stephen Crawford described POST's Field Training Program to the Subcommittee. Following completion of the Regular Basic Course, also known as the Academy, the Field Training Program (FTP) is the second required training process/program for peace

individuals who are pursuing peace officer certification. The regulations and procedures that govern the FTP are California Code of Regulations, Title 11, sections 1004 and 1005, as well as POST Commission Procedure D-13. The FTP is the point where peace officers are first introduced to the actual, formal process of training. The FTP is part two of the Academy and is meant to bridge the gap to harness theoretical training provided in the Academy. Once peace officers begin the FTP, their academy training—the information they learned from their learning domains or “student workbooks”—continues.

Mr. Crawford explained that for general information, anyone who would like to read the workbooks can go to POST’s website and search for: “student workbooks California POST,” or look under BCCR resources. All the Training and Testing Specifications and workbooks are on there. To Mr. Crawford’s knowledge, POST usually updates these items after October and April of every year, following suit with the Commission.

Mr. Crawford also discussed the length of the FTP. While the length of the program is set by the respective department, POST mandates that it be a minimum of 10 weeks. While POST has considered increasing the minimum length, due to the large variance in the size and scope of departments across the state and their resulting abilities POST has opted to maintain the current 10-week mandate.

Mr. Crawford informed the Subcommittee that, as of last week, all POST materials were up to date and current. As of last week, POST has updated the FTP, the three courses that follow the FTP (the basic course, the update course, and the supervisor course), and has updated all addendums, attachments, and forms. Additionally, POST has ensured that everything on its website was current as of the date of the Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Crawford expressed pride in this accomplishment given how long such an endeavor has taken, specifying that this is the first time in the 7 years he has worked with POST that all the materials for which he is responsible is current.

Mr. Crawford explained that it had taken POST about a year and a half to two years to update the field training guide with all three courses to establish academic congruency, in addition to the ever-changing process of the academy. Mr. Crawford described the process of keeping materials up to date as “constant,” given that POST must implement modifications and changes every January when new laws are imposed. Additionally, given that the process is ever-changing, these documents and workbooks must be treated as living documents or else become stagnant. Mr. Crawford referred to the earlier-mentioned LD updates as an example of this process, and explained that, even when POST makes those changes, the revisions never stop.

Returning to the FTP, Mr. Crawford explained that trainees must complete their required hours, which can be at a minimum of 400 hours or longer as determined by the employing agency. The longest field training program in the state of California that Mr. Crawford is aware of is one year, beginning the moment the trainee leaves the Academy. As a caveat, most agencies in California currently require between about 19 to 22 weeks of formal training after the Academy. The length of an FTP for a law enforcement agency can vary, and is largely dependent upon the services they provide, the county, the geography, and the overall abilities of what that agency requires.

Mr. Crawford explained that, since he has been at POST, he has seen the length of the FTP increase. While he is not aware of any quantifiable data to support this claim, however based on his experience, there have been three developments over the last three to five years that have influenced this phenomenon: (1) A lot of peace officers have retired from law enforcement due to the gradual elimination of the “3% at 50” retirement plan from departments; (2) it seems that California is recruiting more from a national base, more than from within the state; and (3) many younger officers have a tendency of moving around to different departments, more so than officers had done in the past.

POST has academically structured the FTP as a four-stage process. However, law enforcement agencies can increase the number of stages as they feel is necessary. Once trainees complete the FTP, their standing is largely dependent on their agency’s probationary policy. In California, law enforcement agencies have an 18 to 24-month probation period once they are hired, and can remain on probation or as an at-will employee past that point, as determined by the law enforcement agency.

Upon the completion of both the Academy and FTP, Mr. Crawford estimated that trainees have likely received at least 1,500 to 2,000 hours of training in total, although the length of both of these programs varies depending on the law enforcement agency. For instance, POST’s minimum Academy, with no extracurricular addendums from the department or a regional training facility, is 664 hours. However, some state agencies have programs that are much longer, above 1,300 or 1,400 hours. Depending on the specific job description, there are different officers in different capacities that just have a lot more training than other officers.

Member Angela Sierra asked, with respect to the variety of hours and the varying size of law enforcement agencies, whether the workbooks are intended to be completed in 10 weeks.

Mr. Crawford explained that the student workbooks were designed to be covered within all 42 of the learning domains. POST ensures that these are academically congruent through its standardized evaluation guidelines. There are core competencies of abilities, skills, and given traits taught during each learning domain of the Academy that trainers emphasize and revisit to reinforce learning. POST uses four different modalities for learning:

1. Experiential training, which reflects what trainees see in the Academy and constitutes a lot of the on-the-job process. What the trainees see, hear, and do is reflected through repetition;
2. Observational training, where trainees mimic behavior as a result of continually seeing and observing best practices;
3. Reflective training; and
4. Structured feedback, where trainees apply the knowledge, skills, and abilities they were taught in the Academy. Mr. Crawford explained that, for this modality, the question for the assessment is whether the trainee can demonstrate proficiency in the field under a higher-stress situation.

Member Sierra asked what differences the Board would see if it were to compare a 10-week program to a longer program.

Mr. Crawford responded that historically, the FTP was subjectively administered by the agencies, and there was nothing codified or structured that continued those learning pieces from the academy to show validation. However, since 2014, POST has been working to address this lack of structure or validation. POST has built a field training guide that covers the particular information law enforcement agencies need to train their cadets on in the FTP and provides particular benchmarks for law enforcement agencies to set as core competencies. Once an agency meets the benchmark, they can go beyond that, if they choose to do so. POST does not approve any additions made by a department to the basic FTP program, but has published a continuation of the FTP in a guide format. This continuation guide carries over from the Academy, and is one of the items that has recently been updated. Mr. Crawford explained that law enforcement agencies can take the continuation guide and reemphasize the knowledge, skills, and abilities trainees have learned in the Academy.

Mr. Crawford further explained that there is a degree of variance between law enforcement agencies due to each agency's style and their specifically required job qualities, but approximately "75% or 80% of the training" is codified, or the same across all agencies. Mr. Crawford told the Subcommittee that he believed such codification has helped his profession grow even more; although law enforcement agencies have the ability to expand upon POST training, codification ensures that all agencies implement best practices and case law. Mr. Crawford explained that 10 years ago, POST was not at that point but now they are. Mr. Crawford frequently receives feedback from officers who "lateral" to different agencies, big and small, and they have told him they received the same training from both agencies. In Mr. Crawford's experience, it didn't used to be like that.

Mr. Crawford explained that POST has a lot more information and programs available that are codified by regulation. POST also conducts quality assurance checks of FTPs conducted by law enforcement agencies, and ensures that the field training officers (FTOs) running these FTPs are trained. POST also reviews law enforcement agencies to ensure they have a continual cycle of training, and it conducts quality assurance checks with agencies. As an example, Mr. Crawford described a quality assurance check he conducted last year where he found a few agencies which were in need of some additional training. In that instance, POST provided that training, showing the agencies the applicable regulations, the guidance, and the applicable standards, and made corrective actions.

Member Sierra asked if an officer who transfers from one agency to another would need to take a new FTP with the new agency.

Mr. Crawford characterized this question as currently "double-edged," but stated that the officer would need to complete a new FTP in that situation. Due to the amount of time and consideration needed to effectively codify such lateral regulations, POST has not yet established uniform policy for these situations, and there are no applicable regulations that dictate when an officer completes a "lateral" transfer to a different agency in the state. If an officer completes a lateral

transfer from an agency outside of California, they would have to go through the minimum 10-week FTP program. However, most agencies have the officer go through their regular training program. Mr. Crawford further explained that, before officers transferring from out-of-state agencies were required to attend the FTP, out-of-state officers were often placed in difficult positions to succeed, as they either (1) could not meet the POST requirements or; (2) were failing out of the FTP program. Because of this, the FTP program was mandated for officers transferring from out-of-state agencies.

Mr. Crawford was not aware of any agency inside of California hiring an officer from another agency within the state that did not conduct some form of training standards checking. This is to ensure that the process was fair and defensible to both the employee and to the agency. Mr. Crawford explained that not all officer experience is equitable; an officer from a small agency would likely have a great degree of difficulty adjusting to working in LAPD, and would not have the prior knowledge, experience, or training needed to fulfill their new responsibilities, and without ensuring some level of departmental competency, an agency would be setting that officer up for failure. However, agencies have discretion over how it determines whether, and to what extent, participation in the FTP is required; an experienced officer from a similarly situated department may meet appropriate standards for proficiency, while an inexperienced officer may have to go through more retraining or possible remedial training to get them up to standard.

Co-Chair Kulkarni recalled a previous conversation she had with Mr. Crawford, where she was informed that POST materials are optional for law enforcement agencies. Co-Chair Kulkarni asked whether Mr. Crawford could explain to the Subcommittee how many law enforcement agencies use POST materials given that understanding. Mr. Crawford confirmed that there is no regulation that requires law enforcement agencies to use POST materials, but noted the potential utility in publishing some communication or guide to encourage agencies to use POST materials. Mr. Crawford estimated that between 75% to 78% of the 606 agencies with FTPs in California use the POST program. The agencies that do not use the POST program still use POST materials, but those materials are outdated.

Mr. Crawford explained that, prior to POST's addendums in October of last year, POST did not have a regulation stating how long a program was to be effective or what would render a program as outdated; once POST approved an agency's FTP, it was considered up to date until it the agency modified the FTP or requested POST to update the FTP. There were few, if any, requests to update an FTP in the past 25 to 30 years, as the process of doing so was slow, and because nothing was codified in statute, there was no one was familiar with the process. However, Mr. Crawford stated that POST has now developed a clear understanding of best practices and is able to provide invaluable guides to law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Crawford also explained that POST did not adequately check the FTPs of law enforcement agencies in the past. However, around the beginning of COVID, Mr. Crawford was tasked with assessing both the number of agencies using the POST FTP, and whether these agency FTPs were up to date. At the time, fewer than 20% of the agencies were using then-current POST material. In contrast, almost 80% of agencies are now using current POST material. Mr. Crawford also noted that POST is not seeing as many problems with these agency FTPs, as the

training and information taught in the Academies is being echoed in the FTP, and much of the same language, forms, and training are used across agencies.

Mr. Crawford explained that in his opinion, POST used to look at the Academy as “a one-stop shop/check-off-the-box type deal,” to help somebody get to a career in law enforcement. Now, agencies emphasize additional continual professional training, and, given that training is consistently replicated in multiple agency academies, the failure rates have subsequently been reduced.

Mr. Crawford stated that many of the materials used in the Academy 20 years ago are no longer used. Mr. Crawford noted that in the past, disjointed and unstandardized training practices were as not academically feasible and not based in truth. In contrast, Mr. Crawford praised POST’s current practices with respect to information gathering and understanding of best practices, which are supplemented through the use of items like job-task analysis, training and testing specifications, learning domains, and the standardized evaluation guidelines.

On the topic of SB 2 and decertification, Mr. Crawford explained to the Subcommittee that POST recently created a sub-context under the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) profile for POST training officers. POST is beginning to track the progress of officers through the FTP, and document if an officer stops or pauses training for some reason, such as when the officer takes military leave. POST instituted this process to track an officer’s FTP completion as well as track people’s job history to better identify potential problematic officers. While the EDI training officer tracking is currently in the pilot stage, Mr. Crawford estimated that it would be implemented within the next 3-6 months. Mr. Crawford explained that POST would subsequently make a regulation to require agencies to track officers using their EDI profiles.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked whether Mr. Crawford could explain why 22 to 25% of agencies choose not to use POST materials. Mr. Crawford stated that previously, POST did not have an enforcement mechanism to require agencies to use POST materials, and although this concern was no longer applicable POST was behind in enforcing this requirement. To correct this, POST recently (within the last week) sent 126 letters of notification to law enforcement agencies that are not using POST materials, informing them that their programs need to be updated pursuant to new regulations. Mr. Crawford estimated that POST should be “caught up” by July, August, or September 2025. Additionally, POST will be conducting a review of each department’s manual every 8 years to ensure POST standards are being followed and programs are current. Mr. Crawford explained that many agencies wanted this review to be conducted every 4 years, due to lack of staff, but that POST determined an 8-year benchmark for review would be sufficient. However, if there are circumstances or developments at a department that might necessitate an earlier review, POST should be able to accommodate.

Mr. Crawford explained that every agency has an FTP has a subculture or hierarchy within agency responsible for overseeing their group of Field Training Officers (FTOs), including the sergeants that oversee the FTOs, and lieutenants who oversee the program. In terms of recent developments, Mr. Crawford reported that POST is conducting more spot checks than before as well as looking at recent updates.

Mr. Crawford explained that POST is trying to increase quality control and address past failure rates, but related that failure rates vary across different departments for different reasons. Based on Mr. Crawford's observations in the FTO program, he believed sheriff's departments have higher failure rates than any other departments, as they have additional, mandatory curriculum requirements to provide services to the jail and court. Mr. Crawford explained that, because sheriff's departments often assign new officers to jail duty upon graduation from the Academy, these officers do not train on what they learned in the Academy at the beginning of their careers. Mr. Crawford noted that some departments are making changes, such as having new hires go to the FTP beforehand or working them into the process to mitigate the attrition rate. These changes are also a way sustain a department's wellness program by showing people that the department is invested in the potential of its personnel.

Mr. Crawford stated that POST offers a basic course for all FTOs and described the process of becoming an FTO. To become an FTO, officers must go through a 40-hour course. After completing that course, they must go to a 24-hour update course once every three years. Additionally, any supervisors overseeing the FTO program must go to a 24-hour course. POST regulates and spot-checks these courses for quality assurance as well as to keep the process evolving.

Mr. Crawford informed the Subcommittee that the EDI history tracking and checking process was also implemented because of SB 2's requirement under Government Code section 7286, subdivision (b)(18). This section states that officers who have had any sustained abuse of force complaints are prohibited from acting as a trainer for a period of at least three years from the date that the complaint is substantiated. POST has also begun tracking these officers. Mr. Crawford believes POST has already removed two training officers pursuant to that code section. Mr. Crawford also reported that POST has incorporated some of the schematic outlines of SB 2—what it is, how it works, and the general “what we've learned so far”—in all three of the basic FTO courses to try to educate the ranks going forward.

Member Sierra asked Mr. Crawford about the extent the field training program focuses on issues related to racial and identity profiling, and asked whether he had any suggestions for the Subcommittee.

Mr. Crawford responded that he does not hear too much about racial and identity profiling. The main issues Mr. Crawford has observed are report writing and concerns about where the new hire is assigned geographically. Mr. Crawford explained that the biggest problem he sees with the younger generation of officers in the FTP program is ensuring that there is effective communication and professionalism; some members of the public feel disrespected by younger officers, and some officers are culturally deficient in an area they have never been taught. Mr. Crawford clarified that younger officers are very intelligent and are hard workers, but struggle with one-on-one conversations.

Mr. Crawford also stated he has never heard anything relating to race throughout his tenure with POST. In his perspective, officers are so preoccupied with studying for tests, making traffic stops, and communicating that race is the last thing on their minds.

Mr. Crawford informed the Subcommittee that POST has five or six sections within Volume 2, Section 6 of the FTP Guide where instructors are tasked with discussing the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments as well as diversity, community relationships, and the agency's racial profiling policy. All the content is pulled from LD 42, as LD 42 is POST's foundational piece. If a new hire does not fully understand LD 42, it is reemphasized in the FTP as a signoff portion.

Co-Chair Kulkarni informed Mr. Crawford that during one of the POST training events she attended last fall, several field trainers were under the misunderstanding that individual data was shared, including names of officers, as opposed to being provided in the aggregate. She and her fellow subcommittee members were concerned about this misconception, because if individual officers believed this to be true, they would be nervous about working with the RIPA Board. Co-Chair Kulkarni asked Mr. Crawford to opine on what could be done to correct this misinformation in the FTP and in the Academy, and what the Board could do to make sure that those who conduct the FTP effectively address this misinformation. Mr. Crawford informed Co-Chair Kulkarni that this is outside of his purview and not related to the field training program.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked if Mr. Crawford could make clear that data is only shared in the aggregate in the Train the Trainer course, as this misunderstanding has resulted in reticence from departments as well as some departments providing fraudulent data. Mr. Crawford encouraged Co-Chair Kulkarni to discuss this with Ms. Poulos, who could then provide him some specifics that he could try to address.

Ms. Poulos agreed with Mr. Crawford that this matter may not be applicable to the FTP, but that she would be interested in discussing this further. Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Mr. Crawford and Ms. Poulos.

Ms. Poulos notified the Subcommittee that her associate, Jennifer Imlay-Hardesty, provided additional clarification regarding the FTP along with a link to the related commission procedures in the meeting chat. Ms. Poulos specified that the FTP is required by all agencies that participate in the POST program, whereas the guide that Mr. Crawford was referring to is optional.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked the POST presenters and the Subcommittee took a 10-minute break.

7. BOARD DISCUSSION OF OUTLINE FOR THE 2026 REPORT

DAG Marisol Leon described the Introduction and POST Section Roadmap for the 2026 Report. AB 953 directs the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) to consult with the RIPA Board regarding the development of training for all peace officers that "prescribes evidence-based patterns, practices, and protocols that prevent racial and identity profiling." Since RIPA's enactment, the Board has reviewed seven POST-certified courses and POST's Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling and made recommendations to align those courses with RIPA's goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling. DAG Leon explained that, as the Subcommittee had heard, POST is working on aligning those guidelines with all its courses.

DAG Leon explained that the POST section of this year's RIPA Report would address the Board's ongoing collaboration with POST. First, the section would detail POST's response to prior RIPA recommendations from the 2025 Report and from years prior. DAG Leon noted that

POST had discussed many of the Board's prior recommendations at the meeting, and that POST has either already implemented them, or was currently working on implementing them.

DAG Leon explained that the Report would also provide an overview of the Board's participation in two POST-sponsored workshops: the AB 953 Workshop on Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling, and the AB 443 Workshop to develop guidelines and a definition of "biased conduct," as presented earlier by Board Member Diallo.

Regarding the AB 953 Workshop, DAG Leon related to the Subcommittee that, in August 2023, POST agreed to the Board's recommendation to develop racial and identity profiling guidelines as a standalone document, and included Board members in their development in two workshops in May and October 2024. The Board has noted that these Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling are an opportunity to align all law enforcement training to more effectively tackle barriers to eliminating racial and identity profiling by individual officers and law enforcement agencies.

DAG Leon also explained that, in March 2025, Board members, along with 15 additional SMEs, attended POST's AB 443 Workshop to develop the definition of "biased conduct" pursuant to the bill's requirements. DAG Leon explained that this definition would be used by law enforcement agencies in their background bias assessments and internal affairs investigations alleging biased conduct.

DAG Leon also explained that in this year's report, the Board will begin its 2-year review of the POST FTP.

POST has represented in the past that the FTP is where bias is measured and tested. Given the link between bias and racial and identity profiling during the first year review (Year 1), the Board will work with two experts to better understand what field training entails, and delve deeper into what Mr. Crawford presented at the Subcommittee meeting, in terms of the codification of certain aspects of the field training, the discretionary aspects of field training for law enforcement agencies, and whether such training is adequate. During the second year of its review (Year 2), the Board will continue working with these experts to develop explicit recommendations for the FTP based on evidence-based research and interventions.

DAG Leon also explained that the Board will provide concrete recommendations to POST and to the California Legislature that aim to address issues related to racial and identity profiling and bias conduct that the board identified since the issuance of its last report in 2025.

DAG Danielle Elliott detailed that the POST Section of the 2026 RIPA Report will contain the Board's list of recommendations that POST agreed to support in the years of 2023, 2024, and 2025, as well as POST's current status in implementing these recommendations.

POST Workshops

DAG Elliott informed the Subcommittee that the 2026 RIPA Report will summarize POST's current progress in implementing the recommendations addressed to both the "POST's Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling" and the AB 443 Workshop. As of this

Subcommittee meeting, POST is still working on the guidelines for racial identity profiling courses. DAG Elliott explained that DOJ staff will summarize the findings and any recommendations that the Board may have to the final work product that POST produces with respect to guidelines.

Regarding the AB 443 definition of biased conduct, POST will be discussing the proposed definition from the workshop at its Commission meeting on June 4, 2025 meeting, and will vote on the adoption of the definition. DAG Elliott informed the Subcommittee that DOJ staff will summarize all information in this section of the 2026 Report as well.

Field Training Program First Year Review

Staff Services Manager (SSM) Aisha Martin Walton stated that the FTP First Year Review is an opportunity to educate the Subcommittee on the components of the FTP. First, the Subcommittee will look at the FTP and its relationship to AB 953, which is the Board's mandate by the Legislature to review the course. The Subcommittee will also look at all the materials related to the FTP, including Section 6 of the FTP as noted by Mr. Crawford earlier today. Within the 18 competencies in Section 6 (community relations and professional demeanor), the Subcommittee will mainly look at Section 6.3 (cultural diversity) and 6.4 (racial profiling).

SSM Martin Walton emphasized that each of the 18 competencies in Section 6 tie back to the learning domains, including LD 3 and LD 42 which are the primary two courses new officers take in the classroom. The 1,064 hours of training new officers receive is a combination of classroom training and the extension of their work in the field. POST has earlier recognized that successful completion of the academy is not just the completion of the coursework in the classroom, rather "successful completion" means the individual is sufficiently prepared to enter the field training. In other words, FTP serves as a transition from the academy.

The next item the Subcommittee will look at is what training trainees receive in the field, as well as the training, direction, guidance, and throughlines Field Training Officers (FTOs) are applying from the training that the officers got in LD 3 and LD 42. This will complete the Board's comprehensive review of the eight racial and identity profiling courses that POST has updated, and the Board has been mandated to review.

With respect to the evaluation of the FTP, the Board will be looking at how the field training officers are evaluating the trainees. In POST's 2025 response report, POST indicated that they believe the most effective way to evaluate and measure the bias of a recruit is in the FTP as it immediately follows the academy. This review by the Board will complete its review of the eight POST courses it is mandated to review, and it is probably the most important because it is a culmination of everything new officers have learned and applies what they have learned in the classroom.

Recommendations

SSM Martin Walton concluded her presentation, stating that after the Subcommittee has completed its review, research, and consultation with SMEs, the Subcommittee will present their

findings and recommendations for both POST and the California Legislature in the Recommendation section of the 2026 RIPA Report.

DOJ opened the floor for any questions from the Subcommittee.

Member Darren Greene asked if there is any pre-evaluation on biases of people entering the Academy. Member Greene was particularly interested if something exists that gives a trainer a baseline understanding of the biases or sentiments a student holds before the training, during the training, and during the FTO program to better gauge training efficacy.

DAG Elliott responded that there are several regulations that require officers to be screened before they enter the Academy for any biases. However, DAG Elliott was not aware of any screening process to determine or track found biases after the initial hiring process. Additionally, there is no consistent test that demonstrates any progress a trainee has made in their development of these skill sets, as it pertains to racial profiling and bias. DAG Elliott informed Member Greene that such tracking is something the Board has expressed interest in and believes it would be helpful.

Member Greene commented that he has seen a lot of officers get in trouble for bias, and often training is scrutinized. Member Greene would be interested to see what people are bringing from their background, as there may be instances where scrutiny might better placed on an individual and the background-check process rather than POST or the department.

DAG Leon noted that, during the AB 443 Workshop, one of the five groups with SMEs was tasked with trying to bolster the process of conducting background investigations to ensure that applicants who already problematic possess biases are not hired. DAG Leon explained that, based on POST's discussion with the Subcommittee earlier on SB 2, as well as the relationship between SB 2 and AB 443, it was possible that POST is thinking about this more intentionally.

Member Sierra requested links to be provided for the most current versions of the FTP Guide Volume 2 sections 6.3, 6.4, as well as the LD 3, and LD 42, and asked what will be occurring during year two of the FTP review.

DAG Leon stated that the purpose of Year 1 of the FTP review is to develop an understanding what is happening with the FTP, which is why POST's presentation on the FTP program was so important. From there, with the help of the Board's experts, DOJ staff and the Board will conduct observations of field trainings to better understand the different handlings of FTP across departments, the best practices LEAs are using, and provide that transparency to the Board and readers of the RIPA Report. Year 2 will serve as a reflection on the findings of year one, such as identifying areas that need improvement and best practices based on other agencies, both inside and outside of California. Member Sierra acknowledged DAG Leon's response, summarizing that the bulk of the Board's recommendations might be in year two.

SSM Aisha Martin Walton further elaborated stating that in Year 1, the Board will be given detailed information pertaining to the FTP and will be provided assistance in understanding what all the parts are. SSM Martin Walton explained that the Subcommittee would be asked to review

the framework of the statute as a roadmap from the standpoint of what are the requirements or the components that the legislature recommended that each of these courses contain.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked DOJ whether there was a method of ensuring or recommending that POST training material include a robust discussion of the fact that RIPA data is not individualized data that is shared with anyone, but only shared in the aggregate, and if there was, how this could be accomplished. DAG Elliott responded this could be addressed. DOJ will note the recommendation and include it in their conversations with POST and in DOJ's recommendations.

Co-Chair Kulkarni informed the Subcommittee members that when this fact was cleared up for those trainers, the dynamic between RIPA and the Board improved significantly. Co-Chair Kulkarni further explained that this misconception limits not only the Board's relationship with officers, but the desire to adhere to the RIPA requirements. Her hope was that when instructors understood how data was actually managed, they could then communicate that to individuals they train.

Member Sierra noted that it would be helpful for the Subcommittee to understand the best place to disseminate this information, either in Academy, or in the FTP, or at another point. Member Sierra explained that overall, the Subcommittee needed to understand the most effective avenue for this information. Co-Chair Kulkarni agreed with Member Sierra's recommendation. Co-Chair Kulkarni asked DOJ to look into what POST regulatory action to mandate 100% law enforcement agency participation would look like and stated that she would advocate for such an action.

DAG Danielle Elliott noted that it would be worth having continued conversations with the POST team members about what sorts of recommendations would be helpful to POST, and what sorts of remedies POST would be interested in. One of the goals DOJ and the Board have this year is to bring POST into those conversations earlier with respect to recommendations, and collaborate with POST on proposed recommendations.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked what outside vendors are allowed to participate in the trainings of law enforcement officers relating to racial bias and racial profiling. In her understanding, it is only limited to one agency, and there is no process for who can apply or assessment as to whether those officers are competent to provide training in this area. Member Kulkarni related that such a process is faulty, especially given that there are so many organizations that are true experts in this field. Co-Chair Kulkarni explained that she would be interested in making a recommendation to open up processes so that many entities can avail themselves of the contracting and be a positive force for POST.

DAG Elliott stated that she believed Co-Chair Kulkarni's understanding is correct, but would confirm with POST. DAG Elliott further explained that, in the 2025 RIPA Report, the Board did recommend that the Legislature expand the organizations that can provide this training. However, DAG Elliott is not aware of any action taken on this recommendation. Co-Chair Kulkarni noted that Subcommittee members could do some offline work to ensure members of the Legislature are aware of the recommendation.

Member Greene asked if DOJ could further investigate why 20-25% of law enforcement agencies are not using the POST curriculum. Member Greene expressed concern about mandating training for departments that lack the financial resources as doing so could impose hardships. DAG Elliott responded that DOJ will look into it. Co-Chair Kulkarni echoed Member Greene's request, adding that when she had asked a similar question to Mr. Crawford, she did not seem to get an answer.

Member Angela Sierra added that it would be interesting to find out the size of the departments that had not adopted the POST curriculum as it could be associated among small departments. She recommended inviting POST to the next Subcommittee meeting to see what is already known as well as what still needs to be discovered about these departments.

Member Greene noted that it is difficult to quickly establish an FTP along with the other training logistics. Additionally, Greene noted that not every CHP office receives new officers from the academy. Given the staff, scheduling, and travel required to operate an FTP, rural police departments could face hardships.

Co-Chair Kulkarni mentioned that she had the opposite assumption to Member Greene's, thinking larger departments would have their own version of the FTP since they have so many officers. Co-Chair Kulkarni echoed Member Sierra's view that collecting characteristic information of departments that do and do not use POST curriculum would be helpful. Co-Chair Kulkarni asked Member Greene if he had any information regarding costs associated for using POST curriculum.

Member Greene stated that simply sending officers to the field officer training can be a cost in its own. Departments have to pay for board and per diem for their new hires and all other departmental personnel needed for FTP over the course of 5 days, which can become rather expensive.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked Member Greene and moved to the next agenda item.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Karen S. Glover commented that POST's LD 42 Activity 5—the "island scenario," to discuss implicit and explicit bias—should be changed. She recommended either adding other types of scenarios or moving away from the desert-island scenario to make the discussion more based in reality, given that these are real everyday engagements. Ms. Glover encouraged trying a "hoodie scenario" or reviewing Eduardo Bonia Silva's book *Racism Without Racists*, which goes into coded language. Ms. Glover also commented that she was surprised no Subcommittee members pointed out to Mr. Crawford the real pattern of racial and other kind of profiling that has been going on. Ms. Glover was disappointed to hear Mr. Crawford say that he does not hear a lot about race, especially given his important role in POST. She was also disappointed that no Subcommittee members commented on his statement.

Michele Wittig commented that she has noted the definition of biased conduct as "any behavior motivated by bias based on a target's individual characteristics or group membership" and stated that she is appreciative of the work that has gone into that. She then offered a couple of

considerations for assessing conduct. First, agencies could assess the officer's behavior at the time that the assessment is being made. The officer's use of a verbal slur would be one relatively "easy" example. Ms. Wittig explained that agencies should also consider the circumstances surrounding the assessment—for example, the presence or absence of a suspect description, or evidence of a pattern or practice that is unexplained but has a strong racial disparity. Second, agencies could assess its own policies that allow pretext or investigatory stops. Ms. Wittig related that she has heard officers state that they employ pretext stops because it helps them to find "hidden criminals," and officers often use the example of Timothy McVey to demonstrate the usefulness of pretext stops. Ms. Wittig noted that this kind of justification for pretext stops are a circumstance under which a lot of biased conduct occurs, but does not take into account the cost in terms of distrust from the community and decreased perception of police legitimacy. Ms. Wittig specified that her comment is to encourage the Board to take a stronger advocacy role in convincing law enforcement agencies to curtail their pretextual or investigatory stops, at least for those that are non-safety related infractions.

9. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked DOJ staff for an overview of the RIPA Board's meeting schedule, as well as what Subcommittee members should expect in terms of the development of the 2026 RIPA Report.

DAG Manners stated that the Policies subcommittee meeting will take place May 22, 2025 from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., the Stop Data subcommittee meeting will take place on May 27, 2025 from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., and the Accountability and Complaints subcommittee meeting will also take place on May 27, 2025 from 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. The next meeting of the full RIPA Board will take place on July 11, 2025, from 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

DAG Manners informed the Subcommittee that DOJ will schedule the third round of subcommittee meetings after the July 11 Board Meeting. This third round will be the final round of subcommittee meetings for the year, followed by the third and fourth full Board Meetings, which will wrap up and finalize the publication of the report.

DOJ will also be revising the draft outline that was provided to the Subcommittee for this meeting, incorporating the feedback and the discussion that took place during the meeting. DAG Manners explained that DOJ would work to have a revised version of the draft to all Subcommittee members in advance of the full Board meeting, then to continue develop the Report so that the Subcommittee has a close-to-final version for the third subcommittee meeting, which will likely be in August or September.

10. ADJOURN

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