

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 8, 2025, 11:33 a.m. – 1:02 p.m.

Subcommittee Members Present: Co-Chairs Manjusha Kulkarni and Ronaldo Villeda, and Members Angela Sierra, Darren Greene, Kevin Mensen, and Wade Forde

Subcommittee Members Absent: Members Rich Randolph and Lawanda Hawkins

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.

3. APPROVAL OF MAY 21, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

Member Greene made a motion to adopt the minutes from the May 21, 2025 Subcommittee meeting as presented, and Member Sierra seconded. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson assisted with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Members Greene, Mensen, Sierra, and Co-Chair Kulkarni
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:**

With four Ayes, the meeting minutes were approved as presented.

4. UPDATES BY BOARD MEMBER SIERRA

Member Sierra provided an update of the Subcommittee's continued work with the Peace Officer Standards and Trainings (POST) Commission. Member Sierra reported that the Subcommittee is continuing to build its relationship with POST as part of its mission to review trainings and provide recommendations that impact racial identity profiling. In the last 12 months, the Board and POST have made a concerted effort to increase communications and work together to be more effective as a team and have a strong partnership.

Member Sierra informed the Subcommittee that, tomorrow, she and Board Co-Chair Guerrero will be presenting at the POST Commission's public meeting in Huntington Beach. At that meeting, the Co-Chairs Sierra and Guerrero will appear before the POST Commission to answer any questions on general issues related to RIPA, in the hope that the Board will be invited again to answer any questions before POST takes any action on the forthcoming RIPA Report. At tomorrow's POST Commission meeting, she and Co-Chair Guerrero will provide an overview of the RIPA statute and the Board's mission, report out on key findings in previous RIPA Reports,

and discuss updates on the work the RIPA Board is doing this year. Member Sierra closed her report by inviting questions from the Subcommittee.

Co-Chair Kulkarni opened the floor to the Subcommittee members for questions. Co-Chair Villeda asked to confirm that the presentation would be a general overview and reminder to the POST Commission of the statute and where we're at in our working relationship and collaboration. Member Sierra confirmed and added that there would also be an update on the topics the Board has been working on this year, as well as an opportunity to answer any questions from the POST Commission.

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

5. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAG Simpson reported that the Subcommittee is currently undergoing a two-year project to review the POST Field Training Program (FTP). To assist with the Subcommittee's review, he introduced DOJ consultants Dr. Rebecca Hetey and Chief Daniel Hahn to present on the topic. Chief Hahn is a subject matter expert with a cumulative 45 years of experience in law enforcement, with 11 years as the police chief in Sacramento and Roseville. Chief Hahn has continued his work teaching implicit bias and history around the country. Dr. Hetey is a Stanford trained behavioral scientist. She has spent the last 11 years working directly with law enforcement agencies in California on various research and training initiatives designed to improve police-community relations, reduce racial disparities, and to help make policing practices and policies more equitable and respectful. Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn are serving as subject matter experts for the DOJ to assist the RIPA Board in conducting a review of the FTP.

Dr. Hetey informed that once new officers graduate from basic academy, they are required to complete the FTP. As Stephen Crawford of POST reported at the previous Subcommittee meeting, the FTP can be considered part two of the academy. In the FTP, trainees are expected to harness the theoretical learnings of the academy and to apply them in the field over a minimum of 10 weeks or 400 hours. The Board has the authority under state law to review and analyze the training courses certified by POST for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of those trainings in eliminating racial and identity profiling by sworn officers. As such, the Subcommittee's scope of review will be limited to portions of the FTP that are related to RIPA and thus fall under the Board's legislative mandate.

Dr. Hetey summarized the purpose and requirements of the FTP, stating that the FTP must equip new officers to carry out the many facets of their jobs, including engaging respectfully and building trust with the diverse communities they are sworn to protect and serve. California Penal Code section 13519.3 reinforces this need by requiring that training and guidelines for all peace officers in the state "shall stress understanding and respect for racial identity and cultural differences and development of effective, non-combative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties in a diverse racial identity and cultural environment," and, "shall include adequate instruction on racial identity and cultural diversity in order to foster mutual respect and cooperation between law enforcement and members of all racial, identity, and cultural groups" in basic training.

Dr. Hetey stated that, in conducting this course review, a guiding question is: How is the FTP educating new officers across the state about what is expected of them under AB 953 and California Penal Code section 13519.4? To begin to answer this question, Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn began an initial gathering of information that will be presented by Chief Hahn.

Chief Hahn informed the Subcommittee that he and Dr. Hetey developed short summaries of Learning Domain (LD) 42 and LD 3, which are two of the primary materials covered in the basic academy directly related to racial and identity profiling. These summaries were created to assist the Subcommittee in their review of the FTP, as it relates to racial and identity profiling. Chief Hahn reminded the Subcommittee that the Board provided recommendations to LD 42 and LD 3 and the student workbook in the Board's 2022 and 2023 Reports.

In addition to these learning domains, Chief Hahn and Dr. Hetey conducted field interviews with law enforcement agencies and with POST to understand the current process of field training, including the information provided by POST materials and how this training is conducted in various law enforcement agencies. They interviewed small, medium, and large law enforcement agencies since POST provides the training programs for 503 law enforcement agencies across the state, from agencies that have a couple of officers to agencies that have thousands of officers.

Some of the materials reviewed by Chief Hahn and Dr. Hetey included:

- Assembly Bill (AB) 953
- Penal Code section 13519.4
- LD 42
- LD 3
- POST Field Training Guide, Volume I (Volume I)
- POST Field Training Program Guide, Volume II (Volume II) – Competency 6

Chief Hahn noted that LD 42 and LD 3 are quite lengthy, which is why he and Dr. Hetey created the summaries; however, Subcommittee members will also be provided with the full learning domains for review.

Next, Chief Hahn discussed how certain forms are used in the FTP. Field Training Officers (FTOs) complete the Daily Observation Report form every day, to document what they observed with the trainee. There are standardized evaluation guidelines (often referred to as SEGs) in the appendix of the POST Field Training Guide – Volume 1, which include guidelines on what the FTO is supposed to review when reviewing the trainee's performance for that day. The Daily Observation Report form also includes narrative pages. For example, if an FTO gives the trainee a rating of one representing "unacceptable" or a seven representing "superior", they must write a narrative explaining why they gave the trainee those extreme ratings. Chief Hahn noted that Section 6 (Relationships with Citizens/Community) of the Daily Observation Report is one of the sections that is identified in the guidelines as pertaining to racial and identity profiling.

Next, Chief Hahn discussed the Competency Six form. This form, which is found under Volume 2 of the program guide, is one of the other primary forms where a trainee's performance is evaluated. It is typically completed one time during the trainee's entire training, but may be

completed more than once. The form evaluates eighteen different sections, from officer safety to ethical standards, community relations, and professional demeanor. Section 6.4 of the form is related to racial and identity profiling. There is not a separate appendix with guidelines for this form; instead, the guidelines are listed in the form at the top of each rating category. The most important distinction between this form and the last is that the Competency Six form is filled out one time during the trainee's four-to-six-month training program, while the Daily Observation Report is filled out every day that the trainee worked. Agencies can also add information at the bottom of the Competency Requirements form, in parts A and B of Section 6, such as policy that is specific to the agency or other information.

Dr. Hetey reminded the Subcommittee that they have reviewed seven POST-certified courses to date. Their review of the FTP is a unique opportunity to review another consequential and formative part of a police officer's training. POST and individual law enforcement agencies recognize the FTP's importance. According to the POST FTP Guide, the FTP is "the most effective influence on the future direction of a department." Many of the Board's previous recommendations have aimed to create department-wide and broader cultural shifts. Field training is crucial piece of making such shifts. Additionally, POST has stated in its written response to the Board's recommendation that the FTP provides the most effective way to evaluate the trainee with respect to racial and identity profiling. As part of the FTP, FTOs have tremendous influence on shaping the behaviors of basic academy graduates. FTOs are uniquely positioned to practice racial and identity prevention because they educate officers when they first hit the streets. Members of the Board with a law enforcement background are encouraged to participate in the review of the FTP, as reviewing the FTP ensures that their lived experience and expertise is brought to the table. Dr. Hetey asked Board members to let the DOJ team know if they are interested in taking part in the review.

Dr. Hetey stated that, to help structure the review process, she and Chief Hahn developed a rubric to make the Board's course review of the FTP more systematic. The goal is for Board members to fill out the rubric and for that form to guide them as they review and make ratings of the various written materials, such as the Daily Observation Report and Competency Six, which Chief Hahn went over. Dr. Hetey presented a sample portion of the rubric and noted that the rubric contains multiple dimensions, including the adequacy of the training to aid compliance with Penal Code section 13519.4, continuity between the basic academy and the FTP, and the extent to which the training is outcome-based. Within each dimension, there are more specific rating tasks. The rubric also offers a chance for Board members to go deeper and identify what they think might be missing from the materials and highlight what they think is working well. The aim is to help the Board collect its thoughts, which will potentially become formal recommendations to POST and the Legislature. Dr. Hetey noted that today's presentation is meant as a high-level overview for Board members that are interested in participating in the FTP review, and there will be a chance to go into more detail about the rubric and the materials that will be reviewed in the future. She then encouraged the Subcommittee to ask questions.

Member Sierra thanked Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn for their presentation and asked whether the Subcommittee members participating in the FTP review will include a review of the notes from

the interviews conducted by Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn or a presentation from small, medium, and large law enforcement agencies about how they utilize the FTP forms. DAG Simpson responded that the Subcommittee's review will be directed to the materials provided by POST as being applicable to all law enforcement agencies. He explained that Dr. Hetey and Chief Hahn consulted with law enforcement agencies to understand the scope of how the training is conducted, as it applies to the materials the Subcommittee will be reviewing. The Subcommittee's review will be looking at the material that POST identified as being applicable to all law enforcement agencies. Member Sierra asked if Subcommittee members will have access to the DOJ consultants to answer questions they may have about the process (such as, how does the FTO provide input every day to the officer they are training), during their review. DAG Simpson affirmed that they would, and that DOJ could also talk to POST to get more information as needed.

Member Forde thanked the DOJ consultants for their presentation and for their explanation on the work performed so far. He asked what care is taken regarding FTOs as they become aware of their own unconscious biases, as unconscious biases can impact FTO evaluations of their trainees and inquired on how they were selected as evaluators. Chief Hahn shared that, like all officers, FTOs take the required racial identity profiling classes. However, unlike patrol positions that officers can sign up for, FTOs are specifically selected by their department for this position. While departments may have different processes for the selection of FTOs, they typically go through an interview process and, once they are selected for the FTO position, they take additional training to become evaluators.

Co-Chair Villeda also thanked the DOJ consultants for their work and asked where there may be gaps or opportunities for the Board to shift the culture since, while POST develops the curriculum, it is up to agencies to implement it. Co-Chair Villeda expressed a desire to ensure that the Board's recommendations do not detract from the effectiveness of the curriculum within the community. Since POST does not have a say in how the curriculum is implemented, Co-Chair Villeda asked the consultants what safeguards the Subcommittee could think about, so that their recommendations can create guardrails for FTOs on the ground. Dr. Hetey responded that culture certainly matters, and there is a tension in that POST provides guidelines but, for many things, there is no one-size-fits-all answer. However, POST has power in saying what the minimum requirements are. While departments can always go over and above that, one guard rail is that if the Board feels that a particular topic related to RIPA is of the utmost importance, that is a conversation to have with POST to include that topic in the POST materials. DAG Simpson reminded the Subcommittee that their recommendations are not limited to just POST and can be directed to law enforcement agencies through their RIPA report section.

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked how many law enforcement agencies use the POST field training, under what circumstances would an officer not go through the training, and, to the extent that not every agency uses the POST FTP materials, what the Board should do to ensure consistency, uniformity, and ensure the behaviors the Board is seeking. Chief Hahn stated that 503 agencies in California agencies use the POST FTP. Although there may be differences in how it is used, given that some agencies have three officers while others have a thousand, Chief Hahn stated

that he does not know of any agency that does not use the POST FTP materials. This doesn't mean there is not such an agency, however if an agency modifies their training or uses some other form, they must submit it to POST for approval so there is still oversight.

Member Forde asked the DOJ consultants how progress is tracked — is there a baseline evaluation and a way to see how the training has affected change and/or progress? Dr. Hetey asked what Member Forde meant by tracking progress of the trainee — does this mean from the beginning of the academy or from the beginning of the FTP? Member Forde asked whether there is a tool to manage or track the trainee's daily evaluations and progress in the Daily Observation Reports over time. Chief Hahn stated that the Daily Observation Report performance marks are submitted daily and tracked electronically. The trainee has to progress to the next phase of training, meaning that they have to get at least acceptable marks on everything. If they don't, the trainee will get remedial materials, they might be in a phase longer than normal, or they might have to do extra written material. It just depends on what it is they're not meeting standards on. Chief Hahn noted that, as a general rule, at the beginning of the FTP when a trainee is right out of the academy, they get low marks in just about everything because they haven't got the experience yet, so their marks should go up as they go through training. Their progress is tracked because they can't move to the next phase until everything is checked off and acceptable.

Co-Chair Villeda asked to confirm that there is no pre-assessment or post-assessment to see the progress made; there are just the Daily Observation Reports and requirement that trainees meet certain criteria to pass the threshold. If a trainee does not meet the criteria, they are sent to a remedial class or get stuck in a phase until they pass that section of the assessment and move on. Chief Hahn responded that if a trainee does not go to the next phase, they get released. Trainees only have a certain amount of time to be at the acceptable level. Many departments also use a written test at each phase to test in a written form the trainee's knowledge. Trainees have to pass that test to go to the next phase. Dr. Hetey noted that Co-Chair Villeda hit on something important, which is that you have to measure what matters. You can't track progress on something you don't collect in the first place, so Board members should pour over what is and is not in the forms.

Member Forde asked the consultants for a presentation on the amount of trainees that fail out of the FTP. Assuming there is a high level of investment put into each officer's training process, by the time they get to the Daily Observation Report process, there has already been a lot of time and taxpayer money put into the process of preparing them for the community. Given that, do trainees fail out of the FTP? Does the trajectory of the Daily Observation Reports ever go in way that there's just no redeeming a trainee? Chief Hahn stated that people fall out at every portion of the training process, from background checks to the academy and to the FTP. People do fail out, and they fail out for different things. If somebody fails out because they were not able to grasp things that are unique to a police officer, but they are great employees, then a department might find another position for that person like a community service officer or a professional staff position. Or, a trainee could also fail out for other reason, for example they might not be a great employee anywhere. Trainees fail out at all portions of the process.

Hearing no additional questions or comments, Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked the DOJ consultants and moved to the next agenda item.

6. BOARD DISCUSSION OF POST SECTION OF THE DRAFT 2026 REPORT

Co-Chair Kulkarni asked DOJ staff to begin by providing an overview of what is covered in the draft POST chapter of the 2026 Report. DAG Simpson stated that the second draft of the POST chapter of the Report is included with the materials for this meeting. The draft is hopefully close to final and includes several sections, which will be discussed by DAG Marisol Leon.

DAG Leon stated that the POST chapter of the Report is split into different sections. The first section will review prior recommendations that the Board made in the 2025 Report and POST's response to those recommendations. The second section will provide an overview of the Board's participation in two workshops conducted in 2024 and 2025. The third section of the Report talks about the two-year review of the Field Training Program (FTP) that was discussed by the consultants earlier today.

Regarding the second section of the Report, DAG Leon noted that RIPA Board members and DOJ staff participated in the AB 953 workshop on POST's Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling in 2024, and, earlier this year, in the AB 443 workshop to develop of a definition of biased conduct that would then be used in hiring practices and whenever IA complaints allege racial profiling or biased conduct. As discussed in the Report, these workshops are important first steps to effective training on the law's prohibition of racial and identity profiling.

DAG Leon presented a portion of the first section of the draft, noting that the draft highlights the Board's recommendation and POST's response. DAG Leon stated that DOJ recently learned that the POST Commission will be voting tomorrow, at their next meeting, on approving the guidelines recommended by the Board to apply to all courses that impact the AB 953 mandate.

DAG Leon explained that the second section of the draft discusses the guidelines the POST Commission will be voting on tomorrow. The draft also includes a couple of sections related to questions that the RIPA Board has raised consistently over the years, including how POST measures the effectiveness of its trainings. While the RIPA Board understands that POST does not hire specific peace officers, which makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the trainings, the draft includes some suggestions for guidance that POST could issue to various law enforcement agencies to measure the effectiveness of courses using behavioral and performance metrics, such as:

- Administering pre- and post-course assessments to evaluate individual officers' understanding of relevant laws, implicit bias, and procedural justice before and after a course;
- Administering attitude surveys to measure changes in attitudes toward race, identity profiling, and bias before and after the courses;
- Having newly assigned officers respond to hypothetical policing scenarios in training that reveal bias awareness or decision-making;

- Engaging in body camera footage analysis by reviewing random samples of interactions that showcase respectful language, tone, and de-escalation practices; and
- Monitor for shifts in the number and nature of citizen complaints relate to racial profiling and biased policing.

DAG Leon noted that all of these suggestions come from scholarship and studies, which show that these methods have been used in the past to assess the effectiveness of trainings.

Further, DAG Leon noted that the draft includes a section called, “Guidance to Support Law Enforcement Agencies,” which highlights the fact that POST does have the ability to issue guidance to different law enforcement agencies, in the same way that the DOJ’s Division of Law Enforcement issues law enforcement bulletins to agencies throughout the state. The draft provides suggestions to POST on guidance it could issue to law enforcement agencies, such as:

- Encouraging law enforcement agencies to engage in rigorous trainer selection and vetting to ensure that facilitators have cultural competency, subject matter expertise, and credibility with newly assigned officers;
- Issuing guidance to ensure that instructors are trained in-adult learning theory and are capable of facilitating dialogue on race identity and trauma-informed approaches;
- Issuing guidance on how to evaluate facilitators through anonymous participant feedback and periodic peer observation;
- How to normalize accountability by establishing clear expectations for behavior aligned with racial and identity profiling trainings; and
- Communicating consequences for violations.

DAG Leon noted that these are just some of the potential topics that POST could issue guidance on, and this is a way to address concerns that the RIPA Board has vocalized in the past regarding ensuring that POST measures the effectiveness of these trainings and providing law enforcement agencies with suggestions and potential tools to do so.

Regarding the draft section on the AB 443 workshop, DAG Leon noted that a couple of Board members and DOJ staff participated in the workshop earlier this year, in March. The purpose of this workshop was to develop a definition of biased conduct that would be used during pre-employment background investigations and any investigation related to a bias-related complaint or incident that is filed with the agency. At the workshop, a group of fifteen subject matter experts developed a particular definition of biased conduct, which is italicized in the draft. On June 4, 2025, the POST Commission decided to vote on two potential definitions: One that strictly followed the statutory framework, and another which more closely followed the definition developed by the subject matter experts at the AB 443 workshop. Ultimately, the POST Commission decided to adopt the definition that more closely followed the statutory language. The Report notes the limited discussion POST engaged in regarding why it picked that option over the option proposed by the subject matter experts. The POST Commission’s decision was based on adding the word “inaction” and “off duty.” It included concerns related to the fact that law enforcement does not always have a duty to act and, without adding that context, adding the word “inaction” to the definition of biased conduct could potentially lead to mislabeling

inaction and linking it to bias. The draft Report notes that, while the Board is disappointed to learn that POST did not adopt the definition developed by its subject matter experts, the Board is hopeful that the revamped pre-employment background investigations involving bias assessments will help law enforcement demonstrate due diligence in preventing biased conduct and will help with consistency and transparency in internal affairs investigations involving allegations of biased conduct.

Lastly, DAG Leon provided an overview of the third section of the draft, which covers the Board's review of the FTP. The draft begins with an overview of the FTP and the FTP materials discussed by the consultants today. The draft also discusses the role of the field training officer (FTO); the FTO supervisor, administrator and coordinator; and some of the research that was conducted this year. The draft then provides an overview of the second year of the Board's review of the FTP, wherein the DOJ consultants and Board will look at what values the FTP teaches and whether they align with AB 953; how well the FTP materials cover potential for bias and racial and identity profiling; and how well the FTP materials and training align with academy training, LD 3 (Principled Policing in the Community), and LD 42 (Cultural Diversity Discrimination).

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked DAG Leon for her presentation and opened the floor to Subcommittee for questions, comments, and feedback.

Member Sierra thanked DAG Leon for the roadmap of the work the Board has done and where they are going. Regarding the draft section providing suggestions to assist local law enforcement agencies in measuring the effectiveness of their employees once they have completed training, Member Sierra noted that, to the extent some of those suggestions may be mirroring activities that POST is doing already, those things should be incorporated or cross-referenced in the draft. Member Sierra also stated that this is a great area to continue to explore with POST in coming years, as it is a challenging issue.

Co-Chair Kulkarni shared that a number of Board members were at the October or November POST training, and there was quite a bit of confusion, even among training staff, about RIPA, the anonymity of the data, and the fact that the data is provided to the Board in the aggregate. There seemed to be a general belief that the RIPA Board gets information about each and every officer, each and every stop, and each and every report that is made. Co-Chair Kulkarni wondered if there is some opportunity in this report or the next to find a way for POST to convey accurate information about RIPA, given this broad misconception.

Co-Chair Kulkarni also noted that, at the last RIPA Board meeting, many Board members had questions and concerns about the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) raids in Los Angeles and expressed a desire for this year's Report to include something about the raids and their impacts on immigrant communities, the workforce, and other things. Co-Chair Kulkarni expressed interest in discussing, in this year's Report or next, what information POST needs to convey regarding cooperation with ICE. There are a number of ICE activities that have been reported by mainstream media, as well as many anecdotes shared about how things like accents, skin color, and other things may indicate bias are being used regularly by ICE agents in

abducting individuals from our communities. If the Board is trying to get at race and identity bias, it would be important to remind officers through trainings that cooperation, largely through statute, is not allowed and include separate information about what ICE is doing and the impact on communities in California.

Member Sierra responded that, since there is Board meeting coming up devoted to the issue of immigration, the Subcommittee should table discussion of where they will be addressing this issue (for example, it may be a standalone section in the beginning of the Report). The Board may decide at the upcoming meeting how they want to address this. Member Sierra also acknowledged that this is a very important point — it is about the California Values Act and the California mandate around the limitations on cooperation. However, since there will be a full Board meeting regarding the issue, Member Sierra suggested tabling the issue of where to incorporate the topic of immigration into the 2026 Report as a whole and whether it should be incorporated into individual sections or at the beginning of the Report.

Co-Chair Kulkarni agreed and recommended having a standalone section to raise some of these issues.

Co-Chair Villeda thanked the DOJ and consultants for their work on the draft report section. He expressed some concern about FTOs and FTP programming. For example, he has heard law enforcement officers in some of these spaces talk about how the FTO shapes and informs them on how they are going to survive within our communities and on the streets. Sometimes, the rhetoric conveyed to them is, “Forget everything you just learned because it’s going to get you killed. I’m going to teach you how to survive in these streets, in this community, or how to approach these problems in these situations.” This can undo a lot of the work that has been done in the academy, leading up to them becoming law enforcement officers in our community. Understanding that the culture is really shaped within that environment, since young cadets coming out of the academy want to fit into their department and not be excluded or be outliers, it could quickly turn into someone falling into line then becoming complicit and learning both implicit and explicit biases.

Co-Chair Villeda also stated that, while POST has limitations in their authority, and that it can be difficult to come together to craft language (for example, people can disagree on a word, its general meaning or implication, or how it’s implemented), the Board has spent hours deliberating and finalizing language that ultimately doesn’t get picked up by the POST Commission or isn’t used in its entirety. Understanding that the Board itself has some limitations and obstacles to overcome, Co-Chair Villeda expressed a desire to work with the DOJ consultants to build more evaluation tools to give to POST that can be made available to agencies. On top of the fact that POST sets the minimum standards for selecting and training FTOs, how can the Board urge POST and agencies to not only meet that minimum, but exceed it? The Board has to put more effort into ensuring that the people chosen as FTOs are reinforcing, and not undermining, what is being taught within the academy.

Further, Co-Chair Villeda called for structured community feedback loops. He expressed appreciation for POST bringing in subject matter experts to the last in-person meeting, however from what he has read, it was largely law enforcement and wasn't really community-based.

Lastly, Co-Chair Villeda asked DOJ to give a brief reminder somewhere in the Report, explaining how many recommendations the Board issued, how many were not applicable, how many were out of their scope, how many went forward, and what happened with the recommendations, as it is important to document all of the recommendations the Board has put forth over the years and the actual outcome.

Member Mensen acknowledged that Co-Chair Villeda brought up some good points regarding the FTP. Member Mensen affirmed that when he went through the FTP, officers were taught when they got in the car on the first day, "Forget everything you learned in the police academy because I'm going to teach you how it's done." Now, a significant amount of modules have been added to the FTP, and it has become a lot more structured than it was in the past. The FTO is a critical role because if that person has issues such as biases, those can easily be passed down to the trainee. At Chief Mensen's agency, the selection of FTOs is one of the biggest processes they go through, and they are selected for a wide range of things from their technical skill to their interaction with the community. Chief Mensen stated that the selection of an FTO is a very big decision because they pick who will be training their officers for years to come.

DAG Leon responded to Co-Chair Villeda's concern about the impact the FTP can have on the culture of law enforcement agencies, and explained this is something the consultants are looking at for the second year of review. The consultants are doing research not just on other U.S. models, but even potentially looking at international models to see what practices could inform the Board's potential recommendations and best practices next year. DAG Leon also thanked Co-Chair Villeda for raising the topic of feedback loops because it is a concern that has come up in the past with other workshops Board members have been invited to. The lack of community input is real and felt, and this is something we wanted to raise in this chapter.

In terms of recommendations the Board has made in the past, DAG Leon recognized that sometimes it's difficult to keep track of what the RIPA Board previously recommended and asked whether this is something the Subcommittee would like to have access to, but not necessarily be part of the RIPA Report. Co-Chair Villeda stated that this is more of a transparency issue—he would want the general public to see what the Board has been doing over the years and what is transpiring with their recommendations. However, it would also be great to have this information as a reference.

Co-Chair Kulkarni expressed that her preference would be to keep this information as an internal tracking document. The tracking is most helpful for the Board to know what they want to recommend in the future. There are other ways that the Board seeks accountability and cooperation, such as when the RIPA Board co-chairs go to POST meetings. Co-Chair Kulkarni expressed a desire to not impede those efforts and stated that finding a happy medium would be ideal.

Member Sierra stated that it makes sense to look at this information internally and noted that last year's Report gave a pretty full discussion of a couple of years' recommendations and which were implemented. People can look at the previous years' reports to see what recommendations were made, but having an internal document with all of this information together does help the Board think about where to go from here, their vision for the next report, and issues they may want to further explore. Additionally, there is public transparency in that the Board issues a report on what they do.

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

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Kulkarni opened the floor for public comment. Seeing no public comment, Co-Chair Kulkarni moved to the next agenda item.

8. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

DAG Simpson informed the Subcommittee that the full RIPA Board will have its discussion on immigration enforcement activities at its next meeting scheduled on Thursday, October 9, 2025 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. More information about this meeting, including the agenda, is available on the RIPA website.

Co-Chair Kulkarni requested copies of the draft course guideline that will be presented at the tomorrow's POST Commission meeting. DAG Simpson stated that DOJ will provide that to Subcommittee members after this meeting.

9. ADJOURN

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