

2027 RIPA REPORT
POST SECTION DRAFT

I. INTRODUCTION

In enacting the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA), the Legislature acknowledged that individuals who are “stopped, searched, interrogated and subjected to a property seizure by a peace officer for no reason other than the color of their skin, national origin, religion, gender identity or expression, housing status, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability are the victims of discriminatory practices.”¹ To address this concern, the Legislature expressly prohibited racial and identity profiling by law enforcement.² In doing so, the Legislature emphasized the importance of ongoing training, accountability, and institutional reform, recognizing that “additional training is required to address the pernicious practice of racial or identity profiling” and mandating that every peace officer in California participate in expanded training prescribed and certified by the Commission on the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).³

To carry out these objectives, the Legislature directed POST to develop and disseminate training and guidelines to address racial and identity profiling and required POST to consult with the RIPA Board (Board).⁴ In turn, it directed the Board to review POST’s law enforcement training materials relevant to the Board’s mandate of eliminating racial and identity profiling by California law enforcement agencies.⁵ Since RIPA’s enactment, the Board has reviewed eight POST courses. This year, the Board completed its review of Section 6 of the Field Training Program and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines.

A. Field Training Program (FTP) and AB 953 Course Guidelines Reviews

Consistent with its statutory mandate, the RIPA Board has continued to review POST courses that POST has identified as relating to racial and identity profiling. Over the past two years, the Board has focused its attention on the POST Field Training Program (“FTP”) and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines. The Board’s review of the FTP was limited to Section 6, entitled *Community Relations/Professional Demeanor* (“Section 6”). POST identified Section 6 as the portion of an officer’s training that is most directly related to issues of racial and identity profiling, community engagement, professionalism, cultural awareness, and procedural fairness. Although the Board will refer to its review throughout this chapter as the FTP Review, this is not intended to be an assessment of the FTP in its entirety, or an evaluation of how individual law enforcement agencies implement the FTP in practice.

The Board’s FTP review, and its review of the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines, are important components of the RIPA Board’s broader effort to ensure that California peace officers receive effective, evidence-based, and legally compliant training related to racial and identity profiling, procedural justice, cultural responsiveness, and community trust. Since RIPA took effect, the Board’s review process has created an important forum for ongoing engagement between the

¹ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (d)(4).

² Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (f) [peace officers “shall not engage in racial or identity profiling”].

³ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subds. (d)(5), (g).

⁴ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (a).

⁵ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (h).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Board, POST, community stakeholders, researchers, and law enforcement representatives regarding the quality, consistency, and effectiveness of RIPA-related law enforcement training throughout California.

The Board's reviews of the FTP and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines focused not only on whether required concepts are present within materials, but also on whether those concepts are sufficiently clear, comprehensive, and consistent with the law's prohibitions on racial and identity profiling. The Board also assessed whether these courses can be operationalized, and whether, as designed and implemented, they are capable of shaping observable officer behavior in the field.

B. Importance of RIPA-Related POST Training, Given the Statewide Increase in Immigration Enforcement Actions

The importance of POST offering rigorous, evidence-based training related to RIPA has become increasingly significant in light of the statewide increase in immigration enforcement actions within California communities. Recent public reporting, litigation, and community accounts have raised concerns regarding the use of racial profiling and broad, discretionary detentions by federal immigration enforcement agents, as well as concerns regarding the existence and adequacy of training for federal immigration enforcement personnel on implicit bias, de-escalation, procedural justice, community trust, and constitutional policing.⁶ These concerns underscore the importance of California maintaining robust statewide standards governing peace officer conduct for California law enforcement agencies and their community interactions, as well as the continuing importance of RIPA-related training designed to prevent racial and identity profiling, strengthen accountability, and ensure that peace officers in California understand both the legal prohibitions against discriminatory policing and the broader institutional harms such practices inflict on community trust.

II. RIPA BOARD'S WORK REGARDING POST DURING FIRST 10 YEARS

Consistent with the "Past/Present/Future" theme of this year's RIPA Report, the POST Subcommittee has outlined below some of its past recommendations to POST and to the California Legislature.

Nearly every year for the past decade, the Board has made recommendations to the POST Commission to better align the courses below with the Board's goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling.

⁶ For an in-depth discussion regarding these issues please see the Policies chapter of this Report at pgs. [REDACTED].
DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Table 1. POST Training Courses Reviewed by the RIPA Board

Name of Course	Course Type/Length	Year of RIPA Board Review
Basic Academy Learning Domain #3 Principled Policing in the Community	Academy – 26 hrs.	2022 Report
Basic Academy Learning Domain #42 Cultural Diversity and Discrimination	Academy – 16 hrs. * Museum of Tolerance (MOT) training required to facilitate this course	2023 Report
Principled Policing: Implicit Bias and Procedural Justice	In-Service Officers – 8 hrs.	2020 Report
Bias and Racial Profiling Video	In-Service Officers – 2 hrs. *MOT training required to facilitate this course	2021 Report
Beyond Bias Racial and Identity Profiling Online	Supervisors – 2 hrs.	2021 and 2022 Reports
PSP: Strategic Communications	In-Service Officers – 3 hrs.	2021 and 2022 Reports
MOT – Racial Profiling Train-the-Trainer	In-Service Officers – 24 hrs.	2024 Report
Racial and Identity Profiling Update	In-Service Officers -4 hrs. Optional Course	2025 Report
Field Training Program (FTP) Section 6: Community Relations/Professional Demeanor	Field Training Program	2026 Report and 2027 Report (forthcoming)

A. Recommendations for POST

While past RIPA Reports have focused on the individual courses reviewed and related recommendations for POST, the Board notes that there are several common themes and repeated recommendations to POST across its review of POST courses. The tenth RIPA Report offers an opportunity to take stock of recurring recommendations, examine patterns that have persisted over the past decade, and consider their implications for ongoing implementation, oversight, and future policy development.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Training & Curriculum Content

Across multiple years, the RIPA Board consistently emphasized that POST training must be evidence-based, research-driven, and embedded across all relevant courses and not limited to standalone modules, consistent with the requirements of the RIPA statute.⁷ Specifically, the Board has recommended that POST should:

- **Integrate bias science and research into its curricula (2018, 2019, 2021, 2023)**
POST training should include peer-reviewed research on implicit bias, empirical studies on discrimination, and accessible explanations of findings.
- **Embed RIPA content across all trainings (2018, 2019)**
RIPA principles should be woven into use of force, stops, searches, and broader policing instruction and should not be isolated.
- **Strengthen RIPA legal framing (2018, 2023)**
POST curricula should clearly define prohibited profiling behavior under California law and reinforce civil rights history, state and constitutional protections, and peace officer obligations.
- **Use real-world data and scenarios (2021, 2025)**
POST training should incorporate RIPA stop data trends and body-worn camera footage to ground training in real enforcement outcomes.
- **Improve instructional partnerships (2019, 2023)**
POST should develop RIPA training with academic institutions and external experts (e.g., policing research centers) to improve rigor and relevance.
- **Focus on reducing discretionary bias in policing (2019)**
POST should include strategies to limit unguided discretion in stops and enforcement decisions.

Accountability & Officer Responsibility

Over the past decade, the RIPA Board identified a major recurring theme: that training must translate into clear expectations, reporting obligations, and enforcement consequences for biased behavior. The Board has recommended that POST:

- **Define duty to intervene and report bias (2019, 2021, 2024)**
Officers must be trained to identify, report, and respond to discriminatory conduct by peers.
- **Strengthen supervision and peer accountability (2021, 2024)**
POST should provide courses on officer peer behavior, supervisor accountability and reporting, and responding to biased practices by fellow officers.
- **Emphasize discipline and consequences (2021, 2023, 2024, 2025)**
Training should explicitly connect biased policing to discipline, misconduct findings, and potential decertification (including SB 2-related consequences).

⁷ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (h) (POST training “shall be evidence-based and shall include and examine evidence-based patterns, practices, and protocols that make up racial or identity profiling, including implicit bias [and] shall prescribe evidence-based patterns, practices, and protocols that prevent racial or identity profiling”).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

- **Institutionalize accountability culture (2023, 2024)**
POST should make accountability a recurring element across all POST-certified courses.
- **Improve oversight and transparency in misconduct systems (2023, 2024)**
POST and law enforcement agencies should support independent oversight and ensure officers understand complaint, investigation, and discipline procedures.

Measurement of Effectiveness of Training Outcomes

The RIPA Board has repeatedly stressed that POST must move beyond facilitator check lists of course objectives and satisfaction surveys, and instead should develop meaningful performance-based evaluation systems. The Board’s recommendations support POST regulations requiring state testing to demonstrate competencies for all legislatively mandated programs.⁸ For example, the Board has recommended that POST:

- **Require pre/post and competency-based evaluations (2018, 2019)**
POST should measure knowledge gain, comprehension, and application of training concepts.
- **Assess behavioral and field impact (2019, 2024, 2025)**
POST should evaluate whether training changes officer behavior and improves community outcomes; assessment should not solely be based on course completion.
- **Use empirical data and RIPA stop data for evaluation (2021, 2023)**
POST should link training effectiveness to disparities observed in enforcement data reported by officers in the field.
- **Develop rigorous research partnerships and oversight structures (2023)**
POST should create academic review partnerships, processes, and data systems to evaluate long-term training impact.
- **Improve certification standards and testing rigor (2024, 2025)**
POST should ensure Learning Domains 3 and 42 and other core courses include meaningful testing and outcome evaluation.
- **Report training effectiveness data (2023)**
POST should include transparency on delivery methods, participation, and outcomes.
- **Strengthen the link between RIPA-related Basic Academy and FTP materials (2023, 2024)**
POST should ensure that Basic Academy and FTP RIPA-related material aligns so that entry level officers receive comprehensive RIPA training and evaluation.

Community Engagement, Transparency, and Governance

A consistent recommendation during the past decade is that POST training design and certification processes must be more transparent and inclusive of community voices. To that end, the Board has recommended that POST:

- **Integrate community participation in training development (2018, 2021)**
Community members should help design and, where appropriate, participate in training delivery.

⁸ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 1081.

- **Increase transparency in POST curriculum processes (2023, 2024)**
POST should publish training guidelines, certification processes, and development pathways publicly.
- **Formalize community engagement structures (2023, 2024)**
POST should establish roles such as community engagement coordinators and structured review timelines for stakeholder input.
- **Broaden stakeholder representation (2022, 2023, 2024)**
POST should expand POST Commission and advisory participation to include vulnerable communities, public members, and interdisciplinary experts.
- **Improve public-facing accountability mechanisms (2025)**
POST should ensure public understanding of complaint processes and reinforce how agencies communicate accountability systems.

B. Recommendations for the Legislature

[TABLE OR INFOGRAPHIC WITH RECOMMENDATIONS TO LEGISLATURE FORTHCOMING]

III. POST FTP REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This year, the Board concludes its two-year review of POST's Field Training Program (FTP) Section 6, entitled *Community Relations/Professional Demeanor* (Section 6). POST identified Section 6 as the portion of the FTP most directly related to issues of racial and identity profiling, community engagement, professionalism, cultural awareness, and procedural fairness. At the outset of the review process, the Board, California Department of Justice (DOJ) staff, and two DOJ consultants (one with expertise in law enforcement academic research, including the study of bias, and the other a former California law enforcement executive with 37 years of operational experience), identified a series of guiding questions intended to frame the FTP Review and ensure consistency across Board evaluators. As detailed in the 2026 Report, these guiding questions were:

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

Reviewers also examined whether the materials translate these concepts into observable officer behaviors and measurable performance expectations during field training.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Review Materials

The Board conducted its FTP Review using a comprehensive 381-page assembled by DOJ for the POST Subcommittee (the Section 6 Packet). It included the three core FTP components under review:

- (1) **Section 6 of the Field Training Program Manual, Volume II (Community Relations/Professional Demeanor):** As noted above, Section 6 addresses topics related to professionalism, communication, community relations, cultural diversity, racial profiling, community-oriented policing, and crime prevention.
- (2) **Standard Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs):** The SEGs establish the statewide performance standards and behavioral rating criteria used by Field Training Officers (FTOs) to evaluate trainees throughout the FTP process. The SEGs are intended to promote consistency in trainee evaluation by defining acceptable, unacceptable, and superior performance across multiple competency categories.
- (3) **Daily Observation Report (DOR) materials:** The DOR serves as the FTP's primary daily evaluation instrument and requires FTOs to document trainee performance, observations, and progress throughout field training. The DOR includes narrative sections, performance ratings, and behavioral assessment categories intended to capture both technical and interpersonal aspects of trainee performance.

In addition to these core materials, the Section 6 Packet also included several supplemental background documents intended solely for reference and contextual understanding. These materials included the text of Penal Code section 13519.4; POST's Learning Domain (LD) 3 and Learning Domain (LD) 42 Training and Testing Specifications and optional workbook materials from the Basic Academy; consultant-prepared summaries of LD 3 and LD 42;⁹ a consultant-prepared overview of the POST Basic Academy Course Instructional System; and excerpts from the 2026 RIPA Report discussing the FTP. These materials were intended to assist Board members in evaluating continuity, context, and alignment between Basic Academy instruction and field training. **See the Section 6 Packet at pg. _____.**

Prior to review, POST confirmed that the FTP Review materials provided to the Board were the most up-to-date and complete versions of the relevant FTP documents at the time of the Board's review.

Review Instructions

To support consistency and clarity throughout the FTP Review process, DOJ and the DOJ consultants worked collaboratively with POST to develop instructional guidance for Board members participating in the FTP review. The instructional guidance emphasized that the Board's review was narrowly focused on the three specific FTP components above: (1) Section 6; (2) the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs); and (3) the Daily Observation Report (DOR) materials.

⁹ POST previously explained that, while officer training and guidelines on racial and identity profiling are scattered across various LDs, LD 3 and LD 42 provide the theoretical foundation trainees are expected to build on and apply during field training under the supervision of Field Training Officers (FTOs). Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, *Annual Report (2025)* p. 122 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2025.pdf>> [as of XX, 2026].

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

The guidance further clarified that Board members were evaluating Section 6 specifically and not the FTP in its entirety. This meant they were not evaluating instructional pedagogy, teaching methods, or the quality of training delivery by individual law enforcement agencies. Rather, the Board's review was limited to the written materials themselves and focused on whether the content, evaluation standards, and documentation tools adequately addressed issues relevant to the Board's statutory mandate.¹⁰

The instructional materials also provided important context regarding the relationship between Section 6 and the POST Basic Academy. Specifically, Board members were advised that the LD 3 and LD 42 materials included in the Section 6 Packet were provided solely for reference and continuity purposes. The guidance explained that the LD 3 and LD 42 Training and Testing Specifications (TTS) constitute mandatory POST minimum training requirements for the Basic Academy, while the accompanying workbooks are optional supplemental materials that may be used by academies and instructors but are not themselves mandated by POST regulations. The inclusion of these materials in the Section 6 Packet was intended to assist Board members in assessing continuity between Basic Academy instruction and the FTP, rather than to evaluate the Basic Academy curriculum itself.

Review Rubric

To facilitate a structured and consistent review process, the DOJ consultants developed a rubric that Board members used to evaluate the FTP's Section 6 materials. The rubric was designed to operationalize the Board's statutory and policy concerns into measurable review criteria and was organized around four primary dimensions:

- (1) Compliance with the requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4, including the law's prohibition on racial and identity profiling;
- (2) Continuity of content between academy and field training;
- (3) Inclusion of core values such as procedural justice, equity, legitimacy, and respect; and
- (4) Outcome-based training capable of producing observable officer behaviors.

In developing the rubric, the consultants reviewed POST materials, relevant statutory requirements, prior RIPA reports, social science research, and best practices related to procedural justice, implicit bias, community trust, and police legitimacy. The consultants also spoke to POST and representatives from three law enforcement agencies to ensure the rubric was comprehensive and applicable to the course. The rubric was intended to provide a common framework for evaluating the written FTP materials while recognizing that the review did not assess how individual law enforcement agencies implement or supplement the FTP in practice.

See the FTP Review's Section 6 Rubric at pg. _____.

Board members used the rubric to guide and finalize their written feedback following completion of their independent review of the Section 6 Packet.

DOJ Consultants' Support

The DOJ consultants supported the Board's review of POST's FTP by analyzing the FTP materials, summarizing key findings, and identifying recommendations related to Section 6, the Daily Observation Report, and the Standard Evaluation Guidelines. The consultants' review focused on whether the written FTP materials appropriately prepare trainees to engage in

¹⁰ For more information about the guidance provided, please see the Appendix.

equitable, respectful, and effective policing practices in diverse communities, and was limited to the written POST FTP materials themselves. Consistent with the Board’s review, the consultants did not assess how individual law enforcement agencies implement the materials in practice.

In assessing the FTP, the consultants attended RIPA POST Subcommittee meetings, consulted with DOJ staff, and reviewed current research and best practices related to:

Term	Definition
Procedural Justice	Procedural justice is a policing philosophy that emphasizes treating people with respect, neutrality, transparency, voice, and trustworthiness during law enforcement encounters. ¹¹
Implicit Bias	Implicit bias refers to unconscious thoughts, attitudes, and associations that influence an individual’s perceptions, decisions, and actions without conscious awareness. ¹²
Police Legitimacy	Police legitimacy is the public perception that law enforcement exercises its authority fairly, lawfully, respectfully, and in a manner deserving of trust and voluntary cooperation. ¹³
Police-Community Relations	Police-community relations refer to the quality of the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve, characterized by mutual trust, cooperation, communication, legitimacy, and collaborative problem-solving. ¹⁴

¹¹ President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2015).

¹² Jennifer L. Eberhardt, *Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice That Shapes What We See, Think, and Do* (New York: Viking, 2019); Joshua Correll et al., “The Police Officer’s Dilemma: Using Ethnicity to Disambiguate Potentially Threatening Individuals,” (2002) 83 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1314; Joshua Correll et al., “Across the Thin Blue Line: Police Officers and Racial Bias in the Decision to Shoot,” (2007) 92 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1006; Rebecca C. Hetey, “Implicit Bias, the Power of Institutions, and How to Reduce Racial Disparities in Policing,” in Joseph Avery & Joel Cooper (eds.), *Bias in the Law: A Definitive Look at Racial Prejudice in the U.S. Criminal Justice System* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2020), pp. 37-66.

¹³ President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2015); Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *Law Enforcement Best Practices: Lessons Learned from the Field* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2019).

¹⁴ Nicholas P. Camp, “Institutional Interactions and Racial Inequality in Policing: How Everyday Encounters Bridge Individuals, Organizations, and Institutions,” (2023) *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*; MarYam G. Hamedani et al., “We Built This Culture (So We Can Change It): Seven Principles for Intentional Culture Change,” (2024) 79 *American Psychologist* 384; Rebecca C. Hetey et al., “When the Cruiser Lights Come On’: Using the Science of Bias & Culture to Combat Racial Disparities in Policing,” (2024) 153 *Daedalus* 123.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

DOJ's consultants also conducted outreach, including with POST leadership and with three law enforcement agencies serving small, medium, and large jurisdictions. The outreach process was intended to help the consultants understand how the FTP functions operationally and how Field Training Officers (FTOs) evaluate trainees on issues related to racial and identity profiling, community interaction, professionalism, and cultural responsiveness.

Together, the POST Subcommittee and consultants' analyses form the basis for the findings and recommendations contained in the following sections.

A. POST Subcommittee Members' FTP Review

Throughout their FTP Review, Board members focused not only on whether required topics were present, but whether they were clearly articulated, reinforced across training stages, and translated into observable behaviors.

General Observations Across All Dimensions

Across the four dimensions, several consistent themes emerged. Reviewing Board members identified strengths in the FTP's inclusion of professionalism, behavioral-based policing, community relations, and communication standards. Members also identified recurring challenges related to translating policy into practice, ensuring consistency across training stages, defining and measuring values-based behaviors, and strengthening explicit guidance related to cultural responsiveness, implicit bias, and procedural justice. Several members also emphasized the importance of ensuring that evaluation standards account for diverse community norms and avoid reliance on culturally narrow assumptions regarding communication styles or demeanor.

The DOJ consultants reached substantially similar conclusions. They found that Section 6 successfully establishes minimum statewide expectations regarding professionalism and community relations, but that it functions primarily as a checklist of competencies rather than a fully developed curriculum. Because the FTP relies heavily on the knowledge and experience of individual FTOs, the consultants concluded that additional written guidance is necessary to ensure consistent statewide instruction and evaluation regarding racial and identity profiling.

Dimension 1: Compliance with Penal Code section 13519.4

General Observations

Board members were mixed as to whether the FTP was compliant with statutory requirements as articulated in Penal Code section 13519.4. Several Board members noted that Section 6 addresses many of the core statutory requirements through provisions related to behavioral-based policing, racial profiling, cultural diversity, community history, and professional communication. At the same time, some Board members raised concerns about whether the materials provide sufficient depth on the topics of cultural diversity, community engagement, and operational guidance for effective field application, as required under Penal Code section 13519.4.

The DOJ consultants similarly noted that POST should provide "more guidance, direction, and explicit written instructions and content," particularly because the FTP establishes the minimum statewide standard and currently depends heavily upon individual FTO experience. They observed that, unlike mechanical policing skills, instruction regarding racial and identity profiling requires more — not less — explicit statewide guidance.

Instructional Clarity and Practical Application

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

A recurring theme in Board members' feedback was the distinction between stating legal requirements and operationalizing them in practice. Board members observed that the legal standards related to racial profiling and behavioral-based policing are identified throughout Section 6, particularly in Sections 6.4.01 and 6.4.02. However, guidance on how trainees should apply these standards during field encounters (including stop data collection, de-escalation, and culturally responsive interactions) was viewed by some members as underdeveloped or inconsistently articulated.

The DOJ consultants also identified a statutory drafting issue. They observed that Section 6 consistently refers to "racial profiling" rather than "racial and identity profiling," even though Penal Code section 13519.4 uses the broader statutory terminology. They recommend conforming the FTP language throughout Section 6 to the statute to ensure the curriculum fully encompasses protected identity characteristics.

Role of Field Training Officers (FTOs)

Board members expressed varying levels of confidence in FTO preparedness. Some Board members felt FTOs would be able to evaluate trainee understanding effectively, as the materials provide sufficient foundational concepts and evaluation prompts related to community culture and history. Other Board members questioned whether FTOs would have sufficient background knowledge, standardized guidance, or training to consistently assess trainee responses regarding racial and identity profiling, community culture, historical context, and implicit bias.

The DOJ consultants' outreach to POST and three representative agencies supported this concern. They found that FTOs generally rely upon their own experience when evaluating trainees on racial and identity profiling issues and receive no specific instruction regarding how to evaluate those competencies beyond the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines.

Key Gaps Identified

The reviewing Board members identified the following recurring gaps in the Section 6 materials: limited references to stop data collection requirements; insufficient emphasis on implicit bias and the harms of profiling; limited discussion of sexual orientation, gender identity, and hate crimes; and a lack of clear behavioral guidance regarding culturally responsive interactions across diverse communities.

Questions for POST

Board members requested clarification from POST regarding how FTOs are trained to evaluate cultural competency, whether stop data reporting obligations are addressed elsewhere in the FTP, and whether additional standardized tools or prompts are available to support consistent evaluation.

Dimension 2: Continuity of Content

General Observations

Board members assessed whether Section 6 builds on prior instruction from the Basic Academy, particularly Learning Domains 3 and 42. Overall, continuity was described as generally strong, but uneven in some topic areas.

The DOJ consultants likewise emphasized that the FTP represents the continuation of Basic Academy training rather than a separate instructional phase. They therefore evaluated whether Section 6 meaningfully carries forward academy instruction into observable field performance

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

and concluded that continuity should be strengthened through more explicit instructional content and evaluation standards.

Alignment with Prior Training

Some of the reviewing Board members identified clear connections between the Basic Academy and the FTP. Concepts introduced in LD 3 are reinforced in Section 6 through community policing, cultural awareness, communication, and problem-solving expectations. LD 42 content is reflected through discussions of racial profiling, behavioral-based policing, constitutional protections, and professional communication standards. However, other Board members observed potential disconnects where prior learning is not explicitly referenced or meaningfully expanded upon. Some members noted that certain concepts appear to be repeated without sufficient application, including implicit bias, community trust, and procedural fairness.

Progression of Learning

Board members noted evidence of skill progression through the transition from classroom instruction to field-based evaluation and scenario discussion. Members also noted missed opportunities to deepen earlier training through explicit cross-references to LD 3 and LD 42, more advanced scenario application, and clearer integration of evolving community demographics and historical context.

Key Gaps Identified

Board members identified gaps related to limited reinforcement of implicit bias instruction, inconsistent treatment of sexual orientation and gender identity topics, and insufficient integration of contemporary community engagement practices.

Questions for POST

Board members requested additional information from POST as to whether FTOs are directed to use LD 3 and LD 42 during evaluations and whether more explicit continuity mechanisms exist between academy training, field training, and continuing professional training.

Dimension 3: Inclusion of Core Values

General Observations

Board members examined whether Section 6 reflects and reinforces values such as equity, respect, procedural fairness, and trust-building. Overall, Board members characterized the inclusion of core values as present, but inconsistently operationalized.

Supporting these observations, the DOJ consultants emphasize that field training is where new officers become enculturated into policing practices and organizational norms. Because field training shapes how officers exercise authority in practice, they conclude that the FTP must communicate not only technical proficiency but also legitimacy, fairness, trust-building, and respectful treatment across diverse communities.

Representation of Values

Board members noted that core values are reinforced through sections addressing professional communication, community trust, procedural fairness, cultural awareness, and the prohibition against racial profiling. The importance of community legitimacy and respectful communication is reflected throughout Sections 6.2 through 6.4. At the same time, some reviewing Board members observed that the materials often describe values in broad or aspirational terms without clearly tying them to measurable behaviors or outcomes.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Opportunities for Practice and Evaluation

Board members identified opportunities for trainees to practice these values through field contacts, scenario discussions, community-oriented policing activities, and evaluation through the Daily Observation Report. However, several members noted limitations in how these behaviors are defined, documented, or consistently assessed by evaluators.

Clarity of Expectations

Board members emphasized the importance of making values-based expectations observable and measurable. Members noted that clear behavioral indicators exist for professionalism, communication, and noncombative interactions. That said, some Board members identified continuing ambiguity regarding how fairness, cultural responsiveness, respect, and appreciation of community history are evaluated in practice.

Key Gaps Identified

The reviewing Board members identified the following concerns: insufficient emphasis on the harms of profiling, limited discussion of implicit bias and otherizing, potential reliance on culturally narrow communication norms, and a lack of explicit behavioral examples tied to procedural justice and legitimacy-building.

Questions for POST

Board members requested additional clarification regarding how values-based competencies are calibrated across evaluators and whether stronger behavioral anchors or examples could be incorporated into the DOR and evaluation standards.

Dimension 4: Outcome-Based Training

General Observations

Board members evaluated whether Section 6 translates training concepts into measurable, observable behaviors. Overall, the extent to which the training is outcome-based was described as developing, with some strong behavioral expectations but inconsistent specificity.

The DOJ consultants similarly noted that the FTP should move beyond simply listing competencies and should provide FTOs with clearer behavioral indicators and evaluation guidance capable of producing consistent statewide outcomes.

Clarity of Behavioral Expectations

Board members observed that certain expectations are clearly defined as behaviors, including respectful communication, avoidance of derogatory language, de-escalation, and objective behavioral-based policing. Members also noted that other expectations remain abstract and may be difficult to evaluate consistently in practice, including cultural responsiveness, procedural fairness, rapport-building, and appreciation of implicit bias.

Use of Evaluation Tools (Daily Observation Report)

The Daily Observation Report (DOR) was a central focus of discussion. Reviewing Board members identified strengths in the DOR's ability to document professionalism, ethics, communication, and community interactions. Members also identified limitations related to subjective interpretation, lack of explicit references to diversity and procedural justice, and limited guidance for documenting culturally responsive behavior.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Assessment of Key Competencies

Board members specifically considered whether trainees are evaluated on their ability to use noncombative methods, foster mutual respect and cooperation, and avoid racial or identity profiling. Some Board members noted that these competencies are addressed indirectly through broader professionalism and communication standards, while others recommended more explicit performance indicators tied to racial and identity profiling prohibitions and community engagement.

Opportunities for Improvement

Board members suggested strengthening outcome-based training by defining more specific behavioral indicators related to de-escalation, procedural justice, implicit bias recognition, and culturally competent communication. Members also suggested incorporating additional evaluation methods, including community feedback, standardized evaluator calibration, and enhanced narrative documentation guidance.

Key Gaps Identified

Board members identified gaps related to inconsistent evaluator interpretation, limited specificity regarding behavioral outcomes, and insufficient incorporation of contemporary community engagement expectations.

Questions for POST

Board members requested clarification regarding how evaluator consistency is maintained across FTOs and whether POST intends to strengthen behavioral anchors, diversity-related performance standards, or documentation guidance in future revisions.

B. POST Subcommittee Follow-Up Dialogue About Section 6

After reviewing the Section 6 Packet and completing their individual rubrics, POST Subcommittee members had the opportunity to engage with one another during the June 10, 2026 POST Subcommittee meeting to discuss the FTP, specifically focusing on the Subcommittee's three guiding questions for their FTP Review.

Guiding Question #1: What values does the FTP teach and do those values align with the goals of AB 953?

POST Subcommittee members agreed that many values associated with AB 953 — such as professionalism, community engagement, procedural fairness, and bias-free policing — appear in Section 6. However, Subcommittee members expressed concern regarding whether those values are sufficiently operationalized through clear performance standards and evaluation criteria. The Subcommittee discussion highlighted the distinction between identifying values and teaching or measuring those values in practice. Members questioned whether concepts such as procedural justice, de-escalation, and bias-free policing are evaluated with enough specificity to ensure consistent statewide application.

POST Subcommittee members also discussed the degree to which evaluator discretion may affect implementation, particularly where written standards provide limited guidance regarding how such values should be demonstrated or assessed.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Guiding Question #2: How well do the FTP materials cover potential for bias and racial and identity profiling?

- a. *How do trainees learn about bias-reducing police tactics and community engagement?*
- b. *How are trainees evaluated on eliminating bias and engaging with community?*

POST Subcommittee members discussed whether the materials adequately prepare trainees to recognize and avoid racial and identity profiling. While members acknowledged that Section 6 includes discussion of behavioral-based policing and racial profiling, questions remained regarding the extent to which the materials address implicit bias, stop-data reporting obligations, procedural justice, and community trust-building. Members also discussed the important role of the FTO in reinforcing these concepts and expressed interest in understanding what additional materials, training, or evaluator tools are available to FTOs beyond the Section 6 materials reviewed by the Subcommittee.

Several Subcommittee members noted that understanding how concepts are implemented in practice would require reviewing FTO training materials, evaluator guidance, scenario-based resources, and other supporting materials referenced by POST.

Guiding Question #3: How well do FTP materials and training align with academy training in LD 3 Principled Policing in the Community and/or LD 42 Cultural Diversity/ Discrimination?

Subcommittee members generally agreed that many concepts introduced in LD 3 and LD 42 are reflected in Section 6 of the FTP. However, their discussion focused on whether the FTP materials sufficiently reinforce and operationalized Basic Academy concepts related to procedural justice, implicit bias, cultural responsiveness, community trust, and bias-free policing. Some members noted that continuity could be strengthened by more explicit connections between Basic Academy instruction and FTP evaluation standards, particularly where Basic Academy materials contain more detailed discussions of these concepts than are currently reflected in Section 6.

C. POST's Response to FTP Review Questions

Following their review, the Board asked POST to respond to the questions and points of clarification it had regarding Section 6 as described above, and POST answered the Board's questions regarding section 6 in a written response. POST Subcommittee members discussed POST's written response during the June 10, 2026 POST Subcommittee Meeting. **See the POST Written Responses at pg. _____.**

The discussion focused on the questions the Board had regarding the role of the FTOs in evaluating trainees, how stop-data requirements are taught and implemented in practice, and the extent to which AB 953-related concepts are reinforced and standardized throughout field training. In its response, POST explained that FTOs receive instruction regarding procedural justice, implicit and explicit bias, cultural awareness, protected classes, and the requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4. POST further explained that FTOs practice evaluating these concepts through scenario-based exercises and role-playing activities that require them to assess trainee interactions with diverse communities, identify potential bias-related performance issues, and provide coaching and remediation.

POST further explained that FTOs are trained to evaluate whether trainees:

- Use respectful language and demeanor across demographic groups;

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

- Apply laws, policies, and discretion consistently regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or immigration status; and
- Understand how their actions may be perceived by community members from different backgrounds.

POST also stated that agencies may evaluate these issues through DOR dimensions, such as Community Relations, Ethics/Professionalism, Investigative Skills, and Officer Safety.

POST Subcommittee members expressed interest in learning more about the training FTOs receive, including how they are prepared to evaluate concepts such as procedural justice, cultural responsiveness, community engagement, implicit bias, and bias-free policing. Subcommittee members also discussed whether additional FTO evaluator resources or standardized evaluation tools exist beyond the Section 6 materials they reviewed.

Subcommittee members also sought clarification regarding stop-data reporting and related RIPA requirements. Members wondered how FTOs evaluate trainees' understanding of stop-data collection and reporting obligations during field training. Although reviewers observed limited references to stop-data collection requirements within Section 6 itself, POST's written responses explained that stop-data training and evaluation may occur through policy/legal instruction, practical patrol activities, DOR documentation categories, training checklists, and scenario-based assessments.

In its response, POST noted that stop-data requirements are addressed through policy and legal instruction via orientation materials, legal blocks, and academy review sessions. It also noted that stop-data requirements are addressed through practical application since trainees complete stop-data entries in CAD/RMS/RIPA systems; FTOs verify that qualifying stops are reported; and FTOs coach trainees on reporting errors. Lastly, POST noted that stop-data requirements are addressed through documentation and testing through training checklists; DOR categories such as Report Writing/Documentation, Legal Authority, and Policy Compliance; written and scenario-based assessments requiring lawful-stop documentation and completion of stop-data entries.

Subcommittee members noted that POST establishes statewide minimum standards and discussed whether and how agencies may supplement these standards differently. Some Subcommittee members expressed interest in understanding the extent to which agencies rely on POST FTP materials, what additional training may be provided at the local level, and how consistency is maintained across FTPs and FTOs throughout the State.

In its response, POST clarified that FTOs are not directed to use LD 3 and LD 42 during evaluations; current continuity mechanisms are the SEGs and DORs; many agencies nevertheless provide LD 3 and LD 42 summaries to FTOs; many agencies expect field evaluations to reflect principles taught in LD 3 and LD 42; and some agencies explicitly reference LD 3 and LD 42 in task lists and evaluation dimensions. POST also mentioned that some agencies may further use curriculum mapping and cross-references; and that some agencies may already actively align academy, FTP, and Continuing Professional Training (CPT) competencies.

Given that members identified several areas where additional information would be beneficial to their full understanding of POST's FTP, the Subcommittee expressed an interest in inviting POST to attend the next POST Subcommittee meeting. **[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS' SEPTEMBER SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION WITH POST FORTHCOMING]**

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

D. Additional Issues Identified

As noted by both POST and the Board, the FTP is a highly influential phase of officer development, because it functions as the transition point between classroom learning and real-world policing. The FTP acts as a primary site where new officers learn organizational culture, policing norms, and behavioral expectations, and the FTP materials establish statewide *minimum standards* rather than a comprehensive curriculum. However, it should be noted that the POST-certified FTP relies heavily on the judgment and experience of individual FTOs, and there is limited formal guidance for FTOs regarding how to evaluate trainees on issues involving race, identity, culture, procedural justice, or implicit bias in Competency 6. FTOs are expected to evaluate trainees using the DOR, which includes the SEGs, and contains 31 behaviors or competencies that are rated daily. Only 1 of the 31 standard competencies in the DOR explicitly addresses relationships with citizens or the community (#6 Relationships with Citizens/Community). Consultants noted that category #3 (Integrity/Ethics) may involve relationships with citizens or community but it is nested under “Attitude” rather than “Performance.” The DOR does not contain explicit expectations related to equity, respect, empathy, procedural justice, de-escalation, and bias-free policing. Many agencies supplement POST materials with their own training, but the extent of that training varies by agency.

During the June 10, 2026 POST Subcommittee meeting, Subcommittee members made similar observations regarding the FTP structure, and noted that, because POST establishes statewide minimum standards, the written materials themselves play an important role in shaping policing culture and professional norms. The Subcommittee also noted that agencies vary in how they supplement POST FTP materials, and FTO discretion plays a significant role in the RIPA-related field training trainees receive, consistent with the consultant’s findings.

Subcommittee members concluded that Section 6 reflects an effort to address professionalism, community relations, and racial and identity profiling, but that the materials could be strengthened significantly in terms of clarity, specificity, depth, and alignment with the goals and statutory requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4.

To that end, the FTP materials should provide more explicit instruction, clearer behavioral expectations, and stronger guidance related to:

Term	Definition
<p>Racial and identity profiling</p>	<p>Racial and identity profiling is the practice of relying on an individual's actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, or other protected identity, rather than individualized suspicion and objectively observed behavior, when making law enforcement decisions.¹⁵</p>
<p>Implicit bias</p>	<p>Implicit bias refers to unconscious thoughts, attitudes, and associations that influence an</p>

¹⁵ Cal. Pen. Code, § 13519.4; *see also* Rebecca C. Hetey, “Implicit Bias, the Power of Institutions, and How to Reduce Racial Disparities in Policing,” in Joseph Avery & Joel Cooper (eds.), *Bias in the Law: A Definitive Look at Racial Prejudice in the U.S. Criminal Justice System* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2020), pp. 37-66.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

	individual’s perceptions, decisions, and actions without conscious awareness. ¹⁶
Procedural justice	Procedural justice is a policing philosophy that emphasizes treating people with respect, neutrality, transparency, voice, and trustworthiness during law enforcement encounters. ¹⁷
Cultural responsiveness	Cultural responsiveness is an officer’s ability to recognize, understand, and appropriately respond to the diverse cultural, racial, ethnic, religious, linguistic, gender identity, and social backgrounds of the communities they serve while treating all persons with dignity, respect, and fairness. ¹⁸
Community trust and legitimacy	Community trust refers to the public’s confidence that law enforcement will exercise its authority fairly, respectfully, and without bias. Police legitimacy is the public perception that police authority is rightful, appropriate, and deserving of voluntary compliance and cooperation. ¹⁹
De-escalation	De-escalation consists of communication techniques, tactical approaches, and decision-making strategies designed to reduce conflict, lower emotional intensity, minimize the need

¹⁶ Jennifer L. Eberhardt, *Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice That Shapes What We See, Think, and Do* (New York: Viking, 2019); Joshua Correll et al., “The Police Officer’s Dilemma: Using Ethnicity to Disambiguate Potentially Threatening Individuals,” (2002) 83 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1314; Joshua Correll et al., “Across the Thin Blue Line: Police Officers and Racial Bias in the Decision to Shoot,” (2007) 92 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1006; Rebecca C. Hetey, “Implicit Bias, the Power of Institutions, and How to Reduce Racial Disparities in Policing,” in Joseph Avery & Joel Cooper (eds.), *Bias in the Law: A Definitive Look at Racial Prejudice in the U.S. Criminal Justice System* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2020), pp. 37-66.

¹⁷ President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2015).

¹⁸ MarYam G. Hamedani, Hazel Rose Markus, Rebecca C. Hetey & Jennifer L. Eberhardt, “We Built This Culture (So We Can Change It): Seven Principles for Intentional Culture Change,” (2024) 79 *American Psychologist* 384; Rebecca C. Hetey, MarYam G. Hamedani, Hazel Rose Markus & Jennifer L. Eberhardt, “‘When the Cruiser Lights Come On’: Using the Science of Bias & Culture to Combat Racial Disparities in Policing,” (2024) 153 *Daedalus* 123.

¹⁹ President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015); Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *Law Enforcement Best Practices: Lessons Learned from the Field* (2019); Nicholas P. Camp, “Institutional Interactions and Racial Inequality in Policing: How Everyday Encounters Bridge Individuals, Organizations, and Institutions,” (2023) *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

	for force, and resolve encounters safely whenever feasible. ²⁰
Historical context	Historical context refers to an understanding of the historical events, governmental policies, discriminatory practices, and prior interactions between law enforcement and particular communities that continue to shape contemporary perceptions of policing. ²¹
Observable officer behaviors	Observable officer behaviors are objectively identifiable actions and communication practices that demonstrate an officer's competence, professionalism, fairness, and adherence to constitutional policing principles during interactions with the public. ²²

Moreover, during its June 10, 2026 Subcommittee meeting, POST Subcommittee Members noted that continuity could be strengthened through more explicit connections between the POST Basic Academy instruction and FTP evaluation standards, particularly where Basic Academy materials contain more detailed discussions of these concepts than are currently reflected in Section 6.

The DOJ consultants also noted that POST’s Basic Academy materials — particularly Learning Domains 3 and 42 — contain significantly more comprehensive, nuanced, and research-informed discussions of race, culture, procedural justice, and police-community relations than are reflected in Section 6.

The POST Subcommittee and DOJ consultants view the FTP as an important opportunity to reinforce and operationalize those Basic Academy concepts through field-based practice and evaluation.

1. Major Themes Identified

The Need for More Explicit Instruction on Racial and Identity Profiling

Section 6 addresses racial and identity profiling in general terms but does not provide sufficient specificity regarding:

²⁰ President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015); Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *Law Enforcement Best Practices: Lessons Learned from the Field* (2019).

²¹ Learning Domain 3, *Principled Policing in the Community* (California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Version 6.1, 2025); Learning Domain 42, *Cultural Diversity/Discrimination* (California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Version 7.0, 2025).

²² Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, *Law Enforcement Best Practices: Lessons Learned from the Field* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2019); Police Executive Research Forum, *Transforming Police Recruit Training: 40 Guiding Principles* (Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 2022).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

- The legal prohibition against racial and identity profiling as defined in California law;
- The harms caused by profiling;
- The role of implicit bias in policing decisions;
- The broader institutional impact of disparities in policing; or
- The professional consequences associated with profiling.

The POST Subcommittee also noted that Section 6 primarily uses the term “racial profiling” and does not consistently reference “identity profiling,” despite the language used in Penal Code section 13519.4. The POST Subcommittee further noted that relying solely on “behavioral observations” does not fully resolve concerns regarding bias because perceptions of suspicious behavior may themselves be influenced by implicit bias.

The Importance of Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and Community Trust

A central theme the POST Subcommittee emphasized throughout its Review is that the FTP should more clearly communicate that policing effectiveness depends heavily on community trust, legitimacy, and respectful treatment. The DOJ consultants further noted that the written FTP materials emphasize professionalism and avoiding inappropriate behavior, but place less emphasis on: building trust; demonstrating fairness; respectful communication; community legitimacy; empathy; active listening; and procedural justice.

The POST Subcommittee also highlighted that Learning Domains 3 and 42 contain extensive instruction on these concepts, including: the four principles of procedural justice; effective communication strategies; historical harms affecting police-community relations; implicit bias; cross-cultural interactions; and the importance of treating all people with dignity and respect.

Lastly, POST Subcommittee Members emphasized that officers should not simply avoid misconduct, but instead should actively engage in behaviors that strengthen public trust and improve police-community relationships.

Greater Integration of Culture, History, and Community Context

While Section 6 includes references to community culture and community history, the POST Subcommittee noted those concepts are treated too narrowly and without sufficient context. The DOJ consultants further observed that:

- Culture and history are deeply interconnected;
- Communities’ relationships with law enforcement are shaped by historical experiences;
- Officers should understand local histories involving discrimination, segregation, or strained police-community relations; and
- FTOs may need additional training to effectively evaluate trainee understanding of these topics.

The POST Subcommittee contrasted the limited treatment of culture in Section 6 with the more nuanced treatment in Learning Domain 42, which frames culture as dynamic, relational, and shaped by social and historical context.

Reliance on FTO Discretion and Lack of Standardized Guidance

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Moreover, the POST Subcommittee repeatedly noted that the FTP depends heavily on the experience, judgment, and professionalism of individual FTOs. With regards to FTOs, the DOJ consultants agreed with the POST Subcommittee and found that:

- FTOs receive little formal instruction on how to evaluate trainees regarding race, identity, culture, implicit bias, or procedural justice;
- Evaluation standards are often broad and subjective;
- Agencies vary significantly in how they supplement POST materials;
- FTO interpretation may differ substantially across agencies and evaluators; and
- More standardized guidance could improve consistency statewide.

The Need for More Outcome-Based and Behavioral Evaluation

In addition, the POST Subcommittee emphasized that concepts such as respect, fairness, empathy, and legitimacy should be translated into observable officer behaviors. Subcommittee Members noted that while these concepts are referenced throughout the materials, clearer behavioral indicators and evaluation standards may assist FTOs in assessing trainee performance consistently and objectively. The DOJ consultants similarly found that:

- Most DOR categories focus on technical or procedural competencies;
- Few evaluation categories explicitly address racial and identity profiling, equity, legitimacy, procedural justice, or bias-free policing;
- Existing standards rely heavily on generalized professionalism language; and
- Expectations regarding respectful and culturally responsive interactions could be more behaviorally specific.

The DOJ consultants further stressed that the FTP should focus not only on technical competence, but also on how officers interact with people during routine encounters.

Greater Continuity Between Academy Instruction and Field Training

The POST Subcommittee generally found strong foundational instruction within Learning Domains 3 and 42 and viewed those Basic Academy materials positively. The DOJ consultants agreed and described these academy materials as comprehensive; research-informed; nuanced; historically grounded; and explicit regarding procedural justice, implicit bias, and police-community relations.

During its June 10, 2026 Subcommittee meeting, POST Subcommittee Members further highlighted the importance of ensuring that concepts introduced during Basic Academy instruction continue through field training and subsequent professional development. Members questioned whether concepts from LDs 3 and 42 are reinforced with sufficient specificity in Section 6 of the FTP, and whether additional cross-references between Basic Academy materials and FTP standards and materials may strengthen continuity.

2. Broader Conceptual Themes Identified

Several broad themes were also identified throughout the review of Section 6.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Field Training Shapes Police Culture

Field training is one of the most influential stages in officer development because it socializes new officers into departmental culture and practical policing norms.²³

Trust and Legitimacy Are Central to Effective Policing

Community trust and police legitimacy are foundational to effective policing and public safety.²⁴ The FTP should reflect these important goals and ensure that trainees understand and apply them upon completion of the FTP.

Equity Requires Both Individual and Institutional Accountability

Disparities in policing are not solely individual-level problems and may also arise from institutional practices, deployment patterns, discretionary systems, and broader organizational culture.²⁵ FTP outcomes therefore should emphasize individual and systemic comprehension of racial and identity law and understanding of community and behaviors that cause and prevent discrimination during traffic or pedestrian stops.²⁶

Behavioral Competence Must Include Interpersonal Skills

Communication, procedural fairness, de-escalation, empathy, and respectful treatment should be treated as core policing competencies rather than secondary or aspirational values.²⁷

Written Standards Matter

Because agencies vary in how they implement training, it should be stressed that the FTP establishes strong statewide *minimum standards* that clearly communicate expectations regarding racial and identity profiling, procedural justice, and community engagement.²⁸

3. Overall Conclusion

The FTP provides an important framework for evaluating and training new officers, but Section 6 could be strengthened substantially to better align with the goals of AB 953, Penal Code section 13519.4, and contemporary evidence-based policing practices. As aforementioned, the FTP materials should provide better behavioral expectations of trainees, and should enhance instruction of concepts such as procedural justice and legitimacy, implicit bias, and racial and identity profiling. The FTP instruction and materials should also be more specific as to the concepts covered, including by providing increased explanations of the cultural and historical context of those concepts. POST should also provide greater evaluator guidance to the FTOs, emphasize outcome-based evaluation for the FTP, and ensure greater alignment between academy training and field training.

Section 6 could also help educate officers about the role and mandates of RIPA. This could be achieved by providing instruction about efforts the law enforcement agency has taken to build trust and practice respectful, equitable policing; educating trainees about the specific obligations of peace officers in preventing, reporting and responding to discriminatory or biased practices by

²³ [Insert Citations to Research]

²⁴ [Insert Citations to Research]

²⁵ [Insert Citations to Research]

²⁶ [Insert Citations to Research]

²⁷ [Insert Citations to Research]

²⁸ [Insert Citations to Research]

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

fellow peace officers; and reviewing the agency's stop data to educate young officers about any disparate local enforcement patterns and what steps the agency is taking to reduce any existing disparities.

[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS' SEPTEMBER SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION WITH CONSULTANTS FORTHCOMING]

E. Recommendations for POST

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION]

Potential Recommendation 1

Strengthen Section 6, the Daily Observation Report (DOR), and the Standard Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs) by incorporating clearer behavioral indicators and evaluation criteria related to procedural justice,²⁹ legitimacy, bias-free policing, de-escalation, and community engagement.

The Board recommends strengthening multiple areas of the FTP to enhance the impact of the FTP materials. This could be achieved by expanding behavioral examples and performance indicators; providing stronger behavioral anchors in the DOR and SEGs; including clearer standards related to equity and legitimacy; and incorporating more explicit references to respect, cooperation, equity, legitimacy, procedural justice, community partnership, and de-escalation.

Potential Recommendation 2

Clarify and reinforce training regarding RIPA requirements, including stop data reporting, accountability, and the harms associated with racial and identity profiling.

Overall, the Board's review of the FTP indicated that the requirements of RIPA and prohibition on racial and identity profiling was underdeveloped and should be reinforced going forward. This includes incorporating more direct references to "racial and identity profiling" throughout Section 6; reinstating earlier, more explicit language previously contained in Section 6.4.01 regarding the prohibition against profiling; expanding the discussion of stop data collection and accountability systems; and providing trainees with more concrete guidance regarding how profiling can occur in practice. In addition, the FTP should include a discussion of the harms profiling causes to legitimacy and community trust.

Potential Recommendation 3

Enhance FTO training and evaluator guidance regarding cultural competency,³⁰ procedural justice, implicit bias, racial and identity profiling, and community engagement.

Consistent with prior Board reports, the Board recommends providing concrete evaluation criteria for the FTP to assess whether trainees correctly understand and retain the materials and

²⁹ In its written responses, POST suggested "Demonstrates procedural justice elements: voice, neutrality, respect, trustworthiness."

³⁰ In its written responses, POST suggested FTO cue cards; one example could involve asking themselves: "Did the trainee treat all involved parties with equal respect?" and "Was any difference in enforcement or investigative effort justified by specific facts, not demographic traits?" POST also referenced standardized scenario rubrics which could involve: diverse neighborhoods, LEP individuals, LGBTQ+ individuals, and unhoused individuals.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

topics covered. This includes evaluating trainees on cultural competency, procedural justice, implicit bias, racial and identity profiling, and community engagement, and expanding behavioral examples and performance indicators for each. It is also important to strengthen and reinforce these concepts by encouraging more meaningful engagement with communities; integrating local community history into field training; combining discussions of culture and history rather than treating them separately; and placing a greater emphasis on relationship-building and legitimacy throughout field training.

Potential Recommendation 4

Improve statewide consistency through stronger evaluator calibration tools, standardized examples, and clearer behavior indicators.

Consistency in instruction and evaluation is key to ensuring that the information in the FTP is accurately presented to and received by trainees. The Board recommends incorporating evidence-based communication practices into training and evaluation to more explicitly evaluate community interaction skills to achieve this goal. The Board also recommends improving calibration across FTOs and strengthening the guidance provided to FTOs to ensure statewide consistency.

Potential Recommendation 5

Enhance continuity between LD 3, LD 42, and field-training evaluation standards so that Basic Academy concepts are reinforced and assessed during field training.

As noted above, the Board and DOJ consultants note that there should be greater continuity of instruction between the learning domains in the Basic Academy and the FTP. To that end, the Board recommends more explicit references to Learning Domains 3 and 42 in Section 6; continued reinforcement of implicit bias instruction; and the expanded use of procedural justice concepts.

Potential Recommendation 6

POST should assess how many agencies use alternative FTP systems, how those systems address RIPA-related concepts, and whether statewide consistency exists.

IV. AB 953 GUIDELINES REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Penal Code section 13519.4 instructs POST to “develop and disseminate” both “guidelines” and “trainings” for all peace officers in California.³¹ As that subdivision makes clear, the “course of instruction and the guidelines shall stress understanding and respect for racial, identity, and cultural differences, and development of effective, noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties,” including the prohibition on racial and identity profiling as set forth in section 13519.4, subdivision (f). [EXPLANATION OF IMPORTANCE OF STANDALONE GUIDELINES FORTHCOMING]

³¹ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (a).

A. Guidelines: RIPA and POST Background

In the 2023-2026 RIPA Reports, the RIPA Board recommended that POST create and publish clear, standalone guidelines (separate from training curricula) to ensure consistency, transparency, and compliance with California law.³²

As noted in last year’s RIPA Report, in August 2023, POST agreed to the Board’s recommendation to develop racial and identity profiling guidelines, and hosted two workshops in May and October 2024 to develop and finalize POST’s “Guidelines on Racial and Identity Profiling” (the RIPA Guidelines) for use across all POST courses related to racial and identity profiling, including, among other courses, the FTP discussed above. Board members were asked to participate in these two workshops as subject matter experts. At the second workshop in October 2024, POST informed the subject matter experts and DOJ that the RIPA Guidelines would not serve as standalone guidelines, but instead, would only serve as a template optional course for a four-hour advanced officer training that agencies could adopt. After approving and publishing its RIPA Guidelines, the POST Commission published a related Bulletin, in which it stated: “The guidelines set minimum standards for a four-hour course addressing legal prohibitions on racial and identity profiling [...] and related training objectives for California law enforcement.”³³ Certain RIPA Board Members raised concerns regarding the potential limited scope of the Guidelines and the lack of standardized application across all RIPA-related trainings. The POST Commission approved the RIPA Guidelines in September 2025.

B. Recent Developments

Since the publication of the 2026 Report, the POST Subcommittee met to conduct its initial review of the approved RIPA Guidelines and present its reflections at the March 12, 2026, subcommittee meeting. At that meeting, the Subcommittee expressed concern that the RIPA Guidelines may not apply to all POST RIPA-related trainings. The general application of the RIPA Guidelines to all courses related to racial and identity profiling is a necessary component of the section 13519.4 legal mandate, which is why the Board has consistently recommended their broader application. Following the meeting, the Board asked POST to clarify whether the approved RIPA Guidelines would be applied to all such courses, and not only to the four-hour advanced officer training. POST’s response was that it “strongly feels that the Racial and Identity Profiling Guidelines are flexible to cover any type of training on this topic. In the introduction of the document [...] it states in the first sentence that they are for minimum training standards for conducting racial and identity profiling training courses. POST interprets that these guidelines can cover any course whether it’s four hours or not.”

C. Guidelines POST Subcommittee Review

The Board believes 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. As such, the Board will be reviewing the Guidelines approved by the POST Commission in September 2025.

³² Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (f).

³³ [Insert citation]

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Subcommittee members will review AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines Packet (“Guidelines Packet”), provide written feedback by answering four questions, and provide recommendations, if any.

D. Guidelines Packet

1. Close Reading Docs

1. California Penal Code Section 13519.4;
2. POST Commission Report on RIPA Course Guidelines Update;
3. POST RIPA Course Guidelines; and
4. POST Commission Bulletin on the Approval of RIPA Course Guidelines.

2. Background Materials

1. Excerpts and links to RIPA Course Guidelines-related discussions and/or recommendations in 2023-2026 RIPA Reports;
2. Excerpts from the 2023 and 2024 POST Reports on Recommendations made by the RIPA Board related to RIPA Course Guidelines; and
3. Excerpts and links of POST Commission Discussions on RIPA Course Guidelines.

E. Written Feedback

Board members will focus on evaluating whether the RIPA Course Guidelines:

- Fully reflect the legal requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4;
- Can function as a comprehensive framework for all RIPA-related training and/or suggest how to expand them if not;
- Are clear, practical, and structured in a way that agencies can translate into policy, training, and supervision; and
- Include mechanisms to measure training outcomes.

F. Recommendations for POST

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION]

V. VISIONS FOR FUTURE REPORTS

- The review of “Section 6” of the FTP and the AB 953 Guidelines concludes the RIPA Board’s first review of all POST RIPA-related courses as required by AB 953. The reviews of these courses have been based on materials and information provided by POST; they have not entailed evaluating pedagogy, instructional methods, delivery quality and/or implementation by individual LEAs across the State.
- The Board will continue its mandate to review RIPA-related courses that have been updated or amended in some way since the Board’s first review ten years ago. The Board will also continue to engage with POST as it modifies and develops additional training for entry level officers, seasoned officers and supervisors, management and executives to

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

more effectively tackle barriers to eliminating racial and identity profiling by individual officers and law enforcement agencies.

- Ongoing education by POST at subcommittee meetings about Commission processes, procedures for RIPA related training, standards, guidelines, course certification and feedback on RIPA Board recommendations.
- Ongoing development of RIPA training recommendations to the Legislature.

DRAFT

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.