

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 (FTP) and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines.

Over the years, the Board has reviewed eight POST courses, making recommendations nearly every year to better align law enforcement training courses with the Board’s goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling. This chapter covers three main areas in addition to providing a summary of the Board’s past recommendations made to the POST Commission and Legislature. Section II covers those recommendations beginning in 2022 through present. This overview is intended to provide context for the Board’s work spanning its history and help orient the reader in tracing the trajectory and development of learning tools over time. It also provides a reference point for readers who may wish to learn more about past recommendations and understand the Board’s efforts towards improving POST training and effectiveness in addition to addressing the pernicious effects of racial and identity profiling. Section III discusses the Board’s review and recommendations related to POST’s Field Training Program, which functions as the transition point between classroom learning and real-world policing where new officers learn organizational culture, policing norms, and behavioral expectations. Section IV discusses the Board’s review of POST’s AB 953 Course Guidelines that were developed following the Board’s recommendation to create and publish clear, standalone guidelines (separate from training curricula) to ensure training consistency, transparency, and compliance with California law. Finally, Section V shares the Board’s visions for future reports, which aims to continue the Board’s mandate to review RIPA-related courses that have been updated or amended since 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's first review ten years ago in addition to ensuring ongoing development of RIPA training recommendations to the Legislature while remaining engaged with POST throughout the review process.

The importance of POST offering rigorous, evidence-based training related to RIPA has become increasingly significant in light of perceived statewide increases 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: A LOOK BACK

Since RIPA's enactment, the Board has reviewed eight POST courses. In reviewing those courses, the Board has made recommendations nearly every year to the POST Commission and the Legislature to better align the law enforcement training courses below with the Board's goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling. This year, 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. Consistent with the "Past/Present/Future" theme of this year's RIPA Report, the Board has outlined below some of its past recommendations to POST and to the California Legislature.

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. Museum of Tolerance Training required to facilitate this course.	2022 Report
Basic Academy Learning Domain #42 Cultural Diversity and Discrimination	Academy – 16 hrs.	2023 Report
Principled Policing: Implicit Bias and Procedural Justice	In-Service Officers – 8 hrs. Museum of Tolerance Training required to facilitate this course.	2018 Report
Bias Based Policing: Remaining Fair and Impartial	In-Service Officers – 2 hrs.	2018 Report
Profiling and Implicit Bias	In-Service Officers – 2 hrs.	2021 Report
Bias and Racial Profiling	In-Service Officers – 2 hrs.	2021 Report
Beyond Bias Racial and Identity Profiling	In-Service Officers – 2 hrs.	2022 Report
PSP: Strategic Communications	In-Service Officers – 3 hrs.	2022 Report
Museum of Tolerance – Racial Profiling Train-the-Trainer	In-Service Officers – 24 hrs.	2023 Report
Museum of Tolerance – Racial and Identity Profiling Update	In-Service Officers – 4 hrs. Course	2025 Report
Field Training Program Section 6: Community Relations/Professional Demeanor	Field Training Program – 40 hrs.	2026 and 2027 Reports

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. 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. The Board has made the following recommendations to POST across multiple reports and years, and re-elevates these recommendations for POST's consideration in this year's report. These recommendations, if implemented, will help to ensure that officers are properly trained in their responsibilities under RIPA, understand the law's prohibition on racial and identity profiling, and build trust in the communities they serve.

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.

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.

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”).

- **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).
- **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 checklists of course objectives and satisfaction surveys, and instead 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 In this regard, 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.
- **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.

⁸ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 1081.

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.
- **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.

B. Recommendations for the Legislature

The Board has also made a number of recommendations to the Legislature and re-elevates these recommendations for consideration in this year's report. These recommendations are designed to improve POST training and effectiveness in addressing the pernicious effects of racial and identity profiling.

Legislative Recommendation	Year
(1) Expand the POST Commission by five people to add more diverse representation from the public and non-sworn community	2022
(1) Increase the minimum academy or basic training hours to more closely reflect the hours certified by POST at most academies, which exceed this amount (2) Analyze or audit POST's funding for training to provide clarity on the most effective use of training funds. (3) Mandate in-service officers to take the 8-hour Procedural Justice training course rather than have it be voluntary (4) Require Field Training Supervisors to take extensive racial and identity profiling training prior to teaching Field Training to newly certified Academy graduates. (5) Mandate measures of effectiveness in curricula approved or certified by POST to determine if trainings are having the desired effect	2023

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.

Legislative Recommendation	Year
(1) Require LEAs to adopt a policy to prohibit racial and identity profiling that includes accountability and consequences of non-compliance (e.g. Senate Bill 2 (SB 2)) based on the POST guidelines (2) Require more frequent, evaluated and evidence-based training on racial and identity profiling more than once every five years, and at a minimum of every three years (3) Require law enforcement supervisors and field training officers receive specialized training on eliminating racial and identity profiling within their departments (4) Require POST-certified courses on racial and identity profiling be revised to include ways to prevent behavior that could lead to officer decertification for serious misconduct under SB 2 (5) Amend the law to increase funding and allow for additional stakeholders, beyond the MOT, to present additional options for the racial and identity profiling training to law enforcement officers (6) Require body-worn camera footage, when available, of highly publicized incidents to be used in the racial and identity profiling training in addition to, staged scenarios (7) Fund an independent study, under the guidance of the RIPA Board and conducted by academic researchers, that assesses the efficacy of POST's racial and identity profiling training on officers' attitudes, prejudices, and enforcement outcomes (8) Provide funding and require POST to report annually on specific training outcomes and performance measures. POST should consider looking at implicit bias metrics before and after the trainings to evaluate its effectiveness	2025

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION—Are there any recommendations the Board would like to make based on this review of its past recommendations? These could be to POST, the Legislature, LEAs, etc.]

III. POST FTP REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board's FTP review is an important component 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

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.

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

Consistent with its statutory mandate, the RIPA Board has continued to review training courses that POST has identified as relating to racial and identity profiling. Over the past two years, the Board has focused its attention on POST's Field Training Program ("FTP"). The Board's review of the FTP was limited to Section 6 of the program, 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.

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 34 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?*

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

Review Materials

The Board conducted its FTP Review using a comprehensive 381-page packet of materials (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

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.

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. [REDACTED].**

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. The instructional guidance emphasized that the Board's review was narrowly focused on the three specific FTP components above: (1) Section 6; (2) the SEGs; and (3) the DOR materials.

The guidance further clarified that the Board was 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, the Board was 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. In contrast, 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.

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].**

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

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 Rubric

To facilitate a structured and consistent review process, the DOJ consultants developed a rubric to evaluate the FTP's Section 6 materials. The rubric was designed to operationalize the Board's statutory and policy considerations 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. The consultants' review focused on whether the written FTP materials appropriately prepare trainees to engage in 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:

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.

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

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.

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.

A. 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. The Board identified strengths in the FTP's inclusion of professionalism, behavioral-based policing, community relations, and communication standards. The Board 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. The Board 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 similarly found that, while Section 6 successfully establishes minimum statewide expectations regarding professionalism and community relations, 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: Alignment with Penal Code section 13519.4

General Observations

The Board noted that Section 6 addresses many of the core statutory requirements articulated in Penal Code section 13519.4 through provisions related to behavioral-based policing, racial profiling, cultural diversity, community history, and professional communication. At the same time, the Board 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

As part of its FTP Review, the Board distinguished between stating legal requirements and operationalizing them in practice. The Board 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 the Board 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.

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.

Role of Field Training Officers (FTOs)

The Board 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 Board 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

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

Alignment with Prior Training

The Board 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, the Board observed potential disconnects where prior learning is not explicitly referenced or meaningfully expanded upon. The Board noted that certain concepts appear to be repeated without sufficient application, including implicit bias, community trust, and procedural fairness.

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.

Progression of Learning

The Board noted evidence of skill progression through the transition from classroom instruction to field-based evaluation and scenario discussion. It 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

The Board 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

The Board 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

The Board examined whether Section 6 reflects and reinforces values such as equity, respect, procedural fairness, and trust-building. Overall, the Board 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

The Board 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, the Board observed that the materials often describe values in broad or aspirational terms without clearly tying them to measurable behaviors or outcomes.

Opportunities for Practice and Evaluation

The Board 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, the Board noted limitations in how these behaviors are defined, documented, or consistently assessed by evaluators.

Clarity of Expectations

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

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.

Key Gaps Identified

The Board 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

The Board 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

The Board 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

The Board observed that certain expectations are clearly defined as behaviors, including respectful communication, avoidance of derogatory language, de-escalation, and objective behavioral-based policing. The Board 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 Board identified strengths in the ability of the Daily Observation Report (DOR) to document professionalism, ethics, communication, and community interactions. The Board also identified limitations related to subjective interpretation, lack of explicit references to diversity and procedural justice, and limited guidance for documenting culturally responsive behavior.

Assessment of Key Competencies

The Board 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

The Board 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.

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.

Key Gaps Identified

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

Questions for POST

The Board 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. Follow-Up Dialogue with POST re: Section 6

After reviewing the Section 6 Packet and completing rubrics, the Board had the opportunity to discuss the FTP during the June 10, 2026 POST Subcommittee meeting, specifically focusing on the three guiding questions it had identified prior to its FTP Review.

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

The Board agreed that many values associated with AB 953 — such as professionalism, community engagement, procedural fairness, and bias-free policing — appear in Section 6. However, some members expressed concern regarding whether those values are sufficiently operationalized through clear performance standards and evaluation criteria. The Board's 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.

The Board 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.

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?*

The Board 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.

The Board 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.

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 #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?

The Board agreed that many concepts introduced in LD 3 and LD 42 are reflected in Section 6 of the FTP. However, its 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. The Board 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 Responses to the Board's FTP Review Questions

Following its 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. The Board discussed POST's written response during the June 10, 2026, POST Subcommittee Meeting.

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 written 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;
- 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.

The Board 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 — and discussed whether additional FTO evaluator resources or standardized evaluation tools exist beyond the Section 6 materials.

The Board 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 the Board 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.

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.

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 Computer-Aided Dispatch/Records Management Systems/Racial and Identity Profiling Act systems;¹⁵ 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.

POST establishes statewide minimum standards and discussed whether and how agencies may supplement these standards differently. The Board 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; 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 Board expressed an interest in inviting POST to attend its September 21, 2026, POST Subcommittee meeting. *[Summary of Board Members September 21, 2026 subcommittee discussion with POST forthcoming]*

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

¹⁵ Law enforcement Computer-Aided Dispatch, or "CAD," software systems allow public safety operations and communications to be augmented, assisted, or partially controlled by an automated system. It can include, among other capabilities, computer-controlled emergency vehicle dispatching, vehicle status, incident reporting, and management information. (*Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Systems* Law Enforcement Information Technology Standards Council <https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/bja/files/media/document/leitsc_law_enforcement_cad_systems.pdf> [as of XX].) Law enforcement Records Management Systems are agency-wide systems that provide for the storage, retrieval, retention, manipulation, archiving, and viewing of information, records, documents, or files pertaining to law enforcement operations. (*Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Records Management Systems (RMS)* Law Enforcement Information Technology Standards Council <https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/bja/files/media/document/leitsc_law_enforcement_rms_systems.pdf> [as of XX].)

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.

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). The DOJ 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, the Board 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 Board 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.

The Board observed 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 Board recommended the FTP materials provide more explicit instruction, clearer behavioral expectations, and stronger guidance related to:

Term	Definition
Racial and identity profiling	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. ¹⁶
Implicit bias	Implicit bias refers to unconscious thoughts, attitudes, and associations that influence an individual’s perceptions, decisions, and actions without conscious awareness. ¹⁷

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ 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.

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.

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. ¹⁸
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. ¹⁹
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. ²⁰
De-escalation	De-escalation consists of communication techniques, tactical approaches, and decision-making strategies designed to reduce conflict, lower emotional intensity, minimize the need for force, and resolve encounters safely whenever feasible. ²¹

¹⁸ 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).

¹⁹ 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.

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); Nicholas P. Camp, "Institutional Interactions and Racial Inequality in Policing: How Everyday Encounters Bridge Individuals, Organizations, and Institutions," (2023) *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*.

²¹ 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).

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.

Term	Definition
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. ²²
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. ²³

Moreover, during its June 10, 2026, POST Subcommittee meeting, the Board also 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 Board views 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:

- 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.

²² 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).

²³ 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 Board also notes 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. 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

The Board notes that FTP should more clearly communicate that policing effectiveness depends heavily on community trust, legitimacy, and respectful treatment. The DOJ consultants further note 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. 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. As noted elsewhere in this section, the lessons and instruction provided by LDs 3 and 42 in these areas should be reiterated and re-emphasized in the FTP.

Ultimately, the Board notes that officers should not simply be trained to avoid misconduct. Instead, POST courses, including the FTP, should train officers to 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, these concepts are treated too narrowly and without sufficient context in the FTP. Culture and history are deeply interconnected, and communities’ relationships with law enforcement are shaped by historical experiences. For these reasons, 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 Board notes the limited treatment of culture and history in Section 6, in contrast to the more nuanced treatment in LD 42, which frames culture as dynamic, relational, and shaped by social and historical context.

Reliance on FTO Discretion and Lack of Standardized Guidance

Moreover, the Board notes that the FTP depends heavily on the experience, judgment, and professionalism of individual FTOs. Notably, FTOs receive little formal instruction on how to evaluate trainees regarding race, identity, culture, implicit bias, or procedural justice, and evaluation standards are often broad and subjective. In addition, agencies vary significantly in how they supplement POST materials, and the interpretation of the materials may differ substantially across agencies and evaluators. Because of this potential for variance and interpretation, more standardized guidance could improve consistency statewide, which supports the Board’s 2019 recommendation that POST should include strategies to limit unguided discretion in stops and enforcement decisions.

The Need for More Outcome-Based and Behavioral Evaluation

Concepts such as respect, fairness, empathy, and legitimacy should be translated into observable officer behaviors. While these concepts are referenced throughout the Section 6 materials, clearer behavioral indicators and evaluation standards may assist FTOs in assessing trainee performance consistently and objectively. The Board notes that most DOR categories focus on technical or

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.

procedural competencies, and there are few evaluation categories that explicitly address racial and identity profiling, equity, legitimacy, procedural justice, or bias-free policing. In addition, existing standards rely heavily on generalized professionalism language, and expectations regarding respectful and culturally responsive interactions could be more behaviorally specific. Importantly, the FTP should focus not just on technical competence, but on how officers interact with people during routine encounters.

Greater Continuity Between Academy Instruction and Field Training

Generally, the Board finds Learning Domains 3 and 42 provide strong foundational instruction, and views those Basic Academy materials positively. These academy materials are comprehensive, research-informed, nuanced, historically grounded, and explicit regarding procedural justice, implicit bias, and police-community relations.

During its June 10, 2026, POST Subcommittee meeting, Board 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

The Board also identified several broad themes throughout its review of Section 6.

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.²⁴

Trust and Legitimacy Are Central to Effective Policing

Community trust and police legitimacy are foundational to effective policing and public safety.²⁵ 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 do not solely arise on the individual-level and may also arise from institutional practices, deployment patterns, discretionary systems, and broader organizational culture.²⁶ 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.²⁷

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.²⁸

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.

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.²⁹

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 fellow peace officers; and reviewing the agency's stop data to educate entry level officers about any disparate local enforcement patterns and what steps the agency is taking to address potential bias or profiling.

[Summary of Board Members' September 21, 2026 subcommittee discussion with DOJ consultants forthcoming]

E. Recommendations for POST

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION—What recommendations would the Board like to make based on its review of the FTP? Some potential recommendations are identified below.]

The Board makes the following recommendations to POST regarding the FTP:

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,³⁰ 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

²⁹ **[Insert Citations to Research]**

³⁰ In its written responses, POST suggested “Demonstrates procedural justice elements: voice, neutrality, respect, trustworthiness.”

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.

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,³¹ 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 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.

³¹ 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.

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

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.

Penal Code section 13519.4 instructs POST to "develop and disseminate" both "guidelines" and "trainings" for all peace officers in California.³² 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 Penal Code section 13519.4, subdivision (f). The development of statewide standalone training guidelines for all POST racial and identity profiling courses is important because it creates statewide clarity across the full training ecosystem, including basic academy training, refresher training, and field training, as well as the expectations of supervisors and the way law enforcement agencies are expected to operationalize prevention and accountability. This larger architecture can be used as a tool to facilitate consistency across the state's various law enforcement agencies and provide durable clarity as to what is expected of training and practice programs. This consistency is needed as a benchmark by which to measure agency performance, training efficacy, and whether implementation and accountability are consistently applied and measured across all participating agencies.

A. Guidelines: RIPA and POST Background

In the 2023-2026 RIPA Reports, the Board recommended that POST create and publish clear, standalone guidelines (separate from training curricula) to ensure consistency, transparency, and compliance with California law.³³

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

³² Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (a).

³³ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (f).

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.

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.”³⁴ Some members of the RIPA Board 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 Board 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, Board members 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 legal mandate pursuant to Penal Code section 13519.4, 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 has since clarified that the RIPA Guidelines are intended to cover every course regardless of recommended course length.

C. Guidelines 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.

D. Guidelines Packet

The Board conducted its review of the Guidelines using a comprehensive 66-page packet of materials (the Guidelines Packet). It included the following:

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.

³⁴ Manuel Alvarez, Jr. Executive Director, Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Bulletin No. 2025-37, *RIPA Course Guidelines Approved by POST Commission* (Sept. 23, 2025) <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/POST-Chapter-Draft-06102026.pdf>> [as of XX].

2. Background Materials

The Board was also provided background materials relating to the RIPA Course Guidelines and how they were prepared:

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

The Board focused on evaluating whether the RIPA Course Guidelines:

- Fully reflected 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.

The Board focused its evaluation of the RIPA Course Guidelines using four review queries:

- (1) Whether the guidelines fully reflect the legal requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4;
- (2) Whether the guidelines can function as a comprehensive framework for all RIPA-related training and/or suggest how to expand them if not;
- (3) Whether the guidelines are clear, practical, and structured in a way that agencies can translate into policy, training, and supervision; and
- (4) Whether the guidelines include mechanisms to measure training outcomes.

The Board appreciated the stronger emphasis on the incorporation of community stakeholders, the use of RIPA data, and the training on officers' legal obligations. The Board also noted the Guidelines' explanation of the need for understanding the culture and historical context of communities, and their emphasis on scenario-based training. The Board observed that the RIPA Course Guidelines satisfactorily reflect the legal requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4, and generally provide a comprehensive framework for all RIPA-related training. The Board found that the Guidelines were clear, practical, and structured in a way that agencies could translate into policy, training, and supervision.

While the Guidelines did provide participant evaluation and testing, the Board noted some shortfalls and a need to provide stronger mechanisms to measure training outcome, including providing some example resources regarding measuring training outcomes for training facilitators, guidance on how agencies should evaluate the effectiveness of training over time, and evaluating the level of participation during discussions and scenario-based activities.

With respect to the identification of key indices and perspectives that make up racial, identity, and cultural differences among residents in a local community, the Board observed that the Guidelines explicitly provided that this is a minimum required topic and they provide 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.

on steps facilitators can take to accomplish identifying these perspectives. The Guidelines do provide coverage regarding the negative impact of intentional and implicit biases, prejudices, and stereotyping on effective law enforcement. However, the Guidelines do not appear to provide further explicit guidance regarding historical perspectives, although they do provide content regarding bias generally.

The Board also identified historical perspectives as an area in need of expansion. Despite the Guidelines stating that “[p]articipants will be introduced to how historical perceptions of discriminatory enforcement practices have harmed communities and police-community relations,”³⁵ the Board did not see where this topic was directly covered or expanded upon elsewhere in the Guidelines. Likewise, the Board did not see full coverage of the history and role of the civil and human rights movement and struggles and their impact on law enforcement, even though the Guidelines explicitly state these are minimum required topics.

Regarding the scope of the Guidelines as applicable to training generally, the Board expressed concern that the Guidelines, structured as facilitator guidelines, are much narrower than what the Board understood this process to accomplish. Board members understood these training Guidelines were meant to apply across all POST RIPA-related courses, not just one course format. Ultimately, the Guidelines are best described as facilitator guidelines for a four-hour POST-certified course aimed at seasoned officers and supervisors, and do not apply more broadly across POST-certified racial and identity profiling courses, as the Board understood these Guidelines to be applied. This drew concerns from Board members that the published Guidelines may not have a clear connection to refresher training requirements and the rest of POST’s RIPA-related courses. This leads to some uncertainty in how these Guidelines will be used to update other POST RIPA-related courses, how they connect to refresher training, how the Guidelines compare to other existing POST training models, and what measures will be used to determine whether the training is actually effective. While the Forward to the Guidelines does not appear to limit the application of the guideline to other trainings, there are areas in the Guidelines that suggest that they are primarily for the Museum of Tolerance Train the Trainer course.³⁶ While POST has since clarified that the Guidelines are intended to cover every course, the Board recommends that POST add clarifying language to the Guidelines making clear that they do indeed apply to all the RIPA-related courses, especially in areas identified by the Board as being ambiguous.

³⁵ *Racial and Identity Profiling Course Guidelines* (Aug. 2025) California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training <https://post.ca.gov/Portals/0/post_docs/publications/Racial_and_Identity_Profiling_Guidelines.pdf> [as of XX].

³⁶ The Museum of Tolerance Train the Trainer course is among the professional development courses designed to assist front line service providers examine both the historical and contemporary contexts for challenges they are facing on the job and increase awareness, both introspectively and professionally, develop and grow leadership skills, and learn new tools that can be used on the job through facilitated Museum tours and discussions, interactive workshops, and live testimonies from survivors. (Professional Development for Law Enforcement Museum of Tolerance Los Angeles <<https://museumoftolerance.com/programs-for-professionals/professional-development-for-law-enforcement>> [as of XX].)

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.

F. Recommendations for POST

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION—What recommendations would the Board like to make based on its review of the POST Guidelines?]

V. VISIONS FOR FUTURE REPORTS

[AREA FOR BOARD DISCUSSION—What would the Board like to focus on in future POST chapters? Some potential suggestions are identified below.]

- The Board’s review of “Section 6” of the FTP and the AB 953 Guidelines in this year’s report concludes its 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 POST modifies and develops additional training for entry level officers, seasoned officers and supervisors, management and executives to 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 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.