

2027 RIPA REPORT
POST SECTION DRAFT

I. INTRODUCTION

California law expressly prohibits racial and identity profiling by law enforcement.¹ The Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA) further acknowledges 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.”² In enacting RIPA, 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 The Board, in turn, was tasked with reviewing POST’s law enforcement training materials relevant to the Board’s mandate of eliminating racial and identity profiling by California law enforcement agencies.⁵ Since RIPA’s enactment, the Board has reviewed eight POST courses. This year, the Board completed its review of Section 6 of the Field Training Program and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines.

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

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

The Board’s FTP review, and its review of the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines, represent important components of the RIPA Board’s broader effort to ensure that California peace officers receive effective, evidence-based, and legally compliant training related to racial and identity profiling, procedural justice, cultural responsiveness, and community trust. Since RIPA

¹ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (f) [peace officers “shall not engage in racial or identity profiling”].

² Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (d)(4).

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.

took effect, the Board's review process has created an important 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.

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

B. Importance of RIPA-related POST Training Given Statewide Increase in Immigration Enforcement Actions

The importance of POST offering rigorous, evidence-based training related to RIPA has become increasingly significant in light of the statewide increase in immigration enforcement actions within California communities. Recent public reporting, litigation, and community accounts have raised concerns regarding the use of racial profiling and broad, discretionary detentions by federal immigration enforcement agents, as well as concerns regarding the existence and adequacy of training for federal immigration enforcement personnel on implicit bias, deescalation, procedural justice, community trust, and constitutional policing. For an in-depth discussion regarding these issues please see the *RIPA 2027 Report Policies Section* at pgs. [REDACTED]. 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 POST SUBCOMMITTEE'S WORK DURING FIRST 10 YEARS

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

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

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 11. POST Training Courses Reviewed by the RIPA Board

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

A. Recommendations for POST

While the past ten RIPA Reports have focused on the individual courses reviewed and related recommendations for POST, several common themes have repeatedly emerged. The tenth anniversary of RIPA offers an opportunity to take stock of these recurring recommendations, examine patterns that have persisted over the past decade, and consider their implications for ongoing implementation, oversight, and future policy development.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

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

Training & Curriculum Content

Across multiple years, the RIPA Board consistently emphasized that POST training must be evidence-based, research-driven, and embedded across all relevant courses and not limited to standalone modules. 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 curriculum 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)**
Develop RIPA training with academic institutions and external experts (e.g., policing research centers) to improve rigor and relevance.
- **Focus on reducing discretionary bias in policing (2019)**
Include strategies to limit unguided discretion in stops and enforcement decisions.

Accountability & Officer Responsibility

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

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

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.

Measurement of Effectiveness of Training Outcomes

The RIPA Board has repeatedly stressed that POST must move beyond facilitator check lists of course objectives and satisfaction surveys by developing meaningful performance-based evaluation systems. The Board's recommendations support POST regulations requiring state testing to demonstrate competencies for all legislatively mandated programs.⁶ For example, the Board has recommended that POST:

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

Community Engagement, Transparency, and Governance

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

- **Integrate community participation in training development (2018, 2021)**
Community members should help design and, where appropriate, participate in training delivery.
- **Increase transparency in POST curriculum processes (2023, 2024)**
POST should publish training guidelines, certification processes, and development pathways publicly.

⁶ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 1081.

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

B. Recommendations for the Legislature

[TABLE OR INFOGRAPHIC WITH RECOMMENDATIONS TO LEGISLATURE FORTHCOMING]

III. POST FTP REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

Review Materials

The FTP Review was conducted using a comprehensive 381-page assembled by DOJ for the POST Subcommittee (“Section 6 Packet”). The packet included the three core FTP components under review, as well as a series of background materials intended to provide context for POST Subcommittee member evaluators:

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.

- (1) **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.
- (2) **Daily Observation Report (DOR) materials:** The DOR serves as the FTP’s primary daily evaluation instrument and requires FTOs to document trainee performance, observations, and progress throughout field training. The DOR includes narrative sections, performance ratings, and behavioral assessment categories intended to capture both technical and interpersonal aspects of trainee performance.
- (3) **Section 6 of the Field Training Program Manual, Volume II (“Community Relations/Professional Demeanor”):** Section 6 addresses topics related to professionalism, communication, community relations, cultural diversity, racial profiling, community-oriented policing, and crime prevention. Because these topics directly intersect with the RIPA Board’s statutory responsibilities concerning racial and identity profiling, Section 6 was identified by POST as the most relevant portion of the FTP for Board review. Accordingly, Section 6 is the primary focus of the FTP review.

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 Penal Code section 13519.4; 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;⁷ a consultant-prepared overview of the POST Basic Academy Course Instructional System; and excerpts from the 2026 RIPA Report discussing the FTP. These materials were intended to assist Board members in evaluating continuity, context, and alignment between Basic Academy instruction and field training. **See the Section 6 Packet at pg. _____.**

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

Review Instructions

To support consistency and clarity throughout the FTP Review process, DOJ and the DOJ consultants worked collaboratively with POST to develop instructional guidance for Board members participating in the FTP review. The instructional guidance emphasized that the Board’s review was narrowly focused on three specific FTP components: (1) the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs); (2) the Daily Observation Report (DOR) materials; and (3) Section 6 of the Field Training Program Manual, Volume II, entitled *Community Relations/Professional Demeanor*.

⁷ 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 June 2, 2026].

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

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

The guidance further clarified that Board members were evaluating Section 6 specifically and not the FTP in its entirety. This meant they were not evaluating instructional pedagogy, teaching methods, or the quality of training delivery by individual law enforcement agencies. Rather, the 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.⁸

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

Review Rubric

To facilitate a structured and consistent review process, the DOJ consultants developed a rubric that Board members used to evaluate the FTP's Section 6 materials. The rubric was designed to operationalize the Board's statutory and policy concerns into measurable review criteria and was organized around four primary dimensions: (1) compliance with the requirements of Penal Code section 13519.4, including the law's prohibition on racial and identity profiling; (2) continuity of content between academy and field training; (3) inclusion of core values such as procedural justice, equity, legitimacy, and respect; and (4) outcome-based training capable of producing observable officer behaviors. In developing the rubric, the consultants reviewed POST materials, relevant statutory requirements, prior RIPA reports, social science research, and best practices related to procedural justice, implicit bias, community trust, and police legitimacy. The consultants also spoke to POST and representatives from three law enforcement agencies to ensure the rubric was comprehensive and applicable to the course. The rubric was intended to provide a common framework for evaluating the written FTP materials while recognizing that the review did not assess how individual law enforcement agencies implement or supplement the FTP in practice. **See the FTP Review's Section 6 Rubric at pg. _____.**

Board members were directed to complete the rubric and finalize their written feedback by May 15, 2026, following completion of their independent review of the Section 6 Packet. In addition, the DOJ consultants prepared their own written report analyzing the FTP materials, summarizing key findings, and identifying recommendations related to Section 6, the Daily Observation Report, and the Standard Evaluation Guidelines. Together, the Board members' evaluations and consultants' analysis form the basis for the findings and recommendations contained in the following sections.

A. POST Subcommittee Members' FTP Review

Subcommittee members conducted their FTP Review using the rubric designed by the DOJ consultants to evaluate alignment with legal mandates, instructional continuity, core values, and

⁸ For more information about the guidance provided, please see the Appendix.

behavioral outcomes. As aforementioned, the reviewing Board members drew on multiple materials, including standardized evaluation guidelines and statutory requirements to assess whether the FTP adequately prepares trainees for real-world interactions with diverse communities.

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

General Observations Across All Dimensions

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

Dimension 1: Compliance with Penal Code 13519.4

General Observations

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

Instructional Clarity and Practical Application

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

Role of Field Training Officers (FTOs)

Board members expressed varying levels of confidence in FTO preparedness. Some Board members felt FTOs would be able to evaluate trainee understanding effectively because the materials provide sufficient foundational concepts and evaluation prompts related to community culture and history. Other Board members questioned whether FTOs 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.

Key Gaps Identified

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

Questions for POST

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

Dimension 2: Continuity of Content

General Observations

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

Alignment with Prior Training

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

Progression of Learning

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

Key Gaps Identified

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

Questions for POST

Board members requested additional information regarding 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

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

Representation of Values

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

Opportunities for Practice and Evaluation

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

Clarity of Expectations

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

Key Gaps Identified

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

Questions for POST

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

Dimension 4: Outcome-Based Training

General Observations

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

Clarity of Behavioral Expectations

Board members observed that certain expectations are clearly defined as behaviors, including respectful communication, avoidance of derogatory language, de-escalation, and objective behavioral-based policing. Members also noted that other expectations remain abstract and may

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.

be difficult to evaluate consistently in practice, including cultural responsiveness, procedural fairness, rapport-building, and appreciation of implicit bias.

Use of Evaluation Tools (Daily Observation Report)

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

Assessment of Key Competencies

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

Opportunities for Improvement

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

Key Gaps Identified

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

Questions for POST

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

B. POST Subcommittee Follow-Up Dialogue About Section 6

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

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

[SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FORTHCOMING]

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

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

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

- 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?*

[SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FORTHCOMING]

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?

[SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FORTHCOMING]

C. POST's Response to FTP Review Questions

POST Subcommittee Members also had the opportunity to review and discuss POST's written responses to their questions during the June 10, 2026 POST Subcommittee Meeting.

[SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FACILITATED BY DOJ ON POST'S WRITTEN RESPONSES FORTHCOMING]

D. DOJ Consultants' FTP Review

1. Purpose of the Expert Review

The DOJ consultants supported the Board's review of POST's Field Training Program (FTP), specifically the portions of the program that fall within the Board's statutory mandate related to racial and identity profiling under Penal Code section 13519.4. 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.

2. Methodology and Rubric Development

Sources Reviewed

To develop the rubric and conduct the Section 6 Review, the consultants reviewed:

- POST Field Training Program Guide, Volumes I and II;
- Section 6 (Community Relations/Professional Demeanor);
- The Daily Observation Report (DOR);
- Standardized Evaluation Guidelines (SEGs);
- Learning Domain 3 (Principled Policing in the Community);
- Learning Domain 42 (Cultural Diversity/Discrimination);
- Penal Code section 13519.4;
- Relevant excerpts from prior RIPA reports; and
- POST instructional guidance materials

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.

Outreach and Information Gathering

In addition to reviewing written materials, the consultants:

- Attended RIPA POST Subcommittee meetings;
- Conducted outreach with POST leadership;
- Met with three law enforcement agencies serving small, medium, and large jurisdictions;
- Consulted with DOJ staff; and
- Reviewed current research and best practices related to procedural justice, implicit bias, police legitimacy, and police-community relations.⁹

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.

3. Consultant Observations About FTP Structure

The consultants described the FTP as a highly influential phase of officer development because it functions as the transition point between classroom learning and real-world policing. The consultants characterized the FTP as a primary site where new officers learn organizational culture, policing norms, and behavioral expectations.

The consultants observed that:

- The POST-certified FTP relies heavily on the judgment and experience of individual FTOs.
- FTOs are expected to evaluate trainees using the DOR, which includes the SEGs, and contains 31 behaviors or competencies that are rated daily.
- 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.
- Only 1 of the 31 standard competencies in the DOR explicitly addresses relationships with citizens or the community (#6 Relationships with Citizens/Community). Consultants noted that category #3 (Integrity/Ethics) may involve relationships with citizens or community but it is nested under “Attitude” rather than “Performance.”
- The DOR does not contain explicit expectations related to equity, respect, empathy, procedural justice, de-escalation, and bias-free policing.
- Many agencies supplement POST materials with their own training, but the extent of that training varies by agency.
- The FTP materials establish statewide *minimum standards* rather than a comprehensive curriculum.

⁹ [Insert footnote defining these terms]

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 consultants emphasized that because the FTP establishes statewide baseline expectations, the written materials themselves play an important role in shaping policing culture and professional norms. [ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN MATERIALS AND BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE FTP STRUCTURE FORTHCOMING]

4. Overall Expert Assessment of Section 6

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

In their analysis, the consultants repeatedly emphasized that the FTP materials should provide more explicit instruction, clearer behavioral expectations, and stronger guidance related to:

- Racial and identity profiling;
- Implicit bias;
- Procedural justice;
- Cultural responsiveness;
- Community trust and legitimacy;
- De-escalation;
- Historical context; and
- Observable officer behaviors.

[DEFINITIONS OF TERMS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE TO FTP IN TABLE FORMAT FORTHCOMING]

In addition, the consultants 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 consultants viewed the FTP as an important opportunity to reinforce and operationalize those academy concepts through field-based practice and evaluation.

[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' OBSERVATIONS ABOUT LEARNING DOMAINS 3 AND 42 AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO FTP FORTHCOMING]

5. Major Themes from the Expert Review

Need for More Explicit Instruction on Racial and Identity Profiling

The consultants found that 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;

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 role of implicit bias in policing decisions;
- The broader institutional impact of disparities in policing; or
- The professional consequences associated with profiling.

The consultants also noted that Section 6 primarily uses the term “racial profiling” and does not consistently reference “identity profiling,” despite the language used in Penal Code section 13519.4.

The consultants therefore recommended:

- 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;
- Including discussion of the harms profiling causes to legitimacy and community trust;
- Expanding discussion of stop data collection and accountability systems; and
- Providing trainees with more concrete guidance regarding how profiling can occur in practice.

The consultants also emphasized that relying solely on “behavioral observations” does not fully resolve concerns regarding bias because perceptions of suspicious behavior may themselves be influenced by implicit bias. [ANALYSIS ON WHY EACH RECOMMENDATION IS IMPORTANT AND BOARD MEMBERS’ JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS’ OBSERVATION ON FTP NEEDING MORE EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION ON RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING FORTHCOMING]

Importance of Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and Community Trust

A central theme the consultants emphasized was that the FTP should more clearly communicate that policing effectiveness depends heavily on community trust, legitimacy, and respectful treatment.

The consultants noted that the written FTP materials emphasize professionalism and avoiding inappropriate behavior, but place less emphasis on: building trust; demonstrating fairness; respectful communication; community legitimacy; empathy; active listening; and procedural justice.

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

Given this disconnect, the consultants recommended that Section 6 incorporate more explicit references to: respect; cooperation; equity; legitimacy; procedural justice; community partnership; and de-escalation.

Lastly, the consultants emphasized that officers should not simply avoid misconduct, but instead should actively engage in behaviors that strengthen public trust and improve police-community relationships. [SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS’ JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: 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.

CONSULTANTS' PROCEDURAL JUSTICE, COMMUNITY TRUST, AND LEGITIMACY RECOMMENDATIONS FORTHCOMING]

Greater Integration of Culture, History, and Community Context

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

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

The consultants contrasted the limited treatment of culture in Section 6 with the more nuanced treatment in Learning Domain 42, which frames culture as dynamic, relational, and shaped by social and historical context. As a result, the consultants recommended:

- Integrating local community history into field training;
- Providing FTOs with guidance on evaluating cultural competency;
- Expanding discussion of historical harms and their continuing impacts;
- Combining discussions of culture and history rather than treating them separately; and
- Encouraging more meaningful engagement with communities.

[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' INTEGRATION OF COMMUNITY CONTEXT RECOMMENDATIONS FORTHCOMING]

Reliance on FTO Discretion and Lack of Standardized Guidance

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

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

The consultants recommended:

- Providing additional evaluator 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.

- Expanding behavioral examples and performance indicators;
- Enhancing evaluator training related to cultural competency and procedural justice;
- Improving calibration across FTOs; and
- Providing stronger behavioral anchors in the DOR and SEGs.

[ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS ON CONCEPTS IDENTIFIED BY CONSULTANTS AND BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FTO DISCRETION & LACK OF STANDARDIZED GUIDANCE FORTHCOMING]

Need for More Outcome-Based and Behavioral Evaluation

In addition, the consultants emphasized that concepts such as respect, fairness, empathy, and legitimacy should be translated into observable officer behaviors. They noted that many FTP competencies remain abstract and difficult to evaluate consistently. For example, the consultants found that:

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

The consultants recommended:

- Strengthening documentation guidance;
- Incorporating evidence-based communication practices into training and evaluation;
- Expanding behavioral expectations related to de-escalation and procedural justice;
- More explicitly evaluating community interaction skills; and
- Including clearer standards related to equity and legitimacy.

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

[SHORT ANALYSIS ON BOARD'S PRIOR RECOMMENDATION THAT POST ASSESS HOW TO EVALUATE WHETHER ITS TRAININGS ARE EFFECTIVE AND BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS ON NEED FOR MORE OUTCOME-BASED AND BEHAVIORAL EVALUATION FORTHCOMING]

Continuity Between Academy Instruction and Field Training

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

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

The consultants generally found strong foundational instruction within Learning Domains 3 and 42 and viewed those academy materials positively. The consultants described these academy materials as:

- Comprehensive;
- Research-informed;
- Nuanced;
- Historically grounded; and
- Explicit regarding procedural justice, implicit bias, and police-community relations.

The consultants concluded that Section 6 could do more to reinforce and operationalize those academy concepts during field training. They recommended:

- Greater alignment between academy instruction and field evaluation;
- More explicit references to Learning Domains 3 and 42;
- Continued reinforcement of implicit bias instruction;
- Expanded use of procedural justice concepts; and
- Greater emphasis on relationship-building and legitimacy throughout field training.

[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS' JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALIGNMENT BETWEEN ACADEMY & FTP FORTHCOMING]

6. Broader Conceptual Themes

The consultants emphasized several broad themes throughout their review of Section 6:

Field Training Shapes Police Culture

The consultants repeatedly characterized field training as one of the most influential stages in officer development because it socializes new officers into departmental culture and practical policing norms.¹⁰

Trust and Legitimacy Are Central to Effective Policing

The consultants framed community trust and police legitimacy as foundational to effective policing and public safety.¹¹

Equity Requires Both Individual and Institutional Accountability

The consultants emphasized that disparities in policing are not solely individual-level problems and may also arise from institutional practices, deployment patterns, discretionary systems, and broader organizational culture.¹² FTP outcomes therefore should emphasize individual and

¹⁰ [Insert Citations to Research]

¹¹ [Insert Citations to Research]

¹² [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.

systemic comprehension of racial and identity law and understanding of community and behaviors that cause and prevent discrimination during traffic or pedestrian stops.¹³

Behavioral Competence Must Include Interpersonal Skills

The consultants argued that communication, procedural fairness, de-escalation, empathy, and respectful treatment should be treated as core policing competencies rather than secondary or aspirational values.¹⁴

Written Standards Matter

Because agencies vary in how they implement training, the consultants stressed the importance of strong statewide *minimum standards* that clearly communicate expectations regarding racial and identity profiling, procedural justice, and community engagement.¹⁵

7. Overall Conclusion

The consultants concluded that the FTP provides an important framework for evaluating and training new officers, but that 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 consultants identified opportunities to strengthen:

- Instructional specificity;
- Behavioral expectations;
- Outcome-based evaluation;
- Integration of procedural justice and legitimacy;
- Discussion of implicit bias and profiling;
- Cultural and historical context;
- Evaluator guidance and consistency; and
- Alignment between academy training and field training.

The consultants also noted that Section 6 could help educate officers about the role and mandates of RIPA. They provided the following examples of how this could be done:

- Summarize efforts the agency is taking to build trust and practice respectful, equitable policing;
- Educate trainees about the specific obligations of peace officers in preventing, reporting and responding to discriminatory or biased practices by fellow peace officers; and

¹³ [Insert Citations to Research]

¹⁴ [Insert Citations to Research]

¹⁵ [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.

- Review what the agency’s current and historical stop data look like to educate young officers about any disparate local enforcement patterns and what steps the agency is taking to reduce any existing disparities.

Lastly, the consultants emphasized that the FTP represents a critical opportunity to shape policing culture at the beginning of an officer’s career and therefore plays an important role in advancing equitable, respectful, and trustworthy policing practices throughout California.

[SUMMARY OF BOARD MEMBERS’ JUNE 10TH DISCUSSION RE: CONSULTANTS’ CONCLUSIONS FORTHCOMING]

E. Recommendations for POST from RIPA Board

[RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POST’S FTP FROM RIPA BOARD IF DIFFERENT FROM CONSULTANTS’ AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATURE FORTHCOMING, IF ANY]

IV. AB 953 GUIDELINES REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Penal Code section 13519.4 instructs POST to “develop and disseminate” both “guidelines” and “trainings for all peace officers in California.”¹⁶ As that subdivision makes clear, the “course of instruction and the guidelines shall stress understanding and respect for racial, identity, and cultural differences, and development of effective, noncombative methods of carrying out law enforcement duties,” including the prohibition on racial and identity profiling as set forth in section 13519.4, subdivision (f). [EXPLANATION OF IMPORTANCE OF STANDALONE GUIDELINES FORTHCOMING]

A. Guidelines: RIPA and POST Background

In the 2023-2026 RIPA Reports, the RIPA Board consistently recommended that POST create and publish clear, standalone Guidelines (separate from training curricula) to ensure consistency, transparency, and compliance with California law.¹⁷

In August 2023, POST agreed to the Board’s recommendation to develop racial and identity profiling guidelines and included Board members in two workshops in May and October 2024. At the second workshop in October 2024, POST informed the subject matter experts and DOJ that the Guidelines would only serve as a template optional course for 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.”¹⁸ Certain RIPA Board Members raised concerns regarding the potential limited scope of the Guidelines and the lack of standardized application across all RIPA-related trainings.

¹⁶ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (a).

¹⁷ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (f).

¹⁸ [Insert citation]

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

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

B. Recent Developments

1. The POST Commission approved the AB 953 Guidelines in September 2025.
2. Since Subcommittee Co-Chairs attended AB 953 Guidelines workshops in 2024, they conducted initial review and presented their reflections at the March 12, 2026, subcommittee meeting.
 - a) Co-Chairs expressed concern approved AB 953 Guidelines may not apply to all POST RIPA-related trainings. BMs interpret such application as part of the legal mandate, which is why the RIPA Board has consistently recommended their broader application
3. On March 17, 2026, POST stated to DOJ that, “POST strongly feels that the Racial and Identity Profiling Guidelines are flexible to cover any type of training on this topic. In the introduction of the document [...] it states in the first sentence that they are for minimum training standards for conducting racial and identity profiling training courses. POST interprets that these guidelines can cover any course whether it’s four hours or not.”¹⁹

C. Guidelines POST Subcommittee Review

The Board believes these Guidelines on racial and identity profiling are an opportunity to align all law enforcement training to more effectively tackle barriers to eliminating racial and identity profiling by individual officers and law enforcement agencies. As such, the Board will be reviewing the Guidelines approved by the POST Commission in September 2025.

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

D. Guidelines Packet

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.

Background Materials

1. Excerpts and links to RIPA Course Guidelines-related discussions and/or recommendations in 2023-2026 RIPA Reports;

¹⁹ Email to Deputy Attorney General Marisol León from POST Legislative Liaison/Public Information Officer Meagan Poulos.

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.

2. Excerpts from the 2023 and 2024 POST Reports on Recommendations made by the RIPA Board related to RIPA Course Guidelines; and
3. Excerpts and links of POST Commission Discussions on RIPA Course Guidelines.

E. Written Feedback

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

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

V. VISIONS FOR FUTURE REPORTS

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