

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)
<https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board>

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 10, 2026 12:05 p.m. –2:28 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Ronaldo Villeda and Manju Kulkarni, and Members Wade Forde, Angela Sierra, Jose Alatorri and Rich Randolph

Board Members Absent: Members Sean Thuilliez and LaWanda Hawkins

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair called the meeting of the Stop Data Analysis Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Subcommittee member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 12, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Villeda asked if any Subcommittee members had any corrections, comments, or minor edits on the Draft March 17, 2026, Stop Data Meeting Minutes.

Co-Chair Villeda moved to approve the meeting minutes as is, which was seconded by Co-Chair Kulkarni. Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Marisol León took the roll call vote to approve the March 17, 2026, meeting minutes as is.

- **AYE:** Jose Alatorri, Wade Forde, Manju Kulkarni, Rich Randolph, Angela Sierra, Ronaldo Villeda
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** None

The motion passed with six ayes and no abstentions.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAG León stated the POST draft a consists of five sections:

1. The Introduction (Section I, p. 1);
2. An overview of the Subcommittee’s work during its first 10 years (Section II, p. 1-6);
3. The POST FTP review and recommendations (Section III, pp. 6-21);
4. The AB 953 guidelines review and recommendations (Section IV, pp. 21-23); and
5. Visions for Future Reports (Section V, p. 23).

DAG León pointed out that, consistent with the “Past/Present/Future” theme of this year’s RIPA Report, the POST Subcommittee has outlined some of the past Board recommendations to POST and to the California Legislature in Section II, pages 1-6 of the Chapter draft.

She then opened the floor to DOJ Staff Services Manager (SSM) I Aisha Martin-Walton.

SSM Martin-Walton informed the Subcommittee of the departure of Subcommittee Co-Chair Manju Kulkarni. SSM Martin-Walton noted that Co-Chair Kulkarni is an attorney and Executive Director of the AAPI Equity Alliance, a coalition of community-based organizations serving Asian and Pacific Islanders in Los Angeles County. Co-Chair Kulkarni was appointed to the

RIPA Board in 2021 by Former California Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon and served on the Policies Subcommittee, as Co-Chair of the former Calls for Service Subcommittee, and is currently serving as a Co-Chair of the POST Subcommittee. SSM Martin-Walton thanked Co-Chair Kulkarni for her guidance, leadership on the POST Subcommittee, and her contributions to the RIPA Board annual reports during her tenure. SSM Martin-Walton informed the Subcommittee that they will be electing a new co-chair at the next Subcommittee meeting in September.

SSM Martin-Walton then presented on the FTP Review. She stated that the DOJ contracted with two expert consultants to support the Board's review, 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. She noted that the consultants reviewed POST FTP materials and that their review 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.

SSM Martin-Walton noted that the consultants found that only 1 of 31 competencies directly address community relationships and that the DOR lacks explicit standards for: equity; respect; empathy; procedural justice; de-escalation; bias-free policing; existing references to culture and community are limited in scope; and reliance on behavioral observations may not fully address implicit bias concerns.

SSM Martin-Walton also shared some of the consultants' recommendations on profiling, trust, and community engagement:

1. Strengthen instruction on racial and identity profiling.
2. Reinstate explicit anti-profiling language.
3. Address harms to legitimacy and community trust.
4. Expand discussion of stop data, accountability, and bias prevention.
5. Increase emphasis on: Respect, Equity, Procedural Justice, Community Partnership, and De-escalation.

SSM Martin-Walton also shared that the consultants found that discussions of culture and history in the FTP's Section 6 are too narrow compared to the more comprehensive treatment provided in Basic Academy Learning Domain 42. They recommended incorporating local community history, historical harms, and ongoing impacts into field training. Because the FTP relies heavily on individual evaluators, the consultants also recommended strengthening FTO guidance and training to ensure more consistent evaluations statewide.

SSM Martin-Walton then provided a summary of the Subcommittees' feedback on Section 6 of the FTP. Subcommittee members requested clarification regarding how FTOs are trained to evaluate cultural competency, whether stop data reporting obligations are addressed elsewhere in the FTP outside of Section 6, and whether additional standardized tools or prompts are available to support consistent evaluation. She noted that the Subcommittee reviewers identified the following gaps:

1. Limited references to stop data collection requirements
2. Insufficient emphasis on implicit bias and the harms of profiling
3. Limited discussion of sexual orientation, gender identity, and hate crimes

4. Lack of clear behavioral guidance regarding culturally responsive interactions across diverse communities

SSM Martin-Walton then noted that reviewers also identified gaps such as limited reinforcement of implicit bias instruction, inconsistent treatment of sexual orientation and gender identity topics, and insufficient integration of contemporary community engagement practices. She also informed that POST Subcommittee 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.

SSM Martin-Walton then informed that reviewers found that core values were present but inconsistently operationalized and that they emphasized the importance of making values-based expectations observable and measurable. She also stated that the reviewers identified gaps such as 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. She noted that 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.

SSM Martin-Walton also reported that with regards to the DOR, reviewers recommended that it should incorporate additional evaluation methods, including community feedback, standardized evaluator calibration, and enhanced narrative documentation guidance. Reviewers also identified gaps such as inconsistent evaluator interpretation, limited specificity regarding behavioral outcomes, and insufficient incorporation of contemporary community engagement expectations. She noted that 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.

SSM Martin-Walton also reported on POST's responses to the Subcommittee's assessment of FTP materials. She informed that DOJ provided the Subcommittee's feedback to POST and POST's written responses will be incorporated into the next draft. The FTP Review Questions for POST were as follows:

- 1) **Compliance with Penal Code § 13519.4:** How are FTOs trained to evaluate cultural competency? Are stop data reporting obligations addressed elsewhere in the FTP? Are there additional standardized tools or prompts available to support consistent evaluation?
- 2) **Continuity of Content:** Are FTOs directed to use LD 3 and LD 42 during evaluations? Do more explicit continuity mechanisms exist between academy training, field training, and continuing professional training?
- 3) **Inclusion of Core Values:** How are values-based competencies calibrated across evaluators? Can stronger behavioral anchors or examples be incorporated into the DOR and evaluation standards?
- 4) **Outcome-Based Training:** How is evaluator consistency maintained across FTOs? Does POST intend to strengthen behavioral anchors, diversity-related performance standards, or documentation guidance in future revisions?

In its written response, POST explained that cultural competency and bias-free policing are already incorporated into FTO training through POST-approved FTO courses and recertification programs. FTOs receive instruction on procedural justice, cultural awareness, implicit bias, and statutory requirements under Penal Code 13519.4. They practice evaluating these concepts through scenarios and role-playing exercises. During

evaluations, FTOs are expected to assess whether trainees demonstrate respectful treatment, unbiased decision-making, and awareness of how their actions may affect public trust. Agencies may also capture these behaviors through performance dimensions such as community relations, professionalism, and ethics.

POST identified several tools that agencies can use to improve consistency in evaluating trainees. These include behaviorally anchored rating scales, standardized evaluation language, training checklists, and structured scenario rubrics. Agencies may also use audit and feedback systems to monitor DORs, stop-data reporting, and coaching practices. Regarding RIPA compliance, stop-data reporting is commonly taught during orientation, reinforced during patrol activities, and evaluated through documentation reviews and scenario-based assessments. FTOs are expected to verify that trainees properly complete required stop-data entries and understand reporting requirements.

POST clarified that while FTOs are expected to reinforce concepts taught in Learning Domains 3 and 42, there is no statewide requirement directing evaluators to explicitly use those learning domains during assessments. Continuity often depends on agency practices. POST identified several best practices, including curriculum mapping, common behavioral expectations, shared scenarios, and formal handoff information from academy training to field training. Agencies can also reinforce these competencies through Continued Professional Training to create a more consistent learning progression throughout an officer's career.

POST's overall position is that evaluator consistency is already supported through the Standardized Evaluation Guidelines and Daily Observation Reports. The agency noted that guidance for values-based competencies exists within current rating suggestions and emphasized that agencies have access to multiple tools to enhance evaluation consistency.

POST stated that it does not currently anticipate revisions to Section 6, the DOR, or related evaluation standards. As a result, many of the enhancements discussed by consultants and subcommittee members that we've heard about today remain opportunities for agencies to implement voluntarily rather than statewide requirements.

DAG León then noted that 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. In 2025, POST published the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines. After approving the Guidelines, POST clarified that: "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." 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. Unlike the FTP Packet that was 381 pages long, the RIPA Course Guidelines Review Packet is only 66 pages long. And like the FTP Packet, it consists of core materials and background materials.

DAG León acknowledged the amount of time and effort this Subcommittee has put into its FTP Review. She noted the Board Members are expected to answer four questions:

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

- training, and supervision; and
- 4) Include mechanisms to measure training outcomes.

DAG León shared with then Board that they have three weeks to complete their answers to these four questions which are due on or by July 1.

5. SECTION 6 FTP REVIEW DISCUSSION ON GUIDING QUESTIONS

Co-Chair Villeda reported that last year the POST Subcommittee identified three questions related to the FTP:

- 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?

Co-Chair Villeda asked whether the Subcommittee wanted to have this discussion and opened the floor for comment. Board Member Sierra noted it seems like there are some outstanding questions. She asked the Subcommittee to consider whether they need to know more about the FTOs, and the training that the FTOs receive. She also stated that in its written responses, POST referenced other materials such as FTO cue cards or other scenarios that might be available that would be helpful for the POST Subcommittee to see so they can understand how these standards are being implemented as part of trainees' evaluations. She stated that she would like some more information about how the FTOs are trained and what other materials they may have, referenced by POST. Member Sierra also reiterated that it would be valuable to learn a little bit more about the training the FTOs receive. DAG León stated that pages 182 through 185 of last year's report discussed the role of the FTO, the role of the FTO supervisor, and the kind of training they undergo.

Board Member Randolph also provided clarification on FTO training. He stated that there is an FTO class and that they have required FTO refreshers as part of the mandatory training throughout the year. He stated that could entail everything as far as just defensive tactics and basics, and multiple different learning domains that are thrown in during the Continuing Professional Training (CPT) and that it is a POST requirement statewide. He also noted that he understands AB 953 and loves what they are here for but informed that the FTO training is just one small component of the over 42 different other learning domains taught. He stated that as someone who has trained dozens of peace officers that are now serving throughout our state, it is a work in progress. He reminded the Subcommittee that racial discrimination and bias can be identified during the background process. He noted that if a peace officer is hired and goes through the academy, then the FTO provides them the tools and it is up to their supervisors to monitor them as they continue to serve our respectful communities.

Co-Chair Kulkarni noted that what they reviewed in terms of FTP materials are what POST uses, but that there are many law enforcement departments that do not use POST training materials. She stated that if that was an accurate statement, then determining the number of and percentage of entities that do not go through POST's FTP would be something for the Subcommittee to look at.

Second, Co-Chair Kulkarni stated that members of the POST Subcommittee attended one of the POST FTO trainings a couple of years ago, and they were quite surprised to find that there was a lack of foundational knowledge about RIPA. She stated that no one in that room outside of DOJ or members of the RIPA Board understood or knew that the data provided from stops is all anonymized. She asked that if FTOs themselves do not know that, then how is it that they are providing adequate and appropriate training to trainees?

Member Sierra stated that she would like more time to think about the Subcommittee's collective observations about the FTP materials. Member Randolph agreed. Member Randolph stated that he is glad they are having this conversation and recognizes that everyone has a job that takes time to learn. Member Randolph noted that he did not do the FTP Review homework and did not feel that it was necessary because he knew what he needed to do as a peace officer and expressed concerns about assignments about law enforcement training when some on the Subcommittee had not been through the training before.

DAG León informed the Subcommittee that a break was next on the agenda. She addressed comments made about the homework. She stated that since RIPA's enactment, the Subcommittee had reviewed a number of different courses over the last decade. She stated that because the FTP was so complex, the subcommittee made the decision to do a two-hear review and also hired consultants who are experts in their field to guide this committee in its review. She also wanted to point out that the subcommittee members and the RIPA Board as a whole, are here to represent specific government entities and organizations and all the work that they have been doing outside of these meetings is part of the responsibility they have as representatives of their constituents.

6. BREAK

After the break, quorum was reestablished and the Subcommittee moved to the next agenda item.

7. BOARD DISCUSSION RE: POST'S INITIAL RESPONSE TO SECTION 6 QUESTIONS

Co-Chair Villeda stated that there are two questions for the Subcommittee today. First, is there any additional information that would give the RIPA Board confidence that cultural competency is being evaluated consistently across agencies? And second, should POST establish more standardized statewide expectations for evaluating cultural competency or should agencies retain flexibility and implementation? He then opened the floor for discussion.

Member Sierra stated that there were a couple of places in the Section 6 materials that suggested officers could refer to Basic Academy learning domains. She recommended that the FTP provide explicit reference to Basic Academy materials, such as page numbers.

Co-Chair Kulkarni agreed that there is a need for greater training and emphasis on cultural competency. She stated that upon her review, one of the issues that came up for her is that there

seemed to be an underlying current that communities of color had a culture and that what the standard was is sort of cultureless rather than seeing every community having a culture. She stated that every person brings their own culture to their interaction with law enforcement, that law enforcement brings their own culture to the interaction, and that law enforcement itself is a culture.

As an example, she described a police interaction in Alabama in which an Indian American subject did not look officers in the eye because he was raised to not make eye contact with authority figures. The officers interpreted his behavior as defiance and then they violently beat him.

Member Randolph clarified a point made by Member Sierra. He mentioned that the trainings are within a binder that every FTO officer has. Therefore, if there are deficiencies, they can identify those patterns and then they make the correction. He also noted that new officers have a year-long probation. So they have a year to prove themselves and meet POST standards and the agency policies.

Co-Chair Villeda asked how many hours within the FTO course address RIPA-related content and how are FTOs tested on it. He asked if it is a rigorous test and they complete it like an evaluation or if it is more like credit obtained for attending a class. He asked the Subcommittee to consider whether POST should establish a more standardized statewide expectation for evaluating cultural competency. He recognized that agencies are given the flexibility to do more, in the sense of supplemental materials or additional trainings. However, he stated that if they were to raise the bar higher and make that the minimum, it could ensure more consistency across the state.

Co-Chair Villeda then noted that the POST written responses stated that stop data requirements are introduced during orientation and policy training. They are reinforced during field activities and evaluated through documentation and testing with FTOs who verify entries and coach on errors. He asked the Subcommittee to consider whether stop data reporting requirements should be more prominently incorporated into FTP standards or evaluation criteria. He asked them to consider what additional safeguards, if any, should the Subcommittee recommend to ensure consistent reporting practices among trainees.

Member Randolph stated that stop data is constantly going on. He stated that every time a peace officer has a contact, the officer has to complete their stop data that evening or after that call. It is constantly being handled and monitored. He continued, stating that stop data is constantly evolving and being cross-referenced. Depending on the size of the law enforcement organization, a Sergeant, a Captain, or a Commander will review the data at the end of the week. Moreover, Member Randolph noted there are policies that are instituted in all agencies throughout the state on their stop data. Member Randolph stated that it is a part of the policing component now in the state of California.

Co-Chair Villeda then asked Member Randolph whether he was saying that because he does not believe the data collection is explicitly broken out into the DOR, that it is just a requirement that gets subsumed in the aspect of daily officer duties.

Member Randolph stated that when a trainee completes an entry of stop data, it is reviewed by the FTO and a Sergeant, and then eventually it is sent off to DOJ. Therefore, yes, it would be

reflected in the DOR. Member Randolph then posed the question: Are you going to sign off on an FT on a trainee who keeps forgetting to do their stop data? Absolutely not. Because that is going to get you fired, right? Failure to follow the policies and procedures. Stop data is ingrained in our peace officers.

Member Randolph noted the Academy and POST is just a small part of it. He stated that the bigger part is in training. If a trainee is done with training and working the streets and did not do their stop data, sooner or later that's going to show up in an audit and get put back into training and further discipline.

Co-Chair Villeda agreed with Member Randolph that stop data is important and foundational but stated that it could be more uniform. He asked how they could incorporate the perception demographic data to understand how officers are approaching contact with community members.

Member Randolph noted that sometimes perceptions cannot be made before making contact. He stated that if you see a vehicle run the stop sign at 2:00 in the morning and you make contact with the driver that it would be difficult to identify their ethnicity because there are no streetlights and it is 2:00 a.m.

Co-Chair Villeda stated that POST identified six categories of tools available to support consistency: standardized DOR language, behavioral rating anchors, FTP checklist and sign off forms, FTO cue cards and prompts, scenario evaluation, rubrics, and audit and feedback mechanisms. He asked the Subcommittee four questions. First, he asked them to consider which of the tools identified by POST would provide the greatest benefit in improving evaluator consistency across agencies? Second, he asked whether mandatory checklist cue cards or evaluation rubrics can improve consistency without creating an unnecessary administrative burden? Third, he asked whether there are additional tools or resources the board could recommend to support FTOs in evaluating cultural competency and bias free policing? Last, he asked whether periodic audits of DORs and trainee evaluations should be encouraged or required to ensure consistency and quality control?

Member Sierra asked whether the Subcommittee had seen the FTO cue cards referenced in the scenario evaluation rubric. She stated that it would be difficult to comment on them without seeing. She stated that it would be helpful for the Subcommittee to look at them if they are going to be making any kind of recommendations about some additional tools.

When asked whether cue cards were shared with the Subcommittee, DAG León stated that POST has not because they are agency-specific. She stated that POST used it as an example of what agencies can do and noted that one agency can have a certain type of cue card system and a neighboring agency can have a different one. She stated that she can ask POST if they have examples of these and share them with the Subcommittee.

Co-Chair Kulkarni thanked DAG León and stated that every agency having different tools would make it harder for the POST Subcommittee to assess the FTP Section 6. She asked how they would make recommendations across the board when some are using X tools, others are using Y tools, and there's no clear sense of the universe of tools available. She stated that because of this, periodic audits and training evaluations should be encouraged to ensure consistency and quality control.

Member Randolph stated that POST already conducts random audits throughout the state. All

law enforcement agencies have to go through audits. So that includes making sure training standards are being met, and these audits include the FTP program.

Member Sierra also emphasized that the Subcommittee does not know what additional tools other agencies are using. She stated that it may not be a one-size fits all approach, but the fact that some agencies are using these additional tools could be an area to explore. She asked how these tools could be integrated in a way that is beneficial to a training officer.

Co-Chair Villeda asked the Subcommittee whether a mandatory checklist of cue cards or evaluation rubrics across the state should be recommended. He stated that if they were to mandate it, it would give the Subcommittee something to consistently review to see how the FTP training is being implemented.

He also asked whether FTOs should be explicitly directed to reference concepts from LD 3 and LD 42 during evaluations. For reference, Co-Chair Villeda stated that continuity occurs primarily through the SEGS and DORs. Co-Chair Villeda stated that FTOs should be explicitly directed to reference LD 3 and LD 42 during evaluations and that it is important to have that integrated within the training.

Member Sierra noted there's a lot of good content in LD 3 and 42, and there are some references to them in the Section 6 FTP materials. Like Co-Chair Villeda, she noted that making these references more explicit would be helpful.

8. BOARD DISCUSSION OF THE 2027 REPORT DRAFT

Co-Chair Villeda initiated the board discussion of the 2027 report. The consultants highlighted the need for more explicit instruction on racial and identity profiling, for instance, incorporating more direct references to racial and identity profiling throughout Section 6, more explicit language previously contained in Section 6.4.01 regarding the prohibition against profiling, including discussion of 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 FTP should more clearly communicate that policing effectiveness depends highly on community trust, legitimacy and respectful treatment.

Co-Chair Villeda also noted the consultants recommended that Section 6 incorporate more explicit references to respect, cooperation, equity, legitimacy, procedural justice, community partnership, and de-escalation. While the consultants found that Section 6 includes reference to community, community culture and community history, they noted those concepts are treated too narrowly without sufficient context.

Member Forde noted that when we use the language of respect, one of the things that was already mentioned, by board member Kulkarni who used the example in Alabama. was that respect looks different depending on the cultural values, perspectives, world view, etcetera, of an individual. Reinforcing and unpacking what respect is, is critically important because we all come to it from different experiences based on our own nature.

Member Randolph then posed a question for the Department of Justice. He asked DAG León about the Board homework assignments and wanted clarification as to who completed the FTP review—whether it was just members representing community-based organizations that

completed the homework.

DAG León clarified that representatives from law enforcement—peace officers—who are members of the POST Subcommittee did their homework and filled out their FTP Review rubric. She noted that Board feedback is always represented as one entity, and the individual identity of board members is always kept anonymous. She further explained that's why DOJ did not attribute certain answers to certain board members.

Member Randolph then asked if community-based organizations would be identified in the report—the ones that completed the rubric?

DAG León then further clarified that by community-based organizations, she meant the community-based organizations that, for instance, Co-Chair Kulkarni represents as a member of the Board. She is an appointee that represents a specific constituency.

Member Randolph then noted that during prior meetings, board members had expressed interest in doing ride-alongs. He asked DOJ what was being done since he had expressed willingness to assist.

DAG León thanked Member Randolph for his willingness to assist and noted that one Board Member was in conversations with Long Beach PD to do a ride along. Any other subcommittee member interested in doing a ride along can reach out to DOJ. DAG León emphasized ride alongs are not being organized by the DOJ. She noted their limited role was putting people in touch with the right law enforcement agencies.

Member Sierra then noted that the draft could be strengthened with concrete examples to provide more context.

DAG León asked the committee if they were interested in having the consultants come to the next subcommittee meeting to answer questions and engage in a dialogue.

Member Sierra stated she thought it would be helpful. Co-Chair Villeda agreed.

Co-Chair Kulkarni also agreed and supported the idea to provide more concrete examples in the draft. She then expressed her gratitude to her fellow board members, the DOJ staff, and community members who join us at all of our meetings.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Michelle Wittig stated that it was her understanding that the Race Implicit Association test is officially recommended by POST to be included in mandatory coursework and that Project Implicit has been the online source of that race Implicit Association Test (IAT) for over 25 years. She stated it is less well known that the IAT is weak as a predictor of biased behavior, although it has been known within academic circles for at least 15 years. Yet the race IAT is too often used as if it's a measure of implicit racial bias.

She informed that IAT stands for an Implicit Association Test, not Implicit Bias Test because the test rests on a simple assumption: if reaction times in favor of white and good, Black and bad, are faster than reaction times to things like Black and good or white and bad, a person is implicitly shown to be biased favoring white people. However, there's no compelling evidence that reaction time differences map onto biased behavior toward Black people.

She stated that it may be a problem because it may be measuring simple knowledge of American culture that is filled with racial stereotypes that associate Black people with negative attributes. She continued and noted that mere awareness of these stereotypes might influence IAT scores even if people hold favorable attitudes towards black people or African Americans as a group. She stated that even African Americans are aware of these stereotypes, and their responses could be influenced by these association.

She closed by stating that the bottom line is we should not allow the IAT to encourage us to make judgments about implicit bias in the absence of correlation with actual behavior.

Hearing no additional comment, Co-Chair Villeda then moved to the next agenda item.

10. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Villeda asked the Subcommittee to please submit feedback to DOJ on the draft section of the report and that the consultants and POST will be invited to the next Subcommittee meeting.

11. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Villeda thanked everyone for their participation and ended the meeting.