

COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

Thursday, December 11, 2025

5:00pm – 6:00pm

TRAINING STANDING COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Procopio Towers
525 B St., 17th Floor, Suite 1725
San Diego, CA 92101**

The link to join the meeting by computer, tablet, or smartphone at 5:00pm is:

Microsoft Teams Link: [MICROSOFT TEAMS LINK](#)

Meeting ID: 289 711 145 174 3

Passcode: Z6Aa6jv7

**Downloading the latest version of Microsoft Teams is required.*

The Commission on Police Practices (Commission) meetings will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 54953 (a), as amended by Assembly Bill 2249.

The Commission Standing Committee meetings will be in person and the meeting will be open for in-person testimony. Additionally, we are continuing to provide alternatives to in-person attendance for participating in our meetings. In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may also participate via telephone/Teams.

I. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME (Chair Mulmat)

II. ROLL CALL (CPP Investigator Waterman)

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. October 16, 2025 Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes

NON-AGENDA REPORTS FROM CHAIR MULMAT AND CHIEF INVESTIGATOR GOLUB

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Implementing Implicit Bias Training

[John Alden Presentation to Richmond, CA](#), runtimes 00:37:00-00:44:06 and 03:10:00-03:59:00.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Case Review Reference Sheet
- B. Reference Sheets for POST, RIPA, and Clear Act
- C. Peace Officer Bill of Rights and Reporting Requirements Trainings
- D. Inside SDPD/Ridealongs

VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

VII. NEXT MEETING – TBD

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Materials Provided:

- October 16, 2025 Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes
- Implementing Implicit Bias Training (Attachment)
- Case Review Reference Sheet (Attachment)
- Reference Sheets for POST, RIPA, and CLEAR Act (Attachment)

In-Person Public Comment on an Agenda Item: If you wish to address the CPP Standing Committee on an item on today's agenda, please complete and submit a speaker slip before the Committee hears the agenda item. You will be called at the time the item is heard. Each speaker must file a speaker slip with the CPP staff at the meeting at which the speaker wishes to speak indicating which item they wish to speak on. Speaker slips may not be turned in prior to the day of the meeting or after completion of in-person testimony. In-person public comment will conclude before virtual testimony begins. Each speaker who wishes to address the Committee must state who they are representing if they represent an organization or another person.

For discussion and information items each speaker may speak for up to three (3) minutes, subject to the Committee Chair's determination of the time available for meeting management purposes, in addition to any time ceded by other members of the public who are present at the meeting and have submitted a speaker slip ceding their time. These speaker slips should be submitted together at one time to the designated CPP staff. The Committee Chair may also limit organized group presentations of five or more people to 15 minutes or less.

In-Person Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: You may address the Standing Committee on any matter not listed on today's agenda. Please complete and submit a speaker slip. However, California's open meeting laws do not permit the Standing Committee to discuss or take any action on the matter at today's meeting. At its discretion, the Standing Committee may add the item to a future meeting agenda or refer the matter to the CPP. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. At the discretion of the Committee Chair, if a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comments may be limited to a set period of time per item to appropriately manage the meeting and ensure the Standing Committee has time to consider all the agenda items. A member of the public may only provide one comment per agenda item. In-person public comment on items not on the agenda will conclude before virtual testimony

begins.

Speakers may not allocate their time to other speakers. If there are eight or more speakers on a single issue, the maximum time for the issue will be 16 minutes. The order of speaking generally will be determined on a first-come, first-served basis. A member of the public may only provide one non-agenda comment per agenda.

We welcome all viewpoints and encourage open participation. However, to ensure everyone has a chance to be heard and that we can complete our work, we ask that speakers respect time limits and refrain from disruptive behavior. Continued disruption after warning may result in removal as permitted under state law.

Virtual Platform Public Comment to a Particular Item or Matters Not on the Agenda: When the item you would like to comment on is introduced (or it is indicated that it is time for Non-Agenda Public Comment), raise your hand by tapping on the “Raise Your Hand” button on your computer or tablet. To raise your hand in a Microsoft Teams meeting on your smartphone (iOS or Android), tap the three-dot menu, then select the "Raise Hand" option. You will be taken in the order in which you raised your hand. You may only speak once on a particular item. When it is indicated that it is your turn to speak, click the unmute prompt that will appear on your computer, tablet or Smartphone.

Written Comment through Webform: Comment on agenda items and non-agenda public comment may also be submitted using the [webform](#). If using the webform, indicate the agenda item number you wish to submit a comment for. All webform comments are limited to 400 words. On the [webform](#), members of the public should select Commission on Police Practices (even if the public comment is for a Commission on Police Practices Committee meeting).

The public may attend a meeting when scheduled by following the attendee meeting link provided above. To view a meeting archive video, click [here](#). Video footage of each Commission meeting is posted online [here](#) within 72 hours of the conclusion of the meeting.

Comments received no later than 8 am the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices. Comments received after the deadline described above but before the item is called will be submitted into the written record for the relevant item.

Written Materials: You may alternatively submit via U.S. Mail to Attn: Office of the Commission on Police Practices, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Materials submitted via U.S. Mail must be received the business day prior to the meeting to be distributed to the Standing Committee.

If you attach any documents to your comment, they will be distributed to the Standing Committee in accordance with the deadlines described above.

Late-Arriving Materials

This paragraph relates to those documents received after the agenda is publicly noticed and during the 72 hours prior to the start of, or during, the meeting. Pursuant to the Brown Act, (California Government Code Section 54957.5(b)) late-arriving documents, related to the Commission on Police Practices’

(“CPP”) meeting agenda items, which are distributed to the legislative body prior to and/or during the CPP meeting are available for public review by appointment in the Office of the CPP located at Procopio Towers, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Appointments for public review may be made by calling (619) 533-5304 and coordinating with CPP staff before visiting the office. Late-arriving documents may also be obtained by email request to CPP staff

at commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov . Late-arriving materials received prior to the CPP meeting will also be available for review, at the CPP public meeting, by making a verbal request of CPP staff located in the CPP meeting. Late-arriving materials received during the CPP meeting will be available for reviewing the following workday at the CPP offices noted above or by email request to CPP staff.

Access for People with Disabilities: As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests for agenda information to be made available in alternative formats, and any requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by contacting the Commission at (619) 236-6296 or commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov.

Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodation required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for auxiliary aids, services, or interpreters require different lead times, ranging from five business days to two weeks. Please keep this in mind and provide as much advance notice as possible to ensure availability. The city is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly.

Commission on Police Practices

**COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES
TRAINING STANDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, October 16, 2025
5:30pm-6:30pm**

**Procopio Towers
17th Floor, Suite 1725
San Diego, CA 92101**

Click <https://youtu.be/DjeKQ4QjXGY> to view this meeting on YouTube.

CPP Committee Members Present:

Committee Chair Darlanne Mulmat
1st Vice Chair Bonnie Benitez
Armando Flores

Excused:

Stephen Chatzky
Elizabeth Inpyn

Absent:

None

CPP Staff Present:

Ethan Waterman, CPP Investigator
Olga Golub, Chief Investigator (Virtual)
Ching-Yun Li, CPP Investigator (Virtual)
Yasmeen Obeid, Community Engagement Coordinator (Virtual)

- I. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME: Committee Chair Mulmat called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.
- II. ROLL CALL: CPP Investigator Waterman conducted the roll call for the committee and established quorum.
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 1. December 5, 2024 Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes
Motion: Commissioner Flores moved to approve the CPP Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes of December 5, 2024. 1st Vice Chair Benitez seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 3-0-0.
Yeas: Benitez, Flores, Mulmat
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
 2. September 4, 2025 Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes
Motion: Commissioner Flores moved to approve the CPP Training Standing Committee Meeting Minutes of September 4, 2025. 1st Vice Chair Benitez seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 3-0-0.
Yeas: Benitez, Flores, Mulmat
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
- IV. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT – None
- V. CHAIR REPORT (*Timestamp 1:38*)
 1. **Inside San Diego PD Event:** Committee Chair Mulmat updated the committee on the Inside SDPD event scheduled for November 8th. Commissioners Benitez and Flores, as well as CPP Investigators Li and Waterman, are scheduled to attend. Policy Manager Burgess has recently attended similar events.
 2. **Mentorship Program Update:** Provided an update on the mentorship program, noting that three mentors have shown interest and one mentee has signed up. Follow-up with the other two mentors is still needed.
 3. **Training on Acronyms:** Discussed the need for training on various acronyms such as POST, RIPA, and CLEAR. Mentioned recent training sessions and the need to create reference materials for Commissioners.
- VI. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORT (*Timestamp 10:14*)
 1. **Training on Reporting Requirements:** CPP Investigator Waterman mentioned that Interim Executive Director Miesfeld does not have the capacity to conduct lecture-style trainings on reporting requirements for the rest of the year. This will be reassessed in Q1 of the next calendar year.
 2. **SDPD Vehicle Pursuit Training:** CPP Investigator Waterman is waiting on materials from Lyndsay Winkley regarding SDPD vehicle pursuit training. He will follow up with her.
 3. **Community Ride-Along Proposal:** Community Engagement Coordinator Obeid has prepared a proposal for community ride-alongs. CPP Investigator Waterman suggested that if the committee is comfortable with it, they can start reaching out to community groups to move forward with the proposal.
 4. **Community Organization Presentations:** The committee discussed inviting

community organizations to present at open meetings to educate Commissioners about their work and how it relates to the CPP. Community Engagement Coordinator Obeid has already identified and reached out to these organizations.

5. **Orientation Trainings:** Commissioner Case and Interim Executive Director Miesfeld presented orientation trainings on bylaws, parliamentary procedure, and the Brown Act to new Commissioners. These sessions were successful and have been added to SuccessFactors for review.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Determining Scope of Implicit Bias Training (*Timestamp 37:50*)

1. **Objective:** The committee aims to increase awareness and understanding of Implicit Bias among Commissioners, focusing on how it affects their perspectives and decision-making processes.
2. **Training Options:** Various options were discussed, including free online resources, self-paced courses, and potentially contracting with an external expert for more intensive training.
3. **Existing Resources:** The committee considered reaching out to the Department of Racial Justice and Equity (now part of HR) to access existing Implicit Bias training materials.
4. **Action Plan:** Commissioner Flores volunteered to compile a list of free and low-cost Implicit Bias training resources, prioritize them, and make them available to Commissioners.

B. Establishing Introductory Case Review Training for New Commissioners (*Timestamp 52:29*)

1. **Overview:** The committee discussed the implementation of the Case Review training for new Commissioners to help them understand the Case Review process and related procedures.
2. **Proposed Training:** CPP Chief Investigator Golub will set up a presentation on the Case Review process, which will include an overview of how IA works, the difference between CATI and CATII cases, and the definitions of various case outcomes (e.g., Sustained, Not Sustained).
3. **Timing:** The training will be scheduled after the Commission votes on the proposal from the ad hoc Case Review Committee to ensure any changes are incorporated.
4. **Format:** The training may be conducted similarly to the recent bylaws and Brown Act training, with a presentation followed by a Q&A session. This session will be recorded and made available on SuccessFactors for future reference.

C. Creating Implementation Roadmap for Training Academies (*Timestamp 55:48*)

1. **Structure:** The Case Review training will be divided into basic (101) and advanced (102) modules.
2. **Timeline:** The goal is to complete the basic modules within the first two years of a new Commissioner's term. This timeline is designed to be achievable given the current staff capacity.
3. **Content Development:** Staff will create training materials for the basic modules, leveraging existing resources where possible. Some advanced topics may require external experts.
4. **Reference Materials:** Quick reference guides will be developed to support Commissioners during case reviews, providing essential information on key topics.

Action Items:

- **Mentorship Program Follow-Up:** Follow up with the remaining two mentors to confirm their participation in the mentorship program. (CPP Investigator Waterman)
- **Training on Acronyms:** Research and report back on the training available for POST, RIPA, and CLEAR acronyms. (1st Vice Chair Benitez)
- **Community Organization Presentations:** Identify and invite various community organizations to present at open meetings about their work and its relevance to the Commission. (Community Engagement Coordinator Obeid)
- **Implicit Bias Training:** Compile a list of free and low-cost Implicit Bias training resources, prioritize them, and make them available to Commissioners. (Commissioner Flores)
- **HR Training Inquiry:** Reach out to HR to inquire about available Implicit Bias training materials and access to SuccessFactors. (Commissioner Flores)
- **Case Review Process Presentation:** Set up a presentation on the Case Review process after the Commission votes on the ad hoc Case Review committee's proposal. (CPP Chief Investigator Golub)
- **Reference Materials for Case Review:** Create and distribute quick reference materials for Commissioners on key Case Review topics such as Sustained vs. Not Sustained and Use of Force. (CPP Investigator Waterman)

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS – None

IX. NEXT MEETING – The next meeting will be on December 11th, 2025 at 5:00pm.

X. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 6:22pm.

Commission on Police Practices Case Review Reference Sheet

Case Review Guidelines

Fair and impartial review of the available evidence.

Review should be based solely on the evidence referenced in IA Report and information known to subject officers at the time of the incident.

Ensure that all allegations are included and addressed.

Check thoroughness of IA investigations (e.g., all reasonable efforts to interview parties and obtain evidence have been exhausted; all policy violations are addressed):

- Inconsistencies in the evidence addressed?
- Interview questions appropriate?
- Legal/policy citations relevant and correct? Is analysis appropriately based on those citations?
- Are any relevant facts ignored or misrepresented?
- Did IA provide CPP with all materials that IA reviewed in making their finding(s)?
- Were all policy violations addressed?
- Were all allegations made by complainant addressed?

Category I complaints involve allegations which SDPD considers to be more serious:

- Force
- Arrest
- Discrimination
- Criminal conduct
- Detention
- Search

These complaints are investigated by detective sergeants assigned to Internal Affairs and undergo review by ranking officers in their unit.

Category II complaints involve allegations which SDPD considers to be less serious:

- Courtesy
- Procedure
- Conduct
- Service
- Other

Generally, these complaints are investigated at the Division-level; a supervisor in the subject officer's unit investigates the complaint and forwards the findings to the commanding officer of the unit, who then ultimately forwards the completed investigation to IA for approval. IA also has the authority to investigate Category II complaints when there are also

Category I allegations, personnel from more than one division are involved, and/or the investigation would be too time-consuming for field supervisors at the division-level.

Preponderance of the Evidence – burden of proof in IA administrative investigations and CPP case reviews. Preponderance of the evidence means more likely than not (>50%).

SDPD Investigation Findings for Category I and II Complaints:

1. **Sustained:** The SDPD officer committed all or part of the alleged conduct, and the conduct was out of policy or unlawful.
2. **Not Sustained:** The investigation produced insufficient information to clearly prove or disprove the allegations.
3. **Exonerated:** The alleged act occurred but was justified, legal and proper, or was within policy.
4. **Unfounded:** The alleged conduct did not occur.
5. **Other Finding:** The investigation revealed violations of Department policies/procedures not alleged in the complaint.

CPP Recommendations:

1. **Agree with IA Findings:** CPP agrees with IA findings.
2. **Agree with IA Findings with Comment:** CPP agrees with IA findings and additional information from the case review should be noted (comments may include, but are not limited to, the appropriateness of the tactics employed by the subject officer).
3. **Disagree with IA Findings with Comment:** CPP disagrees with IA finding ((comments should explain the disagreement and note the recommended finding for IA).

Layers of OIS/ICD Review

1. San Diego Sheriff's Office or Chula Vista PD conduct criminal investigation into SDPD OIS/ICD
2. District Attorney determines whether officers bear criminal liability (usually, based on Penal Code 835a)
 - a. If yes, they prosecute officer
 - b. If no, they forward case to SDPD IA
3. SDPD IA conducts administrative investigation to determine whether officers violated policy
4. CPP reviews SDPD IA administrative investigation

SDPD Investigation Findings for officer-involved shooting (OIS) and in-custody death (ICD) investigations:

- **Within Policy:** The officer's conduct was justified, legal and proper, or was within policy (similar to Exonerated).
- **Not Within Policy:** The officer's conduct was out of policy or unlawful (similar to Sustained).

Typical Evidence in IA Case Files

1. Original complaint
2. Police Officer reports
 - a. Arrest reports
 - b. A-9 reports
 - c. Field interview report
 - d. Citations
3. Criminal history
4. BWC footage
5. Surveillance footage
6. Video recordings made by complainants, witnesses, observers
7. 911 call and radio communications
8. EVENT/CAD information
9. Interview audio recordings
10. Maps
11. Homicide Book (for OIS and ICD investigations)

Examples of Group Concerns

- Policy/procedure violations that occurred but were not addressed in IA investigation
- Observations about incident/conduct that do not necessarily relate to allegations
- Recommendations to the Department related to the incident
- Recommendations to one of the Commission Committees to look at specific Department policies that may need to be revised, created or clarified
- Observations of reoccurring patterns
- Suggestions for handling similar investigations in the future

SDPD Discipline Memo Review

- CPP receives Discipline Memorandum from SDPD after discipline is administered to officer
- CPP reviews the discipline imposed, the original incident, and the SDPD Discipline Manual and makes two determinations:
 - Reported discipline is consistent with the SDPD Misconduct Discipline Matrix: **Agree/Disagree**
 - Discipline imposed is appropriate: **Agree/Disagree**

Overview of CLEAR (California Law Enforcement Accountability Reform) Act

I. Background and History

The California CLEAR Act (SB 16, 2021), formally titled the California Law Enforcement Accountability Reform Act, expanded public access to police records, strengthened mandatory disclosure requirements, and increased transparency surrounding officer misconduct. The Act builds on SB 1421 (2018), which first opened certain police personnel records to public inspection, and forms part of a broader legislative effort that includes SB 2 (2021) to improve statewide accountability.

SB 16 was enacted in response to long-standing concerns about inconsistent disclosure practices, incomplete release of sustained misconduct findings, and significant delays in public access to police records. The Legislature found that transparency is essential for maintaining public trust, evaluating agency performance, and supporting oversight bodies.

The CLEAR Act took effect on January 1, 2022, and applies to all law enforcement agencies in California.

Citations

- SB 16 statutory text (amending Penal Code §§ 832.7 and 832.8): <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>
- CA Senate Floor Analysis (SB 16, 2021): <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>
- Prior transparency statute SB 1421 (2018): Penal Code §§ 832.7–832.8

II. Purpose and Authority

The CLEAR Act establishes expanded statewide requirements for the disclosure, retention, and public release of records involving peace officer conduct.

Its statutory authority includes:

1. Expansion of Categories of Disclosable Records

SB 16 added new categories of records subject to public release, including:

- Sustained findings of unreasonable or excessive force
- Sustained findings of failure to intervene
- Sustained findings of unlawful arrests or unlawful searches
- Records relating to discriminatory or biased conduct
- Records relating to use of force resulting in significant injury

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(1)(A)–(E)

2. Mandatory Release Timelines and Narrowed Exceptions

Agencies must release responsive records within statutory deadlines and may withhold

only in limited circumstances such as active criminal investigations, subject to strict time limits.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7)

3. **Five-Year Retroactive Disclosure Requirement**

SB 16 requires agencies to disclose records created on or after January 1, 2017, expanding public access to historical files.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(4)

4. **Prohibition on Destroying Misconduct Records**

Agencies must retain records of officer shootings, major force incidents, and sustained misconduct for a minimum of **15 years**.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.5(b)

5. **Mandatory Disclosure of All Complaints Related to Biased Conduct**

SB 16 requires disclosure of all complaints, sustained or not, involving discriminatory or biased behavior.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(1)(C)

6. **Costs and Redaction Requirements**

Agencies may recover only narrowly defined duplication costs and must provide detailed justification for any redaction.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)-(6)

III. CLEAR Act's Role in Police Accountability

The CLEAR Act strengthens statewide accountability by increasing the availability and reliability of information about officer conduct.

1. **Enhanced Public Access to Misconduct Records**

SB 16 makes more categories of misconduct available to the public, including bias, unlawful arrests, and constitutional violations.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(1)

2. **Improved Oversight and Independent Review**

Transparency requirements assist oversight bodies in evaluating conduct, identifying trends, and assessing compliance with agency policies.

3. **Standardized Record Retention**

Mandatory 15-year retention ensures accountability even when officers move between agencies or when misconduct surfaces later in time.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.5(b)

4. **Timely Disclosure Requirements**

The Act narrows the conditions under which agencies may delay releasing records and places firm limits on extensions, which promotes timely oversight and public confidence.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7)

5. **Expanded Data Available for Pattern and Practice Review**

The public release of historical and current records supports investigations by oversight agencies, researchers, and civil rights entities.

IV. CLEAR Act and Oversight Agencies

The CLEAR Act does not grant independent investigative or disciplinary authority to civilian oversight bodies. Instead, it supports oversight by:

- Requiring agencies to disclose records needed for investigations, audits, or compliance reviews
- Providing commissioners access to sustained findings of serious misconduct that may indicate systemic issues
- Ensuring that discriminatory, biased, or unconstitutional conduct cannot be shielded by confidentiality
- Establishing minimum retention standards for records relevant to long-term oversight
- Improving the completeness and reliability of public records available for policy analysis

Agencies may not use confidentiality statutes or local bargaining agreements to limit CLEAR Act disclosures.

Citation: Penal Code § 832.7(a)

V. Why the CLEAR Act Matters to the CPP

Understanding the CLEAR Act helps commissioners:

1. Access expanded categories of police misconduct records
2. Identify patterns of force, bias, or constitutional violations
3. Hold agencies accountable for timely and complete record release
4. Clarify which records may be reviewed during oversight investigations
5. Ensure agencies adhere to state record retention and disclosure laws
6. Strengthen transparency and public trust through reliable information

The CLEAR Act is a core component of California's modern police accountability system and works in tandem with POST (training and certification) and RIPA (data reporting) to strengthen statewide transparency.

Overview of POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training)

I. Background and History

The California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) was established in 1959 through enabling legislation that authorized the state to create minimum standards for the recruitment and training of peace officers. Prior to the creation of POST, training practices varied widely across agencies and there was no statewide structure for ensuring consistent standards or professionalism across law enforcement.

The Legislature created POST to improve officer preparedness, enhance the quality of training, and standardize expectations across all California law enforcement agencies. POST's responsibilities expanded over time to include certification of officers and academies, development of state curriculum, and oversight of compliance. A significant expansion occurred with Senate Bill 2 in 2021, effective January 2023, which assigned POST statewide responsibility for reviewing serious misconduct and decertifying officers.

POST is governed by a 15-member commission appointed by the Governor. Commissioners include law enforcement executives, local government representatives, educators, and public members.

Citations

- POST enabling statutes: Penal Code §§ 13500–13553: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>
- POST Commission membership: <https://post.ca.gov/POST-Commission>

II. Purpose and Authority

POST's statutory mandate is to establish, maintain, and enforce minimum statewide standards for the selection, training, certification, and professional conduct of peace officers and dispatchers.

Its authority includes:

1. Officer Selection Standards

POST develops minimum selection requirements for entry-level peace officers, including background investigations, psychological evaluations, medical screenings, and moral character standards.

Citation: Penal Code § 13510; Gov. Code § 1031; POST Selection Manual:

<https://post.ca.gov/peace-officer-selection-requirements-faqs>

<https://post.ca.gov/peace-officer-candidate-selection-standards>

2. Academy Training Standards and Curriculum Development

POST creates and updates the Regular Basic Course (police academy curriculum) as well as field training standards, advanced officer courses, and instructor certification requirements.

Citations:

- Penal Code §§ 13503, 13506

- POST Training Resources: <https://post.ca.gov/Training>
 - POST Learning Domain Guidelines: <https://post.ca.gov/regular-basic-course>
3. **Certification of Officers, Academies, and Presenters**
POST certifies training academies, approves training presenters, and issues professional certificates to individual officers based on education, training, and experience.
Citation: Penal Code § 13510.1
Officer Certification Overview: <https://post.ca.gov/Certification>
 4. **Decertification of Peace Officers (SB 2)**
POST now has authority to suspend or revoke peace officer certifications for serious misconduct, including dishonesty, excessive force, sexual assault, or abuse of authority.
Citations:
 - Penal Code §§ 13510.8–13510.85
 - SB 2 Implementation FAQ: <https://post.ca.gov/SB-2-FAQs>
 5. **Training Reimbursement and State Support Programs**
POST administers the Training Reimbursement Program, provides agency support through regional consultants, and issues legal updates, model policies, and training bulletins.
Citation: Penal Code § 13503(a)–(e)

III. POST's Role in Police Accountability

While POST does not conduct internal affairs investigations or impose local discipline, it plays a central role in statewide accountability systems through training standards, certification, and decertification.

1. **Establishing Statewide Training Requirements**
POST mandates training in de-escalation, use of force, crisis intervention, implicit bias, racial profiling awareness, domestic violence, crisis communications, and other core areas.
Citations:
 - Penal Code § 13519 (Use of Force and De-escalation Training)
 - Penal Code § 13519.4 (Implicit Bias and Profiling Training)
 - POST Course Catalog: <https://post.ca.gov/Training>
2. **Certification and Decertification Oversight**
POST evaluates misconduct cases submitted by agencies. If misconduct meets statutory criteria, POST may suspend or revoke the officer's certification, preventing future employment as a peace officer in California.
Citation: Penal Code §§ 13510.8–13510.85
3. **Maintaining Statewide Training and Certification Records**
POST manages training histories, certification levels, academy completion records, and decertification decisions. These records are used by agencies and oversight bodies in evaluating officer conduct and compliance.
Citation: Penal Code § 13503(e)
4. **Compliance Audits and Quality Assurance**
POST audits agencies, academies, and training presenters to ensure compliance with state law, training standards, and record keeping requirements.
Citations:
 - Penal Code § 13512

IV. POST and Oversight Agencies

POST does not investigate individual citizen complaints, conduct misconduct investigations, or enforce local policies. It also does not administer or enforce the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBRA).

Civilian oversight bodies operate independently from POST, but their work often intersects in the following ways:

- Oversight investigations may analyze whether officers met POST training and certification requirements.
 - Findings of serious misconduct may require an agency to notify POST for SB 2 review.
- Citation:** Penal Code § 13510.8(b)
- Oversight policy recommendations may relate to updating training or practices governed by POST standards.
 - POST maintains statewide records that oversight bodies may consult through public records requests or agency coordination.

POST's authority does not limit the ability of local oversight entities to conduct investigations, issue findings, or make recommendations under local ordinances.

V. Why POST Matters to the CPP

Understanding POST helps commissioners:

1. Identify which standards, requirements, and trainings are mandated at the state level
2. Clarify what falls under local jurisdiction versus POST authority
3. Access POST records relevant to oversight investigations and audits
4. Understand the SB 2 decertification process and how serious misconduct moves from local investigation to statewide review
5. Assess whether agency policies and training align with POST requirements
6. Communicate clearly with the public about state versus local roles in police accountability

POST creates the regulatory foundation for police hiring, training, certification, and decertification in California. Because every law enforcement agency in the state operates within POST's framework, POST is an essential part of civilian oversight work.

Overview of California RIPA (Racial and Identity Profiling Act)

I. Background and History

The Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) was enacted in 2015 through Assembly Bill 953. The Legislature created RIPA in response to statewide data showing disparities in traffic and pedestrian stops, as well as concerns about the lack of standardized statewide reporting. Prior to RIPA, data collection varied by agency and there was no uniform or public statewide system for evaluating racial and identity-based disparities in policing.

RIPA established a permanent RIPA Advisory Board composed of representatives from law enforcement, civil rights groups, community organizations, and academic researchers. The Board monitors statewide stop data, evaluates racial and identity profiling trends, and issues annual reports to the California Attorney General.

RIPA's stop data reporting requirements were phased in beginning in 2018. By January 1, 2023, all agencies employing one or more peace officers were required to submit stop data.

Citations

- AB 953 (2015), codified at Gov. Code §§ 12525.5 and 12525.6: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>
- California DOJ RIPA page: <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953>
- RIPA Advisory Board: <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board>

II. Purpose and Authority

RIPA establishes statewide requirements to prevent racial and identity profiling, to improve transparency, and to provide data-driven oversight of law enforcement practices. Its statutory authority includes:

1. Statewide Stop Data Collection

Agencies must collect detailed information on every traffic and pedestrian stop, including perceived race, ethnicity, gender, LGBTQ+ identity, age, reason for stop, actions taken, searches, and results.

Citation: Gov. Code § 12525.5.

2. Mandatory Reporting to the California Department of Justice (DOJ)

Agencies must report their stop data electronically to the DOJ in the format required by the department.

Citation: Gov. Code § 12525.5(c).

3. RIPA Advisory Board Oversight

The Board examines statewide stop data, assesses disparities, develops best practices, and issues annual public reports.

Citation: Gov. Code § 12525.6.

Annual Reports: <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board/reports>

4. **Training and Policy Development Requirements**

RIPA requires law enforcement agencies to adopt policies that prohibit profiling and mandates training on bias-free policing and data collection.

Citations:

- Gov. Code § 12525.5(b)
- Penal Code § 13519.4 (Implicit Bias Training and Procedural Justice)

5. **Public Transparency Requirements**

DOJ must publish statewide data annually, making stop information available to the public, researchers, and oversight bodies.

Citation: Gov. Code § 12525.5(d)

III. RIPA's Role in Police Accountability

RIPA contributes to statewide accountability through data transparency and evidence-informed analysis.

1. **Statewide Trends and Disparity Analysis**

RIPA data allows the DOJ and RIPA Advisory Board to evaluate patterns in stops, searches, citations, arrests, and use of force outcomes across demographic groups.

Citation: RIPA Report Methodology, DOJ Annual Report.

2. **Oversight Support and Policy Development**

Local oversight bodies can use RIPA data to identify disparities, assess compliance with agency policies, and evaluate potential systemic issues.

Examples and use cases appear throughout the annual RIPA reports:

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

3. **Compliance Requirements for Agencies**

Agencies must submit accurate stop data as required by the statute. Failure to comply can trigger DOJ follow up or jeopardize eligibility for certain state programs.

Citation: Gov. Code § 12525.5(c)

4. **Influence on Training and Statewide Standards**

Findings from RIPA reports contribute to the development of training updates, including implicit bias, procedural justice, and search practices.

Citation: Penal Code § 13519.4(a)

IV. RIPA and Oversight Agencies

RIPA does not grant investigative or disciplinary authority to civilian oversight bodies. However, it provides an essential data foundation that oversight entities regularly rely upon.

Oversight bodies may use RIPA data to:

- Review disparities in stops, searches, and outcomes
- Identify problematic units, assignments, or geographic areas
- Evaluate whether local policies align with statewide trends and best practices
- Provide transparent information to the public regarding police stop activity

RIPA does not replace internal affairs investigations, and it does not establish procedures for handling complaints or discipline. Instead, RIPA supplies an independent statewide data framework that strengthens civilian oversight and public accountability.

Citations

- DOJ RIPA data portal and methodology information: <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/ccrs>
- Gov. Code §§ 12525.5, 12525.6

V. Why RIPA Matters to the CPP

Understanding RIPA allows commissioners to:

1. Use statewide and local stop data to identify patterns and disparities
2. Monitor whether agencies comply with state-mandated reporting
3. Compare local trends to statewide evidence
4. Support policy recommendations with objective, statewide data
5. Improve public communication and transparency

RIPA is one of California's primary statewide tools for documenting officer interactions with the public. It ensures that stop data is captured uniformly, reported consistently, and available publicly, which strengthens oversight and promotes equitable policing.