

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COMMISSION ON
PEACE OFFICERS STANDARDS AND TRAINING

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING



TIME: 1:00 p.m.

DATE: Wednesday, October 24, 2012

PLACE: Embassy Suites -
San Francisco Airport - Waterfront
150 Anza Boulevard
Burlingame, California



REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS



Reported by:

Daniel P. Feldhaus
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #6949
Registered Diplomate Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter

Daniel P. Feldhaus, C.S.R., Inc.
Certified Shorthand Reporters
8414 Yermo Way, Sacramento, California 95828
Telephone 916.682.9482 Fax 916.688.0723
FeldhausDepo@aol.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

MARIO A. CASAS
Committee Chair
California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations

JAMES BOCK
Committee Vice-Chair
California Specialized Law Enforcement

ELMO BANNING
Public Member

ALEX BERNARD
Public Member

EDWARD N. BONNER
California State Sheriffs' Association

JOE FLANNAGAN
Peace Officers' Research Association of California

RICHARD LINDSTROM
California Academy Directors' Association

ALAN McFADON
Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Council

MITCHELL MUELLER
California Highway Patrol

SANDRA SPAGNOLI
California Peace Officers' Association



A P P E A R A N C E S

POST COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

LAI LAI BUI
(*Commission Chair*)
Sacramento Police Department

JAMES McDONNELL
(*Commission Vice-Chair*)
Long Beach Police Department

WALTER ALLEN III
Member
Covina City Council



POST STAFF PRESENT

PAUL CAPPITELLI
Executive Director
Executive Office

ALAN DEAL
Assistant Executive Director
Executive Office
Field Services Bureau

RICHARD REED
Assistant Executive Director
Executive Office
Administrative Services Division

BOB STRESAK
Assistant Executive Director
Executive Office
Standards and Development Division

RICHARD BOND
Bureau Chief
Management Counseling Services Bureau

MARIE BOUVIA
Executive Assistant
Executive Office

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

Continued

ANNE BREWER
Bureau Chief
Training Program Services Bureau

JANICE BULLARD
Chief
Learning Technology Resource Bureau

RON CROOK
Multimedia Specialist
Learning Technology Resource Bureau

FRANK DECKER
Bureau Chief
Basic Training Bureau

DARLA ENGLER
Bureau Chief
Administrative Services Bureau

TAMARA EVANS
Senior Consultant
Training Program Services

BRYON GUSTAFSON
Bureau Chief
Standards and Evaluation Services Bureau

KATHY HOBSON
Associate Analyst
Management Counseling Services

MIKE HONG
Systems Analyst
Computer Services

MIKE HOOPER
Bureau Chief
Center for Leadership Development

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

Continued

STEPHANIE SCOFIELD
Bureau Chief
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

SHELLEY SPILBERG
Personnel Selection Consultant
Standards and Evaluation



ALSO PRESENT

CATHY McFADON
Dispatcher
Stanislaus Regional 911

NAWIED AMIN
Public Comment



I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Call to Order and Welcome | 9 |
| B. | Flag Salute and Pledge of Allegiance. | 9 |
| C. | Moment of Silence | 9 |
| | Officer Kenyon Youngstrom California Highway Patrol | |
| D. | Introductions | 9 |
| | Advisory Committee, POST Commissioners, and Members of Audience | |
| E. | Roll Call | 11 |
| F. | Announcements and Correspondence | 13 |
| | Public Testimony | 14 |
| G. | Approval of Minutes of June 27, 2012, Meeting | 20 |
| H. | Review of Commission Meeting Agenda | 21 |
| I. | Presentations: | |
| | Course Evaluation Instrument Tamara Evans, Training Program Services Bureau | 42 |

I N D E X

| <u>Proceedings</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|--------------------|
| J. Advisory Committee Member Reports | 62 |
| - California Specialized Law Enforcement, (CSLE), Bock | 62 |
| - California State Sheriffs' Association, (CSSA), Bonner | 62 |
| - Peace Officers' Research Associatio of California (PORAC), Flannagan | 62 |
| - California Academy Directors' Association (CADA), Lindstrom | 63 |
| - Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Council (PSDAC), McFadon | 64 |
| - California Highway Patrol (CHP), Mueller | 64 |
| - California Peace Officers' Association (CPOA), Spagnoli | 64 |
| - Public member, Banning | 65 |
| - Public member, Bernard | 66 |
| - California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations (CCLEA), Casas | 66 |
| K. Commissioner Comments | 66 |
| L. Old and New Business | 66 |
| - Nomination period for O.J. "Bud" Hawkins Exceptional Services Award | |

I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

| | | | |
|----|---|------------------|----|
| L. | Old and New Business | <i>continued</i> | |
| | - Nomination period for POST Excellence in Training Awards are Open | | |
| | - Election of Advisory Committee Chair | | |
| M. | Next Meetings | | 79 |
| N. | Adjournment | | 83 |
| | Reporter's Certificate | | 84 |



POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

Wednesday, October 24, 2012, 1:02 p.m.

Burlingame, California



(Gavel was sounded.)

VICE-CHAIR BOCK: I'd like to call the meeting to order.

I'm Vice Chair Jim Bock.

Can we please stand for the flag salute?

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Please remain standing as we observe a moment of silence for honoring the officers killed in the line of duty since our last meeting.

Officer Kenyon Youngstrom, California Highway Patrol.

(Observance of moment of silence.)

VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Thank you. Please be seated.

All right, at this time I'll call for introductions of the Advisory Committee.

I am Jim Bock, representing Specialized Law Enforcement.

CHAIR CASAS: I'm Mario Casas, representing the California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations.

MR. STRESAK: Good afternoon. Bob Stresak with POST.

MR. CAPPITELLI: Paul Cappitelli, POST staff.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MS. BOUVIA: Marie Bouvia, POST staff.

2 MS. HOBSON: Kathy Hobson, POST staff.

3 MEMBER BERNARD: Alex Bernard, public member.

4 MEMBER BANNING: Elmo Banning, public member.

5 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Sandra Spagnoli, representing the
6 California Police Officers' Association.

7 MEMBER MUELLER: Mitch Mueller, representing
8 California Highway Patrol.

9 MEMBER McFADON: Alan McFadon, Dispatchers.

10 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Richard Lindstrom, California
11 Academy Directors' Association.

12 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: Joe Flannagan, PORAC.

13 MEMBER BONNER: Ed Bonner, California State
14 Sheriffs'.

15 THE REPORTER: Dan Feldhaus, the hearing reporter.

16 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Okay, could we have the audience
17 introduce themselves?

18 MR. GUSTAFSON: Bryon Gustafson, POST staff.

19 MR. HONG: Mike Hong, POST staff.

20 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Walter Allen, POST
21 Commissioner.

22 COMMISSIONER BUI: Lai Lai Bui, Commissioner.

23 COMMISSIONER McDONNELL: Jim McDonnell,
24 Commissioner.

25 MR. REED: Dick Reed, POST staff.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MR. AMIN: Nawied Amin, public.
2 MS. ENGLER: Darla Engler, POST staff.
3 MS. BREWER: Anne Brewer, POST staff.
4 MS. BULLARD: Jan Bullard, POST staff.
5 MS. SCOFIELD: Stephanie Scofield, POST staff.
6 MS. EVANS: Tami Evans, POST staff.
7 MR. HOOPER: Mike Hooper, POST staff.
8 MS. SPILBERG: Shelley Spilberg, POST staff.
9 MR. DECKER: Frank Decker, POST staff.
10 MS. McFADON: Cathy McFadon, dispatcher, Stanislaus
11 Regional.
12 MR. BOND: Rich Bond, POST staff.
13 MR. DEAL: Alan Deal, POST staff.
14 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Thank you.
15 Could we have roll call, please?
16 MS. BOUVIA: Banning?
17 MEMBER BANNING: Here.
18 MS. BOUVIA: Beitey?
19 *(No response)*
20 MS. BOUVIA: Bernard?
21 MEMBER BERNARD: Here.
22 MS. BOUVIA: Bidou?
23 *(No response)*
24 MS. BOUVIA: Bock?
25 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Here.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MS. BOUVIA: Bonner?

2 MEMBER BONNER: Here.

3 MS. BOUVIA: Casas?

4 CHAIR CASAS: Here.

5 MS. BOUVIA: Flannagan?

6 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: Here.

7 MS. BOUVIA: Lindstrom?

8 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Here.

9 MS. BOUVIA: McFadon?

10 MEMBER McFADON: Here.

11 MS. BOUVIA: Mueller?

12 MEMBER MUELLER: Here.

13 MS. BOUVIA: Spagnoli?

14 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Here.

15 MS. BOUVIA: Willmore?

16 *(No response)*

17 MS. BOUVIA: Young?

18 *(No response)*

19 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Okay, at our last meeting, we had
20 somewhat of a procedural issue that we have to address
21 today.

22 Mario Casas was elected -- nominated and elected for
23 the chair position, and he wasn't here to accept.

24 So at this point, I believe he was contacted and
25 chose to accept. So at this time, I'd like to turn the

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 meeting over to him.

2 CHAIR CASAS: Thank you.

3 I don't know whether to say "thank you" or -- or,
4 you know, have second thoughts about this.

5 But I'm going to say thank you. I'm very positive.
6 This is a great position, a great committee. And so I'm
7 more than happy and honored to serve as its chairman.

8 So in any case, I do accept the nomination.

9 And does it have to go to vote, still?

10 MR. STRESAK: We did vote last week. So if there's
11 any issues or concerns, now would be the opportunity to
12 voice your concerns about Mario having this bestowed upon
13 him.

14 MEMBER BONNER: Also, in the bar afterwards, we can
15 voice our concerns about Mario.

16 CHAIR CASAS: I think the Chief should be buying, by
17 the way, since I think she led the charge on this one.

18 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: That's what happens when you don't
19 show up.

20 MR. STRESAK: Congratulations.

21 CHAIR CASAS: Thank you. I guess I'm official.

22 Okay, so that being said, thank you for the opening,
23 Jim. I appreciate it.

24 At this point, my first official act will be to
25 recognize -- I understand we have a speaker in the room

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 that would like to address this committee on an issue.
2 And so, therefore, I would like to open it up to that
3 public member.

4 MR. AMIN: Yes. Thank you.

5 My name is Nawied Amin. And tomorrow actually is my
6 first day of orientation for the police academy here at
7 the College of San Mateo, so I won't be able to speak in
8 person.

9 MR. STRESAK: Sir, excuse me for one minute.

10 Could you spell your name, as these minutes are
11 recorded?

12 MR. AMIN: Okay, sure.

13 "N," as in Nancy; "A," as in Adam; "W," as in
14 William; "I," as in Ida; "E," as in Edward; "D," as in
15 David. And then the last name would be "A," as in Adam;
16 "M," as in Mary; "I," as in Ida; "N," as in Nancy.

17 CHAIR CASAS: Welcome, sir. Welcome to the
18 Committee.

19 Just remember, we do have a three-minute rule on
20 this.

21 MR. AMIN: Yes. I'll be brief and as concise as I
22 can be.

23 CHAIR CASAS: Thank you.

24 MR. AMIN: And I have printed out about 17 copies
25 for distribution to the commissioners and to the staff

1 here. And, obviously, you can make more copies as need
2 be. So if you give me a moment, let me just...

3 And I'll just briefly cover eight of my, you know,
4 biggest ideas.

5 The first being, I understand on your Web site, on
6 the commissioners, you have a brief biography and, you
7 know, information on the Commission.

8 I would ask that if you would be so kind to list the
9 beginning terms and the end terms, the actual dates.

10 I understand there's three-year overlapping terms.
11 And in addition, also listings on your Web site, the
12 obligations and responsibilities of the commissioners.

13 So are they required to attend all three meetings
14 each year? And what is the requirement? You know, how
15 are expenses calculated? What's the process?

16 So some information, such as that, you know, would
17 benefit me as a member of the public, as well as the
18 public in general.

19 And then moving along, the second point I'd like to
20 point out, to the best of my knowledge, there is no
21 California POST foundation. A properly established
22 nonprofit public foundation could serve to enhance and
23 provide financial support to services not covered in
24 California, but POST's budget.

25 So perhaps the California POST could take -- could

1 seek legal counsel in taking preliminary steps to
2 establish such a nonprofit foundation. For example, the
3 California State Library Foundation, as the independent
4 partner to the California State Library.

5 The comparison here would be that the California
6 POST Foundation could serve as an independent partner to
7 California POST. And, obviously, the foundation would do
8 such things as accept donations, apply for grants that
9 are reserved for nonprofits.

10 And on the document, there's a few other things you
11 can go over. But for the brief time, I'll move on to the
12 next point.

13 To the best of my knowledge, there is no California
14 POST alumni association. This alumni association could
15 be for anyone who has successfully completed any
16 POST-certified course or class or course of study. And
17 I highly suggest that California POST create such an
18 alumni association.

19 Students, at an optional cost, can become part of
20 the alumni association. And this would continue the
21 relationship that California POST has.

22 For the most part, you know, most students who take
23 California POST-certified courses, once they're done,
24 they never worry about POST again until they're required
25 for training, you know, so forth.

1 So this allows a student taking a POST-certified
2 course to continue on to have a relationship. And also,
3 it allows California POST to send e-mail, newsletters.
4 And there's a variety of services that California POST
5 can provide through the alumni association.

6 And moving on, the fourth item I want to cover
7 quickly, is there is no California POST Web store. It's
8 highly advisable -- it doesn't have to be something
9 high-end. It can be -- there are multiple ways to run a
10 low-cost enterprise online. You can assemble things such
11 as California POST apparel, accessories, collectibles,
12 et cetera.

13 And then moving on, one of the ideas is creating
14 more partnerships with local institutions.

15 For example, California POST could do a showcase for
16 what goes in a police academy, for children. So you can
17 create a program where children from schools can go on a
18 field trip for a nominal fee to a California
19 POST-certified police academy as a means to raise
20 awareness and revenue.

21 Part of being a police academy graduate is dealing
22 with the public, and in particular, children. And the
23 field trips could become a learning exercise in
24 communication skills and dealing with people, especially
25 for police academy students.

1 And then moving on, creating a direct feedback
2 policy.

3 So, for example, this would allow California POST to
4 receive direct feedback from students on what policies
5 are working and what policies need improvement. And the
6 structure would be such that it could be set up through a
7 Web site where a student is provided a registration code
8 or some other provided data that would allow the student
9 to register their feedback directly onto a California
10 POST Web site. The required actual feedback can be
11 anonymous or identifiable, depending on the direct
12 feedback policy that the California POST adopts.

13 The actual feedback would go into a database, and
14 can be compiled, sorted, and viewable by location, name,
15 ZIP code, academy, training facility, course of name,
16 et cetera.

17 The idea of this, again, is to receive direct
18 feedback from students on what policies are working and
19 what policies need improvement or replacement.

20 And then two more things and I'll be out of your
21 hair.

22 The eighth item is, I understand that students are
23 given LD, Learning Domain, workbooks as textbooks for the
24 basic police academy and for other California
25 POST-certified courses. I request that, by default, that

1 they also be given access to download the PDF copies of
2 the applicable learning domain materials for their
3 courses.

4 Students of California POST courses are lawfully
5 permitted to make copies for non-commercial use. But
6 why must a student go the extra route, and very cost-
7 prohibitive route, of converting their learning domains
8 into PDFs, so that they can view it on an iPad, on a PC,
9 on a Mac -- whatever gadget have you. And, essentially,
10 a proper learning domain PDF allows students to search
11 for words and phrases within that LD workbook. Look up
12 terms, definitions, review material, highlight and
13 comment directly on the PDF, and serves as a functional
14 tool and research for the students' respective course.

15 And then my last point is, that social and media
16 outlets such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube can be
17 successfully used for the purposes and interests of
18 California POST.

19 And I've provided several examples there. I
20 understand, and I applaud you for using Twitter; but
21 there are various other things that can be used, such as
22 YouTube and Facebook, especially when you update changes,
23 when you make changes.

24 I understand that you're an evolving institution;
25 and you can perhaps use those media forms, such as

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 Facebook and Twitter and YouTube, to communicate to the
2 public, "Here's what we're doing," "Here's some of our
3 programs," "Here's why you should be interested,"
4 especially to raise awareness and revenue.

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIR CASAS: Thank you, sir. We appreciate you
7 coming forward like this. And we'll refer to your
8 document if we have any other questions.

9 At this point, are there any discussions about or
10 any questions of our guest?

11 *(No response)*

12 CHAIR CASAS: Seeing none, thank you very much for
13 coming for us.

14 MR. AMIN: Thank you.

15 CHAIR CASAS: I guess, next, we go to the *Approval*
16 *of Minutes*.

17 And if everybody's had an opportunity to review
18 the minutes; and if there's any questions or issues at
19 this point, please feel free.

20 If not, I'll entertain a motion to accept.

21 MEMBER BERNARD: Bernard. I'll move the minutes.

22 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Second. Bock.

23 CHAIR CASAS: Call for the vote.

24 MR. STRESAK: All those in favor?

25 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MR. STRESAK: Opposed?

2 *(No response)*

3 MR. STRESAK: Abstain?

4 *(No response)*

5 MR. STRESAK: The minutes are accepted.

6 CHAIR CASAS: Okay. Next, would be the *Review of*
7 *Commission Meeting Agenda.*

8 I'll defer my friend Bob here for that.

9 MR. STRESAK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10 The first thing I'd like to address is
11 *Correspondence to and from POST.*

12 We have correspondence to POST from Chief Rick
13 Braziel of the California Peace Officers' Association
14 regarding ways to mitigate the repercussions of the
15 changes made to the training programs.

16 Correspondence from Keith Royal, CSSA President,
17 Sheriff of Nevada County; and Adam Christianson, CSSAF
18 Training Committee chair.

19 And there was also regarding current requirement for
20 POST certification of courses and concerns regarding
21 proposed changes that POST is requesting.

22 From POST, we have a letter to Governor Edmund G.
23 Brown, requesting a veto of Senate Bill 1563, Cannella,
24 regarding civil service examinations.

25 And correspondence to Commissioner Joseph Farrow,

1 Commissioner of the Highway Patrol, expressing our
2 sympathy over the tragic on-duty death of Officer Kenyon
3 Youngstrom.

4 And lastly, a letter to Senator Mike Eng, commending
5 him and thanking him for his support of AB 2285, which
6 was enacted into law. That is the recruit cheating bill.

7 Any questions?

8 *(No response)*

9 MR. STRESAK: Okay, I'd like to go over the *Consent*
10 *Calendar* next.

11 And we have a couple requests for information on the
12 consent calendar itself. And if you bear with me for a
13 moment while I find my notes.

14 The dog ate my notes. Okay.

15 So we have, on consent, Rich Lindstrom had questions
16 regarding item B.12, *Report on Commission Reimbursement*
17 *Plans*.

18 Rich Lindstrom had a question also on B.13, *Report*
19 *on Efforts to Enhance the SAFE Driving Campaign by*
20 *Partnering with the Below 100 Initiative*.

21 Elmo Banning had a question on B.17, *Report on*
22 *Strategic Plan Objective B.15.10, Develop a Training*
23 *Evaluation Program that Assesses Course Quality*.

24 And Rich, again, on B.19, *Report on Efforts to*
25 *Increase EVOC Training through the Orange County*

1 *Sheriff's Department.*

2 Are there any other pending questions on items in
3 the consent calendar?

4 *(No response)*

5 MR. STRESAK: Okay, with that, we'll open discussion
6 for Item B.12, *Report on Commission Reimbursement Plans.*

7 Rich?

8 MEMBER LINDSTROM: I just wanted to ask, because it
9 mentions that PC 13520 for enabling legislation to assist
10 local agencies, et cetera, and how that connected to the
11 other one that we discussed earlier about providing
12 assistance, I think it was the Orange County deal for the
13 EVOC center that they're trying to...

14 I was just wondering if there's a connection between
15 that and -- I don't see the connection here, but I was
16 wondering if there was any connection of bringing it up
17 here, and also in Orange County, that would be B.19 --
18 yes, B.19.

19 And we already discussed that prior to this meeting,
20 and you said you were going to cover it in that.

21 MR. STRESAK: Right. Let's work backwards then, if
22 you will. I'll discuss --

23 CHAIR CASAS: Ron, are you catching an echo?

24 MR. CROOK: Yes. Mr. Lindstrom, if you could move
25 the microphone closer to you, maybe that will help with

1 that one.

2 MEMBER LINDSTROM: How is that?

3 MR. CROOK: That's better.

4 MR. STRESAK: Okay, if we can work backwards, B.19,
5 *Reports on Efforts to Increase EVOC training through*
6 *Orange County.*

7 One of the concerns, if I understand correctly, your
8 concern was that if POST was making efforts to facilitate
9 the development of the EVOC facility in Orange County,
10 that perhaps there was some collateral issues involving
11 Fresno or some concerns about funding -- directing
12 funding towards Fresno in the future.

13 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Yes, I am wondering what
14 direction POST is going on that and assisting some sort
15 of a grant.

16 For instance, Fresno did provide all the funding
17 without POST assistance on about a \$17 million regional
18 training facility. And there are some enhancements that
19 could be done, I'm sure, at San Bernardino and at Fresno,
20 and maybe some others that POST is going in the direction
21 of perhaps providing some grant funding to Orange County
22 on this. That's the direction POST is going.

23 MR. STRESAK: Okay, point number one is, the
24 time-line between the tax-exempt of the Fresno facility
25 and the Orange County facility were completely different.

1 Fresno initiated efforts to development EVOC I'm assuming
2 several years prior, with EIR reports, et cetera,
3 et cetera, et cetera. So that's point number one.

4 Point number two: When you refer to enhancements,
5 I would think that that would mean additions to and
6 improvements to the discussions surrounding EVOC in
7 Orange County is to address the immediate training need
8 that they have. Point number one, that they do not have
9 a training facility down there at all whatsoever. And
10 this would facilitate, I think, 32 agencies, over
11 4,000 officers.

12 And so time-line-wise, one is talking about
13 embryonic stages of development of an EVOC facility, and
14 you're referring to enhancements to an existing facility.
15 So it appears to me that we need to work, focusing on
16 addressing the immediate training need first, to
17 determine what our priorities would be subsequent to
18 that, if that makes any sense.

19 MEMBER LINDSTROM: I understand that, there will be
20 a priority list. I just wondered if, after I reread that
21 Penal Code section, that it does, in fact, state that
22 POST has the ability to provide grant funding for
23 specific needs to local agencies, districts, et cetera.
24 And it was just a matter of curiosity if that's going to
25 be something available potentially in the future?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MR. CAPPITELLI: Yeah, if I could speak to this.

2 So for the last probably four years, we've had a
3 series of meetings at various stages in Orange County,
4 with the various agencies.

5 And the first attempt to try to get something off
6 the ground failed because it involved too much
7 collaboration with the military base and some other
8 things, so...

9 But this past year, Orange County Sheriff's
10 Department identified a piece of property that they had
11 that could be used to develop all of the elements of the
12 EVOC, with the exception of the high-speed, and that's
13 contained in this information report.

14 We're getting way ahead of ourselves to assume that
15 there will be some funding, because those are decisions
16 for the Commission to make in the future, when presented
17 with all the facts.

18 The purpose of this report is to let the Commission
19 know that there is a dialogue, and that there is a great
20 interest within that region to develop an EVOC, so that
21 the Commission could be aware in case somebody says,
22 "Hey, I've heard POST is involved in some discussions
23 here."

24 In a perfect world, it would be great down the road
25 for the Commission to approve funding in the form of a

1 grant, to not only an entity such as Orange County for
2 the development of an EVOC, but perhaps for other
3 existing EVOC facilities to enhance what they're already
4 doing.

5 But the most immediate unmet training need that we
6 have is to provide something in that region. Because
7 presently there is nothing, and they have to travel all
8 the way to San Bernardino to have their training
9 conducted.

10 So for both basic and in-service, there's great
11 interest in them developing their own. They're also
12 looking at a site for the high-speed. So I don't want us
13 to get too far ahead of ourselves, but I thought it was
14 important for the Commission to know and for this body to
15 know that there is a discussion, there is a dialogue.
16 And at some point, that could be a policy question for
17 the Commission. It's just for informational purposes.

18 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Okay, well, as many of you
19 already know, the Central Valley always gets left out of
20 everything budgetwise. Everything goes north of the Bay
21 area, or south. And that's why I wanted to just put my
22 word in right here, right now, at the very beginning, so
23 if things don't happen and all of a sudden, we said,
24 "Wow, we got left out."

25 And that is the only purpose of me bringing it up,

1 is to just let you be aware that the Central Valley is
2 still a factor in this state. And we appreciate any help
3 that we can get along the way.

4 MR. CAPPITELLI: Right. And I'll say that the
5 facility that has been developed there in your region is
6 fantastic. When I visited, you and I went out there.
7 It's just a fantastic place.

8 The EVOC facility in Lompoc, being developed for
9 Allan Hancock College, is going to be probably opened
10 next year. It will be a great facility.

11 So we're doing everything we can to try to provide
12 the encouragement and the support -- I don't mean
13 financial support, but other means of support -- up and
14 down the state for EVOC development, because we have a
15 great stake in that for our client audience.

16 So I understand what you said. Down the road, if
17 that decision is to be made, I'm sure there will be an
18 opportunity for everybody to weigh in.

19 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Thank you.

20 MR. CAPPITELLI: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. STRESAK: Okay, Rich, you had questions
22 regarding B.13 also.

23 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Well, maybe I'm getting ahead of
24 myself on this one, too.

25 Well, first of all, you're talking about the

1 Below 100 Initiative. And I want to commend the
2 Executive Director and his staff for putting on the SAFE
3 Driving Symposium in San Diego a couple weeks ago,
4 because I feel it was absolutely fantastic.

5 And make sure part of that, the Below 100 Initiative
6 was in there. But I do see in here where staff has
7 examined -- is examining mechanisms to partner with the
8 Below 100 Initiative to provide the train-the-trainer
9 courses to law-enforcement agencies in California. And
10 I do know that regardless of where you're at in this
11 state, that would be greatly appreciated.

12 And I was just maybe asking for an update of maybe
13 how that's going and where that's going. Because it's
14 very positive, regardless whether you're in Eureka or
15 San Diego, and everything in between.

16 MR. CAPPITELLI: Why don't we ask Bureau Chief
17 Scofield to come forward? And she'll share with you the
18 progress of the status of that effort.

19 MS. SCOFIELD: Good afternoon. Stephanie Scofield,
20 Training Delivery and Compliance Services Bureau.

21 In July 2009, the Commission approved a resolution
22 in support of vehicle operations and training research.
23 It was noted that California had more peace officers
24 injured and killed in traffic collisions than any other
25 state.

1 Since this time, POST staff with Commission approval
2 has developed the SAFE Driving Campaign. This campaign
3 has been multi-faceted, and POST staff is actively
4 advancing this campaign to include stakeholders from
5 across the nation.

6 The Below 100 Initiative was developed by
7 stakeholders in the Midwest who recognized traffic
8 collisions are a serious concern for officer safety.
9 Through training and education, the goal of this
10 initiative is to reduce the line-of-duty deaths from
11 traffic collisions to less than 100 annually.

12 Creators of this initiative have developed the
13 train-the-trainer course to provide law enforcement
14 trainers with an understanding of the Below 100 concepts.
15 Being that the SAFE Driving Campaign and the Below 100
16 Initiative have similar messages and goals of reducing
17 peace officer injuries and deaths in traffic collisions,
18 POST staff is examining mechanisms to partner with the
19 Below 100 Initiative to bring the train-the-trainer
20 course into California.

21 Discussions have begun with several stakeholders,
22 and we are looking at a funding mechanism. The idea is
23 to bring the Below 100 trainers into California, get
24 California law-enforcement officers trained, and then we
25 would certify the course throughout California.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 Are there any other questions?

2 MR. CAPPITELLI: Yes. Excuse me, Stephanie, can you
3 talk about the meetings that we've had, the meeting with
4 CPOA, to talk about the project?

5 MS. SCOFIELD: We've met with representatives from
6 the California Peace Officers' Association, as well as
7 the California Highway Patrol, and looking to work with
8 them in terms of funding mechanism to bring these
9 trainers into California.

10 MR. CAPPITELLI: One final note, as the Executive
11 Director, I have spending authority up to \$50,000 for
12 these types of contracts. And so that's what we're
13 looking for, at least for the initial seed money to get
14 this going.

15 So the dialogue is in place. We're moving as quick
16 as bureaucracy will allow us to move.

17 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Thank you, Paul.

18 It's just an unbelievable important project, I
19 believe. And thank you for taking the initiative on
20 getting training to everybody in the state on that.

21 MR. CAPPITELLI: Thank you for your feedback. We
22 appreciate it, and your support.

23 CHAIR CASAS: If I could just add, what Stephanie is
24 dealing with right now is such an important component to
25 our future, as far as saving officers' lives. I am

1 convinced of this after I attended the symposium. We
2 were able to send our association president, myself as a
3 training officer, and one of our lieutenants who is
4 overseeing traffic currently, but he is obviously going
5 to report back to staff about the findings here. And
6 this, by far, is one of the best symposiums I've ever
7 attended that targeted -- truly targeted at saving lives,
8 both from an officer standpoint, as well as from a
9 civilian standpoint. And I think it's a tremendous
10 effort to move forward with this Below 100 campaign.

11 And so kudos to you, Paul, and your staff for having
12 the vision to see this. Because I've got to tell you,
13 I didn't know how big of an issue it was until I attended
14 the symposium and realized that it's not just all about
15 driving, it's about fatigue, it's about culture, it's
16 about...

17 I mean, it just covered everything. And it just
18 gave me a whole new perspective on what we need to do to
19 help POST get to the point that we need them to get to in
20 order to start cutting down, getting those lives saved,
21 Below 100.

22 So, thank you for that.

23 MR. CAPPITELLI: Thank you. Thank you for your
24 feedback. We appreciate it.

25 MR. STRESAK: We've also received some encouraging

1 reports from the field in terms of chiefs already
2 initiating programs within the organization to begin
3 facilitating and implementing some of the recommendations
4 from the SAFE program. So it's been encouraging to hear
5 that.

6 MR. CAPPITELLI: Thank you, Stephanie.

7 MR. STRESAK: Mr. Banning, B.17, *Develop a Training*
8 *Evaluation Program that Assesses Course Quality.*

9 You had some further questions, or are we good?

10 MEMBER BANNING: I think we're good with the number.

11 All I was looking for, sir, was the -- if the --
12 well, Consultant Evans is going to give a report. Maybe
13 she'll cover that in her report, and so I'll just defer
14 that until -- or ask questions if...

15 MR. STRESAK: You had some concerns about the actual
16 numbers of certified courses; is that what you wanted to
17 address?

18 MEMBER BANNING: Well, there was a discrepancy
19 between the two numbers. There was one report said there
20 was 6,100 and I think 70 or 20 reports -- of course, I
21 have it written down.

22 MR. STRESAK: Mr. Banning's referring to Tami's
23 report refers to that POST had about 6,170 certified
24 courses. And our current report to the Commission says
25 that we have about five thousand- --

1 MEMBER BANNING: -- six hundred and eight.

2 MR. STRESAK: 5,608.

3 And what you need to understand about course
4 certification numbers is, they are continually in a state
5 of flux. As certifications come in, decertifications go
6 out. And it ebbs and flows.

7 And so based on the timing of when one report was
8 written, the status of it versus the timing of the second
9 report, it gives that discrepancy. It's not a -- while I
10 appreciate it and thank you for pointing it out, it's not
11 really a significant issue because of the ebb and flow --
12 continual ebb and flow. It's hard on any given day to
13 nail down exactly how many certified courses we have, so
14 that's...

15 MEMBER BANNING: And I just want to go on the record
16 that that's a number that's a number that is often thrown
17 out by area consultants when people approach them for
18 certifications of courses. They'll say, "Well, we
19 already have 6,000, we have 5,000, we have 4,000 already
20 certified." I don't know what that has to do with
21 getting your course certified. But if they have a
22 consistent number, I think it's probably a little bit
23 more, maybe palatable, or at least credible. I mean, it
24 becomes quite problematic, because that number is thrown
25 out almost instantly, a lot of times.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 I hear that from people all over the state. And so
2 if it got down to -- there is a 500-point difference
3 there. 500, we don't do that many in a quarter. I think
4 the report's going to show that we only did, what,
5 eighty-something last quarter?

6 MR. STRESAK: I think it was 80, yes.

7 MEMBER BANNING: As long as it is hand-grenade
8 close, I'm good with that.

9 MR. STRESAK: I think that number is generally used
10 as a barometric reading to imply the workload with ten
11 area consultants and that number of certified courses
12 that the workload can be overwhelming at times, so...

13 MEMBER BANNING: And the only other question I had
14 was, how many -- well, I'll wait for Ms. Evans' report
15 and see if there's anything, if she covers that.

16 MR. STRESAK: Okay.

17 MEMBER BANNING: Thank you.

18 MR. STRESAK: Thanks, Elmo.

19 Okay, any other questions on the consent calendar?

20 *(No response)*

21 MR. STRESAK: I wanted to cover the strategic plan,
22 update our -- current update on the strategic plan is
23 that we have deleted two strategic plan objectives due to
24 completion. One was to study the feasibility of model
25 school based programming that can be replicated

1 statewide.

2 If you recall, that's Mike Hooper's and Greg
3 Kyritsis' efforts to create a standardized school program
4 that allows us to facilitate future recruitment retention
5 for law enforcement candidates, and also to facilitate
6 more of a seamless transition from grade school, into
7 high school, into junior college, into the academy,
8 without a candidate having to either duplicate or
9 replicate studies or efforts to move into the law
10 enforcement profession.

11 So Greg has done a great job on that.

12 Mike, thanks for your leadership on that.

13 And then *Strategic Plan B.15.10, Develop a Training*
14 *Evaluation Program that Assesses Course Quality*. We'll
15 hear a presentation from Tami Evans in a little while
16 regarding the development of our quality assessment
17 review program.

18 Any questions on the strategic plan?

19 *(No response)*

20 MR. STRESAK: Okay, Mr. Chair, I think -- if there
21 is no further discussion on the consent calendar, I think
22 we have to entertain a motion to accept the consent
23 calendar.

24 CHAIR CASAS: With that being said, we would like it
25 to open it to a motion to accept the consent calendar.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER LINDSTROM: So moved. Lindstrom.

2 MEMBER MUELLER: Second. Mueller.

3 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, call for the vote.

4 All in favor, say "aye."

5 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

6 CHAIR CASAS: Opposed?

7 *(No response)*

8 CHAIR CASAS: Okay. The vote passes.

9 MR. STRESAK: Okay, the next item would be the
10 Finance Committee. The Finance Committee met this
11 morning, and there were no significant issues that were
12 discussed at the Finance Committee. A thorough report
13 was given, thanks to Bureau Chief Engler and Assistant
14 Executive Director Reed.

15 And the Finance Committee accepted the finance
16 report as accepted to the committee.

17 Any questions on that?

18 *(No response)*

19 MR. STRESAK: Okay, moving on to the remaining part
20 of the agenda of the Commission, we had a question from
21 Rich on Item L.

22 Rich, *Report on Course Certification Requirements*
23 *regarding Course Budgets.*

24 Should I go ahead and explain what we discussed?

25 MEMBER LINDSTROM: That would be excellent, because

1 the point here is, I'm outside of my responsibility here
2 for the California academy directors. But since I'm so
3 closely associated with the Fresno Police Department and
4 them as a regional training center, I'm sort of wearing a
5 different hat here, and I'm posing this question for them
6 regarding our discussion earlier today.

7 MR. STRESAK: Okay, I'd like to call up Bureau Chief
8 Scofield.

9 Steph, would you come up, please?

10 MS. SCOFIELD: Commission Regulation 1054 defines
11 the allowable cost presenters can charge students in
12 POST-certified tuition based training course. Such costs
13 include those for instructors, coordination, clerical
14 support, and fees for class materials.

15 At the October 2010 meeting, the Commission approved
16 changes to Regulation 1054 that became effective July 1st
17 of 2011.

18 One of the changes prohibited agencies from charging
19 students for instructor time, if the instructor was
20 on-duty at the time of the instruction.

21 At that time, this was done for consistency with
22 the State Controller's Office recommendation for the
23 calculation of instructor costs.

24 Upon Commission approval of this regulation, POST
25 staff was advised of stakeholder concerns regarding the

1 prohibition of instructor charges while on duty.

2 Stakeholders argue their desire to recover costs to
3 provide regional training for outside agencies. Due to
4 these concerns, the Commission approved the suspension of
5 this provision.

6 Due to limited resources, staff has not had the
7 opportunity to thoroughly research this through the State
8 Controller's Office and vet this among the stakeholders.

9 Until this can be completed, POST staff requests
10 this provision of instructor costs be deleted from
11 regulation to avoid confusion among the presenters.
12 And staff intends to provide the Commission a follow-up
13 report by the June 2013 meeting.

14 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Well, I guess my question is,
15 what direction is POST going on? Or has it not been
16 decided or...?

17 MR. STRESAK: It had been decided to evaluate this
18 further, so that it has been stricken from existing
19 regulation to reduce the confusion at this point; and
20 that we'll go back and rehear this and reevaluate it.

21 And if we need to amend or modify, accordingly, we
22 will come back to this committee and the Commission.

23 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Well, just for the point of
24 clarification for the other people that may not be aware,
25 the Fresno Police Department provides a variety of

1 training for their own personnel, but they're also a
2 regional training center, where other officers from a lot
3 of other different agencies come in for this training.
4 And I believe the original, when this was originally
5 signed, they weren't able to capture reimbursement for
6 their on-duty training personnel, even though they were
7 training other people with some of their own. And I
8 think that became what the original issue was.

9 So thank you for going forward and researching this.
10 They're very interested in what the outcome will be.

11 MR. STRESAK: Thank you, Rich.

12 Any other questions on this item?

13 *(No response)*

14 MR. STRESAK: Thanks, Steph.

15 Are there any other questions on any other existing
16 agenda items?

17 *(No response)*

18 MR. STRESAK: Mr. Chair, call for a motion.

19 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, I will entertain a motion to
20 accept Training Delivery Bureau presentation on the
21 *Report on Course Certification Requirements regarding*
22 *Course Budgets.*

23 MEMBER BERNARD: So moved. Bernard.

24 CHAIR CASAS: Second?

25 MEMBER BONNER: Bonner. Second.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 CHAIR CASAS: Call for the vote.

2 All in favor of moving this forward to the
3 Commission for approval, say "aye."

4 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

5 CHAIR CASAS: Opposed?

6 *(No response)*

7 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, the vote passes.

8 MR. STRESAK: Okay, you still have to cover items
9 C through O, with L excepted.

10 CHAIR CASAS: Let's see, can we bunch them together,
11 C through O?

12 Okay. I'll also entertain another motion to accept
13 C through O as represented on the consent calendar?

14 MR. STRESAK: Oh, no, this is --

15 CHAIR CASAS: What are we looking at?

16 MR. STRESAK: These are items going to the
17 Commission for action.

18 CHAIR CASAS: Sorry, I'm still trying to get
19 technically trained here.

20 Okay, if I could also entertain a motion to accept
21 agenda items C through O, we'll combine them here to
22 entertain a motion to pass this committee to the
23 Commission.

24 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Lindstrom. So moved.

25 CHAIR CASAS: Seconded by?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER MUELLER: Mueller.

2 CHAIR CASAS: All those in favor, say "aye."

3 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

4 CHAIR CASAS: Opposed?

5 *(No response)*

6 CHAIR CASAS: The vote passes.

7 MR. STRESAK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 We'll now call for Senior Consultant Tami Evans from
9 Training Program Services to make a presentation on the
10 *Course Evaluation Instrument*.

11 MS. EVANS: Good afternoon, everyone.

12 This is a very brief presentation about the POST
13 Quality Assessment Project that we've been working on
14 pursuant to Strategic Plan Objective B.15.10 over the
15 past two years.

16 This Strategic Plan objective specifically directed
17 POST staff to develop methods to effectively assess
18 course quality and instructor performance in
19 POST-certified courses.

20 So as a result of this project, POST convened a
21 large work group of representatives and stakeholders from
22 across the state, including training managers, training
23 presenters, instructors, regional training center staff
24 and so on, who came together and developed the forms that
25 are attached to the Commission agenda item, which

1 addresses this topic as well.

2 And if you're interested in seeing that, it's agenda
3 Item Number B.17, which was just discussed in the last
4 segment. Those forms, the new evaluation tools, are
5 attached to that agenda item, if you'd like to review
6 them.

7 These evaluation tools, which were created by the
8 work group, are now available to folks -- training
9 presenters and instructors across the state -- to use in
10 evaluating their own courses and instructors, if they
11 choose to.

12 If they prefer, they can use them to set instructor
13 standards for their own instructors. They can also use
14 the forms to document their own courses that are
15 presented.

16 These forms are optional. They're not required by
17 POST. But we provide them to training presenters and
18 instructors as a resource and as an evaluation tool. And
19 they are being made available online.

20 If you like, you can take a look at the forms. This
21 is one example of the course evaluation form that is an
22 attachment to agenda Item B.17.

23 So as a result of all the work that our evaluators
24 and our work group, our stakeholders have come together
25 to produce, we were able to initiate -- or, actually,

1 I should say, reinitiate a POST program on quality
2 assessment. This program specifically helps POST to
3 evaluate the quality of training courses and instructor
4 performance.

5 We were authorized by management staff to begin the
6 new Quality Assessment Program as a pilot in July; and it
7 will run as a pilot for one year. During that time, our
8 trained course evaluators will be going out and
9 evaluating randomly selected POST-certified courses
10 throughout the state.

11 This program focuses specifically on in-service
12 training, or advanced officer training. We are not
13 reviewing academy courses or basic courses because
14 there's already a process in place for that. That's the
15 basic course certification review.

16 So this is the flip side of that. This Quality
17 Assessment Program specifically is intended for
18 in-service training.

19 Our course evaluators are law enforcement
20 instructors in the field who have attended a
21 POST-certified evaluator training course in order to
22 learn how to use the newly developed forms and go out and
23 evaluate courses for POST. They monitor the class
24 presentations, and they write a standardized report,
25 using the form that I showed you previously, and submit

1 it to POST. And POST submits -- POST reviews the form
2 for spelling, grammar, appropriate language; and then
3 forwards it out to the training presenter and the
4 regional POST consultant.

5 If there are any issues that arise as a result of
6 the monitoring of the course, the training presenter is
7 encouraged to work together with the POST regional
8 consultant in order to work out whatever the issues may
9 be.

10 There's actually two purposes for the quality
11 assessment process. It provides evaluation tools or
12 resources, as I mentioned earlier, for training managers
13 and presenters and instructors. It helps to set
14 standards if people choose to use them. But it also
15 reestablishes the quality-control efforts which were
16 previously managed by POST until the funding was no
17 longer available several years ago.

18 We are running another course instructor evaluator
19 training class November 28th to 30th in San Diego. And,
20 in fact, your Committee chair is one of the attendees who
21 will be attending that, Chairman Casas. And we also have
22 quite a few other folks who signed up for the class.
23 We've had 75 applications for 25 spots in the class.
24 This has been quite popular.

25 We're running the classes -- right now, we're

1 running it twice a year. If we continue to get such an
2 enthusiastic response from the field, we may choose to
3 increase the number of presentations, hopefully to
4 accommodate everyone.

5 We have both training managers from regional
6 training centers and agencies who would like to evaluate
7 their own internal training programs that come to attend
8 the course, as well as experienced instructors who would
9 like to go out and evaluate training on behalf of POST.
10 At this point, we have about 24 people in the pool of
11 folks who are going out to do evaluations on behalf of
12 POST.

13 The prerequisites for this training are at least
14 some type of instructor development training, academy
15 instructor certification course, or the master instructor
16 course. We've also taken equivalencies from a few folks
17 who have master's degrees in education. And we do ask
18 that the applicants have some law-enforcement training
19 experience as an instructor.

20 Here are a few photos of our evaluators at work.
21 I just like to show this because it's hard to visualize
22 unless I show you a photo.

23 This is a firearms course, the classroom portion.

24 This is a tactical medicine course, where they're
25 watching students learn how to load an individual into

1 the back of a car for emergency transport.

2 This is a search-and-seizure class.

3 And this is a critical-incident management class.

4 So in each instance where our evaluators go out and
5 review POST-certified courses, they stay out of the area
6 of instruction where the students are involved. They
7 stand back and observe and monitor. They don't
8 participate in the class. They fill out these
9 standardized forms, as I mentioned earlier, and submit
10 the reports to POST afterwards.

11 They also hold a brief debriefing with the training
12 presenter in order to share their observations with them
13 before they leave.

14 Okay, before we move on to the next segment, I'd
15 just like to ask -- I know that there were some questions
16 earlier. If anyone has any questions at this point, I'm
17 happy to entertain them.

18 MEMBER BANNING: Tami, can you hear all right?

19 How many evaluations have you completed so far?

20 MS. EVANS: I believe -- and I can't be exact -- but
21 I believe it's in the neighborhood of 35.

22 MEMBER BANNING: Thirty-five? Okay.

23 And do you have any idea on how many agency
24 evaluations, private presenters or public institution
25 courses you've done in those categories?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MS. EVANS: Without giving you the specific numbers,
2 Member Banning, I can tell you that it's been
3 approximately 60-40 in favor of agencies versus
4 presenters, private presenters.

5 MEMBER BANNING: Okay, thank you.

6 MEMBER LINDSTROM: May I? Lindstrom here.

7 May I just add some comments on that?

8 MS. EVANS: Yes.

9 MEMBER LINDSTROM: You know, this is really a
10 bifold-type purpose on this. POST is doing some of these
11 assessments. But that evaluation tool that Tami has
12 provided here, she just had the course assessment up
13 there, but she also has an instructor assessment on that.

14 This particular quality assessment was brought up at
15 the last consortium, and it was overwhelmingly --

16 MS. EVANS: Supported?

17 MEMBER LINDSTROM: I don't know if there was an
18 approval, but it was embraced as something very positive
19 for POST. And a lot of people and their agencies or
20 colleges are already using this tool that has been
21 provided, but they don't submit those evaluations to
22 POST. It's an internal purpose.

23 So it's sort of a twofold type of purpose, and they
24 wouldn't have statistics on how many people or agencies
25 or institutions are using the forms itself.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MS. EVANS: That's correct. Thank you.

2 Although I do know anecdotally a couple of regional
3 training centers have already told me that they've begun
4 using the POST forms internally. So they are in use out
5 there.

6 MEMBER BANNING: Oh, and there's no doubt, I looked
7 at the rubrics from both of them. They were outstanding.
8 I mean, it saves somebody a whole bunch of work trying
9 to establish those standards for not only the course
10 evaluation, but also for the instructor evaluation.

11 Now, this doesn't -- as we had a speaker earlier,
12 one of the concerns is the CEI reports, from the Course
13 Evaluation Instrument. Students are still able to go
14 online and evaluate each individual course according to
15 the course control number; isn't that correct?

16 MS. EVANS: Yes, that's the next part of the
17 presentation.

18 MEMBER BANNING: Oh, I'm sorry.

19 MS. EVANS: That's okay.

20 MEMBER BANNING: My bad.

21 MS. EVANS: No problem.

22 MEMBER BANNING: I'm done.

23 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Spagnoli. I had a question about
24 the course assessment. And I think it's good that an
25 independent body come and assess courses.

1 However, it seems like with the courses that are
2 being assessed by the presenters themselves, or the
3 person offering the course, the self-assessment, are they
4 exempt from having the independent person come and assess
5 it? Because I think it could be a work-around to not
6 have POST come and do that assessment, which I think it's
7 good to have somebody independent do it as well.

8 MS. EVANS: No, at this time we have not exempted
9 any POST-certified presenters from the random selection
10 of courses for review.

11 Our only limitation at this point is that due to the
12 limited number of trained evaluators that we have, we
13 can't get out to as many courses as we would like, at
14 least for the time being. And it's a little difficult
15 for us to get the evaluators to commit to something like,
16 say, a 40-hour course or an 80-hour course. That's a
17 little bit more difficult. But we're hoping as we build
18 the pool of trained evaluators, we'll have more
19 flexibility in the future.

20 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Sure. And then the second
21 question I had, just was on the selection of courses.

22 Have you been giving some thought to actually
23 selecting courses based on student feedback that fall
24 well below the -- let's say, if 3 is average, if the
25 feedback falls a little below 3, that you would actually,

1 instead of being random, more targeted to select that
2 course for an assessment based on, you know, a large
3 candidate pool, by who went through the course or student
4 pool?

5 MS. EVANS: Absolutely. We are currently working on
6 an update for the course evaluation instruments. And
7 I'll explain a little bit further in detail as we get to
8 that segment. But we are absolutely going to solicit
9 more student feedback, if we can.

10 CHAIR CASAS: I want to say, Tami, that I really
11 like the idea of this. I think it's been a long time
12 coming.

13 I do -- having some experience with STC, they do
14 something similar where the representatives for the
15 regions actually sit in on the classes and do a very
16 similar process. I don't know if it's exactly like this.
17 But I like the idea. It's worked out very well. They
18 consistently are able to maintain the quality of training
19 that they want. And I think this is something that we
20 definitely should move to.

21 Has some thought been given to the potential
22 sensitivity of certain of our evaluators going out to,
23 say, a management class or other classes and evaluating
24 that course?

25 And I think you've said it already, it is simply

1 being done on the criteria that this program highlights,
2 the presentation itself, the instructor's method of
3 delivery, things of that nature.

4 But do you think there will be any sensitivity to
5 courses that we do review?

6 MS. EVANS: I'm hoping, as we increase our pool of
7 trained evaluators, I'm hoping to be able to match the
8 evaluator with their field of expertise.

9 CHAIR CASAS: Okay.

10 MS. EVANS: For example, the folks here who are
11 reviewing this firearms course are all firearms
12 instructors. So that worked out really well because they
13 were available to review that course.

14 And in the future, if we're reviewing, say,
15 hazardous materials or SWAT, I'd like to be able to have
16 folks who are subject-matter experts in those topical
17 areas to be able to go out and review those courses.

18 But at this point, we're a little bit limited in our
19 flexibility just by the number of trained evaluators that
20 we have. Hopefully, we'll have more flexibility in the
21 future.

22 CHAIR CASAS: So it's good to hear that's the goal,
23 right, to have a balance? I like that.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. EVANS: All right, I mean I'll move on to the

1 next part then.

2 Course Evaluation Instruments. As we discussed in
3 the last Advisory Committee meeting, we previously used
4 the Scantron technology which, of course, became
5 outdated, and POST no longer asks presenters to send in
6 their student course evaluations to POST for data
7 collection and analysis.

8 Since that time, though, that has limited the amount
9 of student feedback that POST gets on certified courses.
10 As Committee Member Spagnoli just mentioned, it's very
11 helpful to have that feedback from students, especially
12 in cases where our evaluators can't be in the class. And
13 so we'd need some other means of learning about what's
14 happening in the POST-certified courses.

15 This just -- it might be a little bit small print,
16 but this just gives you an idea of the rate of return
17 that we've had on the course evaluations over the past
18 seven years in the beginning of 2012.

19 Overall, you can see we're pretty low. We're
20 looking at under a hundredth of a percent for all the
21 POST-certified courses that we're getting evaluation
22 instruments back on.

23 This was an area of concern for our work group, for
24 our stakeholders who met to design the forms initially.
25 They also mentioned the fact that they brought forward

1 their concerns that since the time that we discontinued
2 the old Scantron forms, that POST wasn't really able to
3 collect enough student feedback from the students in the
4 POST-certified courses to really have a good database of
5 knowledge on the courses and the quality, at least from
6 the students' perspective.

7 So that's when we decided that we needed to try to
8 make the course evaluations a little bit more
9 user-friendly, so that people could use them actually in
10 the classroom, instead of having to go back to a computer
11 to go online, to enter their student evaluations online
12 or fill out a hard paper copy and submit that to the
13 training presenter.

14 We wanted to try to find a way that would be as
15 user-friendly as possible, and it would give us realtime
16 information, immediately updated in EDI, where the
17 presenter and POST can both see it.

18 So our Computer Services staff has been absolutely
19 wonderful in helping us to develop these applications.

20 And I see Mike is here.

21 Thank you, Mike.

22 Mike has been a very big force on this project,
23 helping to develop these applications.

24 And if I don't know the exact technology, I'm going
25 to depend on you, Mike, to help me out, okay?

1 This will now be accessible, once it's finished, it
2 will now be accessible either by Web or on a smart phone,
3 where this QR Code, is what it's called, will be
4 provided -- would generate it automatically in EDI and
5 provided to training presenters who can then give it to
6 their students.

7 And if you're not familiar with this -- I think most
8 everybody is -- but if you're not familiar with this,
9 just about all the new smart phones now have free
10 software pre-downloaded into the phone that will
11 automatically read this. And basically, all it is, is a
12 Web link. It just takes you to a Web page. And that Web
13 page on your phone would look like this (*indicating*).

14 So you would go to the course evaluation on your
15 phone. And you can fill it out immediately with your
16 course control number pre-entered. And there will be a
17 series of four or five questions, asking the student
18 multiple-choice, to give ratings on the quality of the
19 course and the presentation. And then there will also
20 be a space for a narrative at the end, where the student
21 will be able to enter a narrative on their feedback on
22 the course.

23 So what this will do then was automatically upload
24 into the course in EDI, where the presenter and POST can
25 both see it.

1 So if you are the presenter of a training, you will
2 always be able to click on the tab in your EDI interface
3 that shows you what all -- how many evaluations have been
4 submitted and what the feedback has been.

5 We're hoping that this will become easy enough for
6 students to use, that they can use it right in the
7 classroom; and it will encourage more feedback from
8 students.

9 Again, it's not required; it's optional. But we
10 would encourage everyone to make use of this, if they
11 would like to.

12 And I've already covered this. Basically, it's
13 another alternative to the online -- the PC application.

14 The other part of this that the Computer Services
15 folks are working on, is direct entry for the course
16 evaluators, who go out and evaluate the courses on behalf
17 of POST, to have their own access to EDI, where they will
18 enter their course evaluations into EDI where, again, the
19 presenter or POST will be able to pull them up and look
20 at them. So they'll all be online, and we won't have
21 to -- we'll be able to decrease the amount of time spent
22 e-mailing reports back and forth. It will just be
23 automatically entered directly into EDI, where everyone
24 could have access to it. And the interface pretty much
25 mirrors the forms the way that it's been created.

1 It's pretty much the same thing.

2 CHAIR CASAS: Hey, Tami, at one point do those
3 evaluations somehow come together what the students fill
4 out, versus what the evaluator observing fills out to
5 corroborate, I guess for lack of a better word, the
6 problems or positives of that course? Is that part of
7 this plan or...?

8 MS. EVANS: Yes. It will all be co-located in one
9 place in the EDI system, where the presenters go in to
10 update or modify their courses, or they make their course
11 announcements and so forth. It will all be accessible
12 right there, where they can choose whether or not they
13 want to look at the student evaluations, the POST
14 evaluator reports; or if someone has come out and
15 evaluated their course, it will all be available in one
16 spot, right there.

17 CHAIR CASAS: Thank you.

18 MS. EVANS: Yes, thanks.

19 I don't have anything further.

20 If anybody has any questions, I'm happy to entertain
21 them.

22 MEMBER BANNING: Tami, I know that in ODP, I know in
23 federal presentations, the student is required to fill
24 out an evaluation form.

25 This is still just a voluntary process for the

1 students going to a class.

2 The way they've linked it in all the federal classes
3 that I present, is that unless the student -- there's
4 still anonymity. But unless the student fills out the
5 evaluation, it won't allow them to print a certificate of
6 training.

7 MS. EVANS: We had that discussion with the
8 stakeholders, because there were several people who
9 suggested that. But what we've found out is that a lot
10 of times, a presenter is presenting a course that doesn't
11 necessarily include all -- just their own students, but
12 it is also students from outside agencies and so on and
13 so forth.

14 MEMBER BANNING: Got it.

15 MS. EVANS: And so it's difficult for that presenter
16 to put pressure on an outside student to complete an
17 evaluation before they can get a certificate.

18 That was a little bit of an obstacle course right
19 there.

20 MEMBER BANNING: Okay, that makes sense.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR CASAS: Would it really be the presenter's
23 burden, though? Isn't it more of just an accountability
24 issue, if the officer wants that certificate? Or,
25 obviously, they wouldn't get it until they fill out the

1 eval.

2 MS. EVANS: Right.

3 MEMBER BANNING: Well, part of the problem, though,
4 is like if you have a multiple-course class -- let's say
5 the narcotic investigation course, you have several
6 presenters or several instructors in each domain. So it
7 would require the student to fill out an evaluation for
8 each domain.

9 Well, if there's 15 or 16 of them, and if the
10 student just happened to miss one, I guess theoretically,
11 it wouldn't prevent them from getting a certificate for
12 the whole course.

13 And then what I think is going to happen, is in
14 order to get their certificate, they're going to
15 rubber-stamp whatever they need to do to make it to go.
16 I don't know if there's much value in that evaluation.

17 CHAIR CASAS: Yes, that's true.

18 Thank you, Tami.

19 MS. EVANS: All right. Thank you very much.

20 MR. STRESAK: Thank you, Tami.

21 A couple quick comments.

22 Tami has been with this effort from concept to
23 coordinating the SMEs to facilitating the SME meetings,
24 which, at times, you can imagine were a little
25 contentious. She was there at the pilot development, the

1 pilot implementation, the pilot evaluation, and course
2 correction afterwards. So she's put an incredible amount
3 of effort into this incredibly needed program.

4 So, Tami, thank you so much for everything you've
5 done.

6 *(Applause)*

7 MR. STRESAK: Chief, your comment on the QR code.
8 We will use that to triage and to identify -- to
9 red-flag, if you will, identify out of a field of
10 5,000 courses what perhaps needs commendation and what
11 perhaps needs immediate attention and correction.

12 And, once again, this effort would be to
13 ultimately -- the goal would be to remediate the course,
14 not necessarily to impose punitive action or sanctions,
15 but to do every effort that we can to remediate and make
16 the course whole and effective again.

17 And then another quick side note. Taking you back
18 to November of 2011, the University of California, Davis,
19 incident. We received a letter from the Governor's
20 office, asking us to address some training issues that
21 were identified from that incident.

22 At that time, we felt it might be strategic to ask
23 for -- to see how receptive the Governor's office might
24 be to adding personnel to this QAP program, so that we
25 would have sufficient resources.

1 Because, as you know, our evaluation began with
2 CEI's years ago, and then we had a group of retired
3 chiefs that went around evaluating courses, and then due
4 to budgetary restraints, we lost that.

5 So we thought we'd seize that opportunity to at
6 least mention to the Governor. The Governor's office did
7 indicate a preliminary reception or a willingness to
8 listen to any kind of future proposals.

9 Shortly thereafter, within months, we submitted a
10 BCP requesting six positions for this effort for the
11 Quality Assessment Program effort. The Department of
12 Finance promptly turned that down.

13 Following the rejection from the Department of
14 Finance, we felt it would be at least worth an effort to
15 go to the Governor's office now, saying that: "We've
16 asked for six positions for this. You appear to be
17 receptive initially. They've been turned down by the
18 Department of Finance. Can we have another swing at the
19 ball?"

20 So that request currently resides in the Governor's
21 office and is percolating, if you will. So let's keep
22 our fingers crossed.

23 CHAIR CASAS: Any other questions on that?

24 *(No response)*

25 MR. STRESAK: Okay, I think we're good.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, this is the point where we'll go
2 ahead and call out for the Advisory Committee member
3 reports, individual reports.

4 So I'll go ahead and start off by saying, there's
5 nothing from -- I'm sorry, strike that.

6 So I assume it's talking about --

7 MR. STRESAK: No, no.

8 Individual member reports, we'll start with.

9 CHAIR CASAS: We'll start with Jim.

10 VICE-CHAIR BOCK: Coming up in November here, we're
11 going to have the PORAC conference down in Disneyland.
12 And at that, I'm going to be meeting with hopefully a
13 large collective of the Specialized Law Enforcement.
14 We'll hopefully have something for the February meeting.

15 CHAIR CASAS: Yes.

16 MEMBER BONNER: Ed Bonner. Sheriffs' Association is
17 going to meet in Alameda County the first week in
18 December. And I expect that, like all of us, we will do
19 a post-mortem on the elections coming up, so...

20 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: As far as PORAC is concerned,
21 Jim already talked about the PORAC conference, is the
22 highlight of the conference will be when we do the
23 director's installation. That keynote speaker will be
24 the most recently Medal of Valor winner, a sergeant in
25 the Marine Corps. And I apologize, I don't remember his

1 name. But he's a very plain-spoken individual, very
2 dedicated to work, and his family. And if you ever get a
3 chance to listen to the interview he had with David
4 Letterman, he talked about that he couldn't take the
5 phone call from the President because he had to go to
6 work. So he will be the keynote speaker for the
7 installation.

8 MEMBER LINDSTROM: From the California Academy
9 Directors, about half the police academies in California
10 are run by community colleges. And in two Tuesdays, it
11 will be a big deal for community colleges in California
12 because of the impact it's going to have. And I think
13 law-enforcement training provided by community college or
14 many agencies themselves contract with community
15 colleges.

16 Our fire academy locally -- our college turned down
17 contracted training for the fire departments in our area
18 this year. We still do contracted training with our
19 law-enforcement agencies. And I do not think they will
20 touch us, ever, on that. But I shouldn't really say
21 that. I'm just hoping that they don't touch us. But
22 there will be community colleges affected by the budget
23 this year if this Prop. 30 goes down.

24 And with that, will be a lot of agencies not being
25 able to contract with their community colleges.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 So that's all I have.

2 MEMBER McFADON: Alan McFadon with the Dispatchers.

3 And POST Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Committee
4 just met a few weeks ago in San Diego, facilitated by
5 Bryon Gustafson.

6 Thank you, sir.

7 Many beneficial projects are being worked on and
8 continue being built. The dispatchers really appreciated
9 the efforts of POST staff and asked me to thank
10 everybody.

11 MEMBER MUELLER: CHP, nothing to report. But I'd
12 like a shout-out to Director Cappitelli and his staff for
13 an outstanding job with the Driving Symposium in
14 San Diego. We had several people attend that.

15 As you are aware, the CHP has lost 223 officers in
16 its history, and many of those, driving vehicles. And so
17 it touches us very deeply. And anything we can do to
18 support POST in its efforts with the Below 100 Campaign,
19 we're certainly behind it.

20 MR. CAPPITELLI: Thank you, Mitch.

21 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: From California Peace Officers'
22 Association, we had a successful trade show in COPSWEST
23 this year.

24 And we will be starting our training, legislative
25 update training at the end of November. And that will be

1 in Walnut Creek. And the full schedule is on our
2 calendar. It goes through the end of December.

3 Last week -- or, actually, Monday and Tuesday of
4 this week was the Women Leaders in Law Enforcement
5 Conference, and CPOA is a co-sponsor with Cal Chiefs,
6 CSSA, and also the California Highway Patrol. And the
7 Trailblazer Award this year, which is the second time we
8 presented it -- Mona Prieto from the CHP got that award.
9 It's sort of our lifetime achievement award for being a
10 trailblazer for women in law enforcement.

11 She was the first female in history of the
12 California Highway Patrol to be on the motorcycle. So
13 that kind of started her whole career. And, in fact,
14 she is the highest ranking woman of the California
15 Highway Patrol history as well. She is amazing to listen
16 to her career. So that was a great award to give her
17 personally.

18 And next year, we are combining our annual training
19 summit and symposium with COPSWEST. So that will be in
20 November.

21 And that's all we have.

22 MEMBER BANNING: Elmo Banning. I have no report
23 from the public.

24 But given our location, I'm obligated to say, "Go,
25 Giants."

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER McFADON: I second that.

2 MEMBER BERNARD: Alex Bernard, public member. No
3 report.

4 CHAIR CASAS: Okay. Mario Casas, California
5 Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations, no report at
6 this time.

7 So that will end the *Committee Member Reports*.

8 I'd like to open it now to any *Commissioner*
9 *Comments*.

10 (No response)

11 CHAIR CASAS: None?

12 Wow. Not a one, huh?

13 Thank you very much. Thank you for attending. We
14 really appreciate you being here.

15 *Old and New Business*.

16 MR. STRESAK: *Old Business*, which is new business.

17 A reminder that nominations for the *O.J. "Bud" Hawkins*
18 *Exceptional Service Award* are open. And we have -- we're
19 actually closing in the month of December in which
20 they're due.

21 So a reminder to make an effort to the field, to
22 your organizations, to your agencies, to your neighboring
23 agencies, et cetera, of that award and nomination
24 availability.

25 Secondly, I would like to address the issue. We

1 have had an absence of a WPOA representative on this
2 committee for a period of time now. POST staff has made
3 multiple attempts to reach out to the organization to
4 seek a nomination. And for whatever reasons, we have not
5 yet filled this vacancy.

6 So, Mr. Chair, I guess I'd like to pose to you
7 perhaps opening for discussion to this committee of any
8 alternatives or other considerations for finding an
9 equivalent representative from WPOA or some similar
10 organization.

11 CHAIR CASAS: I'd like to open up discussion on
12 that.

13 I don't know if it would be fair to ask anybody now
14 who they recommended, but it's definitely food for
15 thought as to, you know, which would be considered as a
16 replacement.

17 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Chair?

18 CHAIR CASAS: The Chair recognizes Chief Spagnoli.

19 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Sandra Spagnoli.

20 I think, over the last seven years, I know four of
21 the major organizations in the state have come together
22 under the auspice of Women Leaders in Law Enforcement.
23 And I think that the conferences range between five and
24 about eight hundred people, the majority of them are
25 women in the field. And I think that board, who has come

1 together, would sort of be a good place to start if WPOA
2 does not have somebody to put up.

3 WLLE does not work with WPOA to sponsor this. So
4 that would be the only disconnect. But it would
5 certainly give, for the purposes of having somebody who
6 represents those people in the field, to gain someone
7 from that committee or that board, might be helpful if we
8 can't get WPOA to respond.

9 CHAIR CASAS: So are you suggesting that WPOA
10 somehow connect with WLLE or...?

11 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Well, if WPOA -- are they in
12 the -- I assume they're in the regulation, to having them
13 as a member; is that right? Or somebody similar?

14 CHAIR CASAS: I don't know if it's regulated. But
15 I think that -- I don't know how it's written, Paul or
16 Bob; I may have to defer to you.

17 MR. STRESAK: That's a good question.

18 Alan, do you recall?

19 MR. CAPPITELLI: Mr. Deal is intimately familiar
20 with this topic.

21 MR. DEAL: I'm the master of trivia.

22 The Commission specifically identifies those
23 positions that they wish to be represented as part of the
24 Advisory Committee. And so there is a listing of which
25 WPOA is one of those organizations that has been

1 designated by the Commission.

2 Normally, what we do is go to the head of that
3 organization or agency or board, and ask them for someone
4 to represent them. And they do so by sending us a
5 letter. And the letter is obviously addressed to the
6 Commission, the Commission reviews that, and then in
7 almost every instance, we'll accept that nomination and
8 approve that individual to be a member of the Advisory
9 Committee.

10 CHAIR CASAS: Alan, correct me if I'm wrong, but
11 historically speaking, those that are represented here,
12 and the Commission, for that matter, generally have
13 associations that are fairly large -- represent a large
14 number of officers, both management and rank-and-file up
15 and down the state, and have some kind of a training
16 connection? Or is it...?

17 MR. DEAL: Not necessarily.

18 I would say that, you know, we have some
19 professional associations, although they do provide some
20 level of training, I think it is as much looking at the
21 full range of things that come before the Commission as
22 it relates to selection and training.

23 Obviously, we spend more time on the training side
24 of that. We do a considerable amount of work on the
25 selection side.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 But I think it really represents the common, most
2 active stakeholders that really represent a significant
3 slice of those individuals that are most affected by the
4 decisions made by the Commission.

5 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, any other comments?

6 *(No response)*

7 CHAIR CASAS: Suggestions?

8 MEMBER LINDSTROM: Well, I have a suggestion, that,
9 you know, this question is coming before us right now;
10 and I don't think anybody has a clear idea maybe what
11 some of those suggestions might be, except Sandra --
12 which is a good suggestion, by the way. But I think
13 maybe this is something that maybe we should postpone
14 until -- bring it back at the next Advisory Committee.
15 That gives everybody certainly enough lead time to
16 research and make any solid suggestions.

17 CHAIR CASAS: I think that's how we handled it the
18 last time this came up, I believe.

19 Joe?

20 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: A question: Have they not
21 responded to the letter, or have they just said no?

22 MR. STRESAK: A failure to respond to our inquiries.
23 Not a refusal, but a failure to respond.

24 MEMBER McFADON: Alan McFadon.

25 Just a question of clarity here, what the Chief was

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 suggesting is an entirely different POA; is that right?

2 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: It's actually not an organization.

3 MEMBER McFADON: Organization?

4 So you would have to change that chair, correct?

5 MR. STRESAK: We would have to change that
6 recommendation -- or bring this before the Commission
7 before a change, is that what you're saying?

8 MEMBER McFADON: Right, isn't that correct?

9 MR. STRESAK: I would assume so, yes.

10 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Would you remind me of the
11 conversation that we had regarding the number of members
12 on this board? Didn't we have that discussion two years
13 ago? Somebody?

14 CHAIR CASAS: Yes, this issue came up again, we did
15 have that discussion.

16 MR. CAPPITELLI: The discussion came up last time,
17 when I believe it was the COPS organization disbanded.
18 That's the last time we've had some discussion.

19 CHAIR CASAS: So any other --

20 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: I would imagine that if we did a
21 follow-up letter, if they are listed in the organizations
22 that are allowed to sit at the table, that if the
23 follow-up letters say something to the effect of, you
24 know, "If you fail -- continue to fail to respond or
25 whatever, we're going to drop your position from the

1 Advisory Committee" or "It will be recommended that the
2 WPOA position be eliminated from the Advisory Committee."
3 And that might light a fire under, you know, somebody to
4 make a response, if that hasn't already happened, that
5 type of a letter.

6 MR. STRESAK: If this committee is willing, we can
7 initiate further correspondence. But I would ask perhaps
8 that this Committee takes the opportunity to at least
9 look at alternatives. So in the event that we are met
10 with any kind of lack of response, that at least we have
11 an alternative which we can move forward with.

12 Does that make sense?

13 CHAIR CASAS: Yes.

14 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: Does that take a vote, or can you
15 do it by direction

16 MR. STRESAK: It seems to me that that's an action
17 item. I would take a vote on that motion.

18 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: I'll motion it.

19 MR. STRESAK: A motion to table?

20 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: No, what Bob said. If we
21 continue to have no response, then we vet the issue of
22 eliminating the position -- or how --

23 MR. STRESAK: The motion would be to initiate
24 additional correspondence and for this committee to
25 evaluate further alternatives.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: I'll make that motion.

2 CHAIR CASAS: A motion on the floor.

3 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Spagnoli. Second.

4 CHAIR CASAS: Seconded by Spagnoli.

5 Call for the vote.

6 All in favor, say "aye."

7 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

8 CHAIR CASAS: Opposed?

9 *(No response)*

10 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, it passes.

11 MR. CAPPITELLI: Mr. Chair, just for clarification,
12 any recommendation that would come out of this committee
13 would be forwarded to the Commission. It would be the
14 Commission's decision.

15 CHAIR CASAS: Right, ultimately.

16 MR. CAPPITELLI: Yes.

17 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, still under *Old and New*
18 *Business.*

19 Did you have anything else, Bob?

20 MR. STRESAK: I did not. Thank you.

21 CHAIR CASAS: The other thing I'd like to bring up
22 is that there's been some -- I don't know if anybody else
23 has had this issue, there's been some discussion in the
24 training arena, primarily down in Region 10, where I'm
25 at. When it came down to, as you're all aware, it's

1 crunch time for CPT, perishable skill credits and so
2 forth, and we had an instructor, who is a tactical
3 communications instructor, put on a class, in order to
4 get those credits. And unfortunately I was unable to
5 provide him with the credits himself, unless he actually
6 was a student in that same class that he teaches.

7 And for some reason I recall, this may have been
8 brought up at some time in the past, and I can't remember
9 what the result was or the reason why this exists. But
10 apparently it's not just tactical communications, other
11 subject-matter experts that teach these perishable skills
12 training and that cannot get credit for being an expert,
13 teaching the class, unless they're sitting in a seat as a
14 student.

15 And, you know, I need a little clarification on
16 that. Because apparently he taught the class, but yet
17 unless he attended it himself, he was unable to get
18 perishable skills credit for that.

19 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: Is this a POST -- was this a
20 POST-certified course?

21 CHAIR CASAS: Yes, perishable skills.

22 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: Perishable skills? I mean --

23 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: But he's not a student, he's the
24 instructor of the course?

25 CHAIR CASAS: Correct.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: So he didn't attend the course,
2 he's instructing it.

3 CHAIR CASAS: But yet he's a subject-matter expert
4 in that curriculum.

5 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: But how would someone get CPT
6 credit because they have something in their mind? He
7 wouldn't even need to go to the course because he -- you
8 know what I mean? He wouldn't even need to present it.
9 He could just -- for anything that you are subject-matter
10 expert, somebody could just give themselves 24 hours of
11 training, because I'm an expert in that, I could teach
12 it, I could teach 24 hours. You know, they could accept
13 credit.

14 I would think to accept credit for a course, you
15 would have to be a student.

16 CHAIR CASAS: Well, I think that's the issue, does
17 it make any sense to have the person who is a subject-
18 matter expert in that field attend the class simply to
19 get the credit.

20 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: That's a good point.

21 CHAIR CASAS: Is there a way for us to --

22 MEMBER FLANNAGAN: You have to attend someone else's
23 course then, theoretically?

24 CHAIR CASAS: Right.

25 And I'm going to defer to my expert, Alan Deal,

1 here.

2 MR. DEAL: As you recall, probably 18 months ago,
3 we had this issue come up, where there was discussion as
4 it related to training records of individuals who have
5 been in the business a long time. And you would have
6 25, 30 or more points that -- as you went through and
7 looked at the courses, the individual would have been
8 identified as having attended a course over and over
9 and over again. And that was a situation where we were
10 having problems that the people who were instructing in
11 the course, were putting themselves on the course roster.

12 And there is a specific place that they're supposed to
13 go, and it's not on the roster as one of the students.
14 And so we've done some changes to try to minimize that
15 from occurring.

16 There are probably a number of records that need to
17 be cleaned up behind that. There are courses that are
18 1070 requirements -- 1070, one of the regulations that
19 says certain types of specialty courses require an
20 individual instructor to have satisfied certain training
21 requirements.

22 It is not unusual to find someone who becomes an
23 instructor to actually sit through a course, that is the
24 learner's course; and the next go-around, that shows up
25 on their resumé as part of the course-certification

1 package, to where they become an instructor of record
2 because they have satisfied the 1070 requirement, having
3 attended that course as a means by which they are now
4 qualified to be an instructor in the course.

5 It is probably one of those areas where, you know,
6 further evaluation or review would be worthy; because
7 sometimes some of the, what I would call the high-risk
8 courses, some of you probably remember the presenter,
9 ITR. That was a situation where, when you looked at how
10 both of the co-owners of ITR attended each other's course
11 and that, therefore, you know, they qualified them to
12 become an expert as it related for purposes of satisfying
13 the instructor resumé component and the 1070
14 requirements, so that they could then instruct.

15 So in the situation that you're describing, we would
16 probably need to look at it specifically to be able to
17 evaluate it, because there are probably a number of other
18 variables that we don't have and that we should have if
19 we're going to make a determination. That would be
20 something we could talk about offline.

21 CHAIR CASAS: Yes, I think that's what I'm asking,
22 Alan, is just if we could look at that a little bit
23 better. It would just be much more easier for me and
24 others that are in this situation, especially when it
25 comes down to crunch time.

1 I mean, if I'm unable to send that officer or
2 sergeant to a class -- it's just simpler to give them the
3 credit, if they're teaching the class somehow and they
4 obviously know the curriculum and they know the subject
5 matter, and to be able to find a way to get a waiver for
6 them. I don't know. I just think it's worth looking at.

7 MR. DEAL: Well, we look at courses beyond, say, the
8 specific course that they may be teaching in. I mean,
9 quite likely, you would have other kinds of training that
10 they have attended. But that's one of those situations,
11 as you're well familiar, Murphy would be able to look at
12 that for you on an individual basis and say whether or
13 not that person has satisfied the requirement. But,
14 again, that's on an individual, case-by-case basis.

15 But that's where your area consultant within the ten
16 regions, that's the value of getting together with them
17 early, as you're going through the process so that they
18 can guide you and assisting in that particular area.

19 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Deal.

20 Any other business, new, before we move on?

21 MR. STRESAK: I also wanted to take the opportunity
22 to introduce POST's newest bureau chief, Anne Brewer.

23 Anne, would you stand up, please?

24 Congratulations, Anne.

25 *(Applause)*

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MR. STRESAK: And Bryon Gustafson, since our last
2 Commission meeting, was appointed to bureau chief also.

3 Congratulations to Bryon.

4 *(Applause)*

5 MR. STRESAK: And Bryon will be defending his Ph.D.
6 on November --

7 MR. GUSTAFSON: 5th.

8 MR. STRESAK: -- 5th. November 5th.

9 So we wish you the best, Bryon, in that.

10 And then the last announcement I have to make is
11 the Legislative Committee meeting will be meeting in
12 Diplomat A tomorrow at 08:30, I believe. In Room
13 Diplomat A.

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, any other points of interest for
16 new business?

17 *(No response)*

18 CHAIR CASAS: If not, we will move into our Next
19 Meetings announcement, which will be -- the next,
20 upcoming meeting will be the February 26th, 2013, at
21 3:00 p.m. for review of nominations for the 2012 *POST*
22 *Excellence in Training* awards and O.J. "Bud" Hawkins
23 *Exceptional Service* and review. That's when we're going
24 to be expected --

25 And this is just for the Advisory, I take it?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MR. STRESAK: Yes.

2 CHAIR CASAS: For the Advisory Committee members
3 that will come down early that day to review the
4 applications and break up in our typical committees that
5 we do. But that will be February 26th.

6 And then our Advisory meeting will be on the 27th,
7 the following day at 1:00 p.m., and so forth, for the
8 Commission, the following day.

9 MR. STRESAK: Have you identified the Committee
10 members to review the nominations?

11 CHAIR CASAS: I have not.

12 Do I need to?

13 MR. STRESAK: I believe so, yes.

14 CHAIR CASAS: Okay do we have a different category
15 or is it just for those two awards?

16 MR. STRESAK: Well, anybody that's not here, you can
17 volunteer, for starters.

18 CHAIR CASAS: Who is not here?

19 Thank you for that, Bob.

20 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Exactly.

21 CHAIR CASAS: Go ahead, Alex?

22 MEMBER BERNARD: Usually, in the past, staff did
23 that.

24 CHAIR CASAS: That's why I'm surprised about this.

25 MR. STRESAK: I stand corrected. All right.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 MEMBER MCFADON: In the past, we had a lot of
2 different -- all the three categories came up at once,
3 and so we all broke out into groups early and worked on
4 that, but with just one award. We're just going to need
5 a group that's small.

6 One small group, right?

7 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: No, they're still the same number.

8 CHAIR CASAS: No, they are still the same amount of
9 awards.

10 There's four from them.

11 MEMBER BANNING: Individual organizations?

12 MEMBER MCFADON: Then it is this entire committee
13 broken into different groups, right?

14 CHAIR CASAS: Yes, and staff has usually broken them
15 up.

16 MR. STRESAK: I stand corrected. We'll work on that
17 assignment for you.

18 So I'll take the opportunity to ask, is there any
19 recommendations for improvements or adjustments to the
20 process that you wish for me to consider at this point?

21 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: I would just think, if there could
22 be some sort of a sheet, and maybe work on the note sheet
23 and the response, and so there's how we can grade it
24 better. Really, it's just an open narrative. Because
25 then somebody -- Mario would have to go to the

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1 Commission, sort of explain why we supported it. And
2 rather than taking notes, it would be good if there were
3 some sort of just checklist with some brief notes so that
4 you had something to present.

5 MR. STRESAK: A checklist or a rubric?

6 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Yes, exactly.

7 You're in the business of that, so...

8 CHAIR CASAS: An excellent recommendation, Chief.

9 Thank you for that.

10 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: It would just help whoever has to
11 present.

12 CHAIR CASAS: Right.

13 You should be chairman...

14 Oh, you were.

15 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: You're doing a fine job, Mario.

16 MEMBER BANNING: Not as good as the last chairman,
17 I just want to say.

18 CHAIR CASAS: Okay, anything else on that?

19 MR. STRESAK: We're good.

20 CHAIR CASAS: With that being said, I think we're at
21 the point now where we're going to go and adjourn the
22 meeting.

23 Thank you for being here and we'll look forward to
24 you next time.

25 *(The gavel was sounded.)*

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 24, 2012

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIR CASAS: Meeting adjourned.

*(The Advisory Committee meeting concluded
at 2:35 p.m.)*



REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were duly reported by me at the time and place herein specified; and

That the proceedings were reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand on November 12th, 2012.

Daniel P. Feldhaus
California CSR #6949
Registered Diplomat Reporter
Certified Realtime Reporter