BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS
TITLE 15, DIVISION 1, CHAPTER 1, SUBCHAPTER 1
STANDARDS AND TRAINING OF LOCAL CORRECTIONS
AND PROBATION OFFICERS

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Penal Code sections 6035 and 6036 establish the minimum standards for selection and training of local corrections and probation officers and authorizes the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC[1]) to amend those standards.

ARTICLE 5. CERTIFICATION OF TRAINING COURSES

§ 231. Certification of Courses.

Section 231, Certification of Courses, outlines the criteria by which the Board may certify a training course.

The proposed revisions remove subsection (b)(3), "the cost of providing the instruction as related to the benefits," and renumber the remainder of subsection (b) (items (4) through (7) as items (3) through (6)) to maintain clarity and continuity following the removal of the cost-related criterion.

These changes are necessary due to long-standing practical challenges identified through a review of current Board practices. The Board is not a party to financial transactions between participating agencies and training providers, meaning it does not oversee, participate in, or verify the actual costs associated with providing instruction. Because agencies pay providers directly, the Board has limited ability to monitor or assess training costs or to determine whether a course's price accurately reflects its benefit. Cost-related concerns are generally identified only when reported or discovered incidentally, making cost-related evaluations an unreliable criterion for Board decision-making in the certification process.

Removing the cost-based requirement eliminates a factor that the Board cannot consistently or effectively evaluate, ensuring the certification criteria remain practical, enforceable, and within the scope of the Board's administrative role. Renumbering the remaining subsections ensures the regulation remains easy to interpret without altering the intent or substance of the remaining requirements.

There are no fiscal or operational impacts anticipated.

[1] For the purpose of this document, "BSCC" and "Board" are used interchangeably to refer to the Board of State and Community Corrections.

§ 232. Application for Certification of Course.

Section 232, Application for Certification of Course, outlines the requirements for applying to the Board for course certification.

The proposed revisions make a minor grammatical change by adding “and” between “methodology,” and “instructor experience” for clarity. Additionally, the phrase “and costs associated with delivery” is removed from subsection (c). This change aligns the application requirements with the practical limitations identified in a review of current Board practices.

The Board is not involved in the financial transactions between participating agencies and training providers, and therefore does not oversee, verify, or participate in determining the actual costs of course delivery. Further, the actual cost of course delivery may change with each presentation due to a variety of interrelated factors (e.g., number of students, location, travel requirements, agency available resources, customization of content). Because agencies negotiate with and pay providers directly, the Board has limited ability to monitor or assess training costs or determine whether those costs accurately reflect the value of instruction. Issues related to course costs are generally identified only when they are reported or discovered incidentally, making cost-related information neither reliable nor necessary for evaluating a course’s suitability for Board certification.

For this reason, requiring cost information as part of the application serves no practical purpose and is removed to ensure the application criteria remain consistent with the Board’s administrative role. The remaining application requirements continue to provide sufficient information for determining the quality, structure, and relevance of proposed training courses without relying on cost-based data that the Board cannot effectively evaluate.

There are no fiscal or operational impacts anticipated.

§ 299. Allocation and Use of Funds Based on Annual Training Plan.

Section 299, Allocation and Use of Funds Based on Annual Training Plan, outlines how the Board allocates funds to participating county or city agencies and defines the permissible uses for those funds.

The proposed revision to subsection (b) replaces the term “tuition” with “course training costs.” This change ensures the regulation uses terminology that accurately reflects the nature of allowable expenses. The term “tuition” is generally understood as a fee paid by an individual student or payer to enroll in a course and may represent only one component of the total cost of delivering training. Because the Board allocates funds to agencies, not individual trainees, and those funds are intended to cover the full range of expenses associated with attending or providing training, “course training costs” is the more accurate and appropriate term. This revision improves clarity without changing the intent or permissible uses of allocated funds.

There are no fiscal or operational impacts anticipated.

§ 317. Records.

Section 317, Records, outlines the documentation each county or city participating in the training program is required to maintain for BSCC's monitoring purposes.

The proposed revision to subsection (a)(2)(A) replaces the term "tuition" with "course training costs." This change ensures the regulation uses terminology that accurately reflects the nature of expenses agencies incur when participating in training. The term "tuition" is commonly understood as a fee paid by an individual student or payer to enroll in a course and may represent only one part of the overall cost of delivering training. Because the Board allocates funds to agencies, not individual trainees, and does not engage in or oversee the financial transactions between agencies and training providers, "course training costs" is the more accurate term for the records that must be maintained.

Updating this terminology provides clarity regarding the types of expenses that must be documented for monitoring purposes and ensures consistency with other sections of the regulation where cost-related language has been revised. The change does not alter the intent of the record-keeping requirement but ensures it aligns with the Board's administrative role and the practical realities of how training expenses are incurred and tracked.

There are no fiscal or operational impacts anticipated.

§ 320. Program Evaluation.

Section 320, Program Evaluation, outlines how the Board evaluates the effectiveness of training programs.

The proposed revisions remove subsection 320(b)(1), "cost effectiveness of the training course," as an evaluation factor. This change is consistent with the revisions made to Sections 231 and 232, which eliminate cost-based criteria from the course certification and application processes. The Board is not a party to financial transactions between agencies and training providers and does not oversee, participate in, or verify the actual costs associated with providing instruction. Because agencies negotiate with and pay providers directly, the Board has limited ability to monitor training costs or determine whether a course's price accurately reflects its benefit. Cost-related issues are typically identified only when they are reported or discovered incidentally, making cost-effectiveness an unreliable and impractical factor for evaluating overall program performance.

Removing this criterion ensures that the evaluation factors relied upon by the Board remain relevant, necessary, and aligned with information the Board can consistently assess. The remaining factors continue to support a comprehensive evaluation of program effectiveness based on elements directly related to training quality, job relevance, and delivery systems.

The remaining evaluation factors listed in subsection (b) have been reorganized as items (1) through (5) for clarity and continuity following the removal of the cost-effectiveness factor. This renumbering does not alter the intent or substance of the remaining evaluation criteria.

There are no fiscal or operational impacts anticipated.

PURPOSE

These revisions are proposed to eliminate the use of cost as a criterion when certifying training courses, reviewing applications for certification, and evaluating the effectiveness of training programs. A review of current Board practices identified that the Board is not involved in the financial transactions between agencies and training providers and therefore cannot reliably assess or verify training costs for purposes of certification or evaluation.

Removing cost-related requirements ensures that the regulations reflect factors the Board can consistently and effectively evaluate. The revisions also update terminology for clarity and consistency across sections, aligning the regulatory language with the practical realities of how training expenses are incurred and tracked. These changes provide agencies and training providers with greater flexibility when selecting or offering training courses, ensuring they can choose options that best meet their operational needs without being limited by cost-based criteria that the Board is not positioned to administer.

PROBLEMS THIS PROPOSED REGULATION SEEKS TO ADDRESS

The proposed revisions address practical limitations in the Board's ability to evaluate or rely on cost-related information when certifying training courses, reviewing applications, or conducting program evaluations. The Board is not a party to the financial transactions between participating agencies and training providers and does not oversee, participate in, or verify the actual costs associated with course delivery. As a result, cost-based information is not consistently available, is often identified only when reported or discovered incidentally, and cannot be reliably used as a basis for regulatory decision-making.

Additionally, certain terminology in the existing regulations, specifically the use of "tuition," does not accurately reflect the expenses agencies incur or the types of costs relevant to monitoring and administration. Updating these terms ensures consistency across sections, improves clarity, and aligns the regulations with the practical realities of how training costs are incurred, recorded, and referenced within the program.

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED FROM THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

In addition to the benefits outlined in the Notice of Proposed Action, the proposed revisions are anticipated to improve the clarity, consistency, and practical application of the regulations governing course certification, application review, and program evaluation. By removing cost as a criterion that the Board must consider, the course certification and evaluation processes will be based solely on factors the Board can reliably assess. This reduces unintended barriers created when cost information, over which the Board has no direct oversight, affects whether courses may be certified or favorably evaluated.

The revisions are also expected to broaden opportunities for training providers and participating agencies. Providers may be more willing to offer a wider range of certified courses when certification is no longer influenced by cost-related requirements, and agencies will have greater flexibility to select courses that best meet their operational needs without being limited by cost criteria that the Board cannot practically administer. Additionally, updated terminology improves clarity for agencies and providers who rely on the regulations, helping ensure that cost-related references accurately reflect how training expenses are incurred and documented within the program.

TECHNICAL, THEORETICAL, AND/OR EMPIRICAL STUDY, REPORTS, OR DOCUMENTS

The BSCC did not rely upon any technical, theoretical, or empirical studies, reports, or documents in proposing the adoption of these regulations.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION AND THE AGENCY'S REASONS FOR REJECTING THOSE ALTERNATIVES

No other reasonable alternatives were presented to or considered by the BSCC.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED REGULATORY ACTION THAT WOULD LESSEN ANY ADVERSE IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

The BSCC has not identified any alternatives that would lessen any adverse impact on small businesses.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESSES

The BSCC has determined that the proposed regulations would not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business based on the Economic Impact Assessment, as discussed below.

LOCAL MANDATE DETERMINATION

As required by Government Code section 11346.9(a)(2), the BSCC has determined that there will be no mandates imposed on local agencies or school districts as a result of the adoption of the Title 15 regulation amendments.

ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PURPOSE

Penal Code sections 6035 and 6036 require the Board to establish minimum standards for the selection and training of local corrections and probation officers and authorize the Board to amend those standards as needed.

The proposed revisions update the existing regulatory framework by removing cost-based criteria from course certification, application review, and program evaluation, and by correcting outdated terminology. These updates reflect necessary adjustments to ensure the regulations remain aligned with the Board's administrative role and accurately describe the factors the Board can consistently evaluate when carrying out its statutory responsibilities.

THE CREATION OR ELIMINATION OF JOBS WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendments will not create or eliminate jobs within the state of California.

THE CREATION OF NEW BUSINESSES OR THE ELIMINATION OF EXISTING BUSINESSES WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendments will not create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses within the state of California.

THE EXPANSION OF BUSINESSES CURRENTLY DOING BUSINESS WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendments will not expand businesses currently doing business within the state of California.

BENEFITS OF THE REGULATIONS TO THE HEALTH AND WELFARE OF CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS, WORKER SAFETY, AND THE STATE'S ENVIRONMENT

The anticipated benefits of the proposed regulation amendments include improved flexibility for agencies and training providers to offer and select training courses based on operational needs rather than cost constraints. By removing cost as a factor that the Board evaluates during course certification and program review, agencies may be able to provide a wider range of certified training to staff, including courses that may not have been accessible under previous cost-related limitations. This increased access to relevant, high-quality training supports the safety and security of juvenile and adult local detention facilities by improving local correctional and probation officer preparedness, competency, and professional development.

Improved clarity in terminology throughout the regulations also benefits agencies and training providers by reducing ambiguity and improving consistency in how training requirements and allowable costs are understood and applied. Clearer regulations support more efficient implementation of training programs, which can contribute to better outcomes for staff and the populations they serve.

The Board has determined that adoption of these regulations will not affect the state's environment. The regulations pertain solely to administrative standards governing training requirements for local corrections and probation officers and do not include provisions that influence environmental conditions or practices. As such, no positive or negative environmental impact is anticipated.