

## **CAC Ad-hoc Report on Recruitment and Retention**

### **Background**

According to the Sonoma County Sheriff's office during 2023 (and since the COVID pandemic) the office was significantly understaffed. The lack of staffing was impacting operations at the jail and across the department and being widely reported in the Press Democrat. Recruitment and hiring were paused due to the pandemic and there was no pipeline of applicants, limiting the departments ability to surge hiring once the pandemic impacts had begun to recede.

Reports and complaints from the jail were also coming out about the amount of time being spent in solitary confinement due to lack of SCSO staffing.

### **Initial goals**

Initially this ad-hoc was created to analyze the recruitment and retention practices at SCSO in the hopes of improving staffing levels. However, during our 2024 winter retreat, the Sheriff reported that staffing issues had essentially been resolved. For the first time in some time Sheriff Engram considered staffing to be at or near 100%.

After the winter retreat meeting, the ad-hoc met to discuss what other items was of interest to us and the community on this topic. Two items were presented by the team during that meeting:

1. The Sheriff stated during our meeting that the department was more diverse now than it was prior. So the Ad-hoc committee requested from SCSO a demographic description of the department over time. That table can be viewed below as attachment 1 - PDF from SCSO. The Ad-Hoc continues to have concerns about the SCSO's efforts to increase diversity.
2. The SCSO use of military/SWAT imagery in hiring and recruitment images were another concern brought up by several members of the ad-hoc. In the recent campaigns, images of SWAT teams and police in full riot gear appeared across social media recruitment campaigns. See attachment 2 for examples below.

### **Recommendations**

1. Limit use of military and SWAT images in recruitment.  
The CAC Ad-Hoc committee thinks that the Sonoma County Sheriffs Department Recruitment strategy should focus its imagery and videos more on community policing. SCSO's current mix of militaristic/SWAT imagery shows duties that aren't realistic of new hire duties first, and more importantly, is likely to negatively alter the pool of applicants. The Ad-Hoc committee agrees with the Police Executive Research Forum that,

*“Recruitment campaigns that present the agency as carrying out SWAT-style operations could reinforce negative perceptions of police. But campaigns that*

*focus on service-oriented roles and de-escalation could have a positive impact on community perceptions of the agency. They also send an important message to officers in the department by demonstrating the department's commitment to those values.” – Police Executive Research Forum, August 2023, page 20.*

2. Take part in 30x30 program - a commitment to a more diverse force.

The CAC Ad-Hoc committee thinks that the more diverse the Sheriff's Department is, at all levels of employment, the better the Department's relationships with the communities of Sonoma County will be. The 30x30 program addresses one area of diversity – gender. Participation is not endorsing a mandatory quota. Rather:

“The 30×30 Initiative is a coalition of police leaders, researchers, and professional organizations who have joined together to advance the representation and experiences of women in policing agencies across the United States. <https://30x30initiative.org/about-30x30>

The Sheriff should agree to participate in the program.

# Attachment 1: Demographics of Sworn Patrol, Sworn Management, Sworn Detention and Management

Sheriff's Office Demographic Rollup 3/22/2024 Including Extra Help													
	6/5/2019	1/23/2020	6/22/2021	7/5/2022	2/16/2023	3/22/2024		6/5/2019	1/23/2020	6/22/2021	7/5/2022	2/16/2023	3/22/2024
<b>Sworn Patrol</b>							<b>Sworn Detention</b>						
US-Hispanic or Latin	27 10.0%	30 10.9%	33 12.2%	30 11.8%	29 11.3%	33 12.3%	US-Hispanic or Latin	46 22.0%	52 24.2%	51 26.2%	51 26.7%	50 27.8%	58 30.5%
US-White	232 85.6%	233 85.0%	227 83.8%	208 81.6%	208 80.9%	213 79.5%	US-White	145 69.4%	141 65.6%	122 62.6%	115 60.2%	106 58.9%	104 54.7%
US-American Indian/Alaska Nat	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	2 0.7%	US-American Indian/Alaska Nat	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	1 0.6%	2 1.1%
US-Native Hawaiian Pac Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	US-Native Hawaiian Pac Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	1 0.5%	1 0.6%	2 1.1%
US-Asian	5 1.8%	4 1.5%	4 1.5%	4 1.6%	3 1.2%	4 1.5%	US-Asian	4 1.9%	5 2.3%	4 2.1%	4 2.1%	3 1.7%	3 1.6%
US-Black or African American	2 0.7%	2 0.7%	2 0.7%	2 0.8%	2 0.8%	2 0.7%	US-Black or African American	9 4.3%	9 4.2%	6 3.1%	9 4.7%	9 5.0%	9 4.7%
US-Not Specified	3 1.1%	3 1.1%	3 1.1%	9 3.5%	13 5.1%	14 5.2%	US-Not Specified	2 1.0%	5 2.3%	9 4.6%	9 4.7%	8 4.4%	10 5.3%
US-Two or More Races	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	0 0.0%	US-Two or More Races	2 1.0%	2 0.9%	2 1.0%	1 0.5%	2 1.1%	2 1.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>190</b>
Female	14 5.2%	17 6.2%	14 5.2%	12 4.7%	13 5.1%	16 6.0%	Female	51 24.4%	56 26.0%	52 26.7%	51 26.7%	53 29.4%	52 27.4%
Male	257 94.8%	257 93.8%	257 94.8%	243 95.3%	244 94.9%	252 94.0%	Male	158 75.6%	159 74.0%	143 73.3%	140 73.3%	127 70.6%	138 72.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>Sworn Management</b>							<b>Management</b>						
US-Hispanic or Latin	4 17.4%	4 16.0%	3 11.1%	3 11.5%	3 11.1%	2 8.0%	US-Hispanic or Latin	3 15.0%	3 15.0%	2 9.5%	2 11.1%	2 9.1%	2 9.5%
US-White	17 73.9%	19 76.0%	23 85.2%	22 84.6%	22 81.5%	21 84.0%	US-White	16 80.0%	16 80.0%	18 85.7%	16 88.9%	20 90.9%	18 85.7%
US-American Indian/Alaska Nat	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	US-American Indian/Alaska Nat	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
US-Native Hawaiian Pac Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	US-Native Hawaiian Pac Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
US-Asian	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	1 4.0%	US-Asian	1 5.0%	1 5.0%	1 4.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.8%
US-Black or African American	2 8.7%	2 8.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.8%	1 3.7%	1 4.0%	US-Black or African American	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
US-Not Specified	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	US-Not Specified	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
US-Two or More Races	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	US-Two or More Races	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>
Female	1 4.3%	2 8.0%	1 3.7%	1 3.8%	2 7.4%	3 12.0%	Female	16 80.0%	16 80.0%	15 71.4%	14 77.8%	19 86.4%	18 85.7%
Male	22 95.7%	23 92.0%	26 96.3%	25 96.2%	25 92.6%	22 88.0%	Male	4 20.0%	4 20.0%	6 28.6%	4 22.2%	3 13.6%	3 14.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>

Further details can be found on the IOLERO website.

**Attachment 2:**



