

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

Pronoun Training

If this training did not work well in the online learning format, please provide us with specific information as to why.

<p>Congrats - you outsmarted us. Making the training interactive forces us to engage to some level rather than just play the video in the background and sign when it ends. The old way is preferred.</p>
<p>I appreciate the information and that all PPB is learning together. I have a [a family member of this community] and look forward to all of PPB members listing their pronouns in their sig block.</p>
<p>I had to start it twice to get through it as there was a glitch the first time. I have had to do other trainings multiple times for it to take and it seems to waste time.</p>
<p>I think delivering these trainings online is useful because they're not hard skills that require practice in a specific setting. I think there will be some who think there should be discussions around this and therefore shouldn't do this kind of training online, but I think there could be messaging that people are encouraged to practice these skills and have conversations with their coworkers. We can't have every training in-person when there is so much going on, so this is a great option.</p>
<p>I think this training should be online to reduce potential conflicts as this topic is highly controversial.</p>
<p>I thought the content was broad, not necessarily good or bad. I think that the downside was that the training did not accurately reflect interactions with that community while on patrol.</p>
<p>I understand the need for these videos to go along with this policy and many others. However, being forced to answer the in-video questions is over the top. Most of us treat LMS videos like podcasts and listen to them in the background while we write reports or something similar. There is hardly enough time during the patrol shift to keep up on regular LMS videos, let alone videos with segmented question/answer portions.</p>
<p>I would be nice if the participants spoke directly to the camera, rather than looking at the ceiling.</p>
<p>Information here that has no place as part of any governmental workplace.</p>
<p>NA</p>
<p>Not a good use of my time... while we are so short staffed especially. Treat all people with respect. If me understanding them is so important kindly let me know if I'm wrong in assuming pronouns.</p>
<p>not a good use of time.</p>
<p>Nothing like wasting my time fixing a problem that didn't exist in the first place.</p>
<p>Online is maybe the best, poor option to conduct this training.</p>
<p>ONLINE training is adequate</p>
<p>Overall the training was great and well-formatted, my only feedback is that I didn't really get anything new compared with the second video on this subject.</p>
<p>Stop wasting our time...</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>The "scenario" with three responses was elementary. It was incredibly obvious which one participants were supposed to chose and relies on stereotypes of responses. I think it is disingenuous to lump people into three categories.</p>
<p>THE CAPTIONS GAVE OUT IN THE MIDDLE. PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE ENTIRE VIDEO IS CAPTIONED. IT IS WONDERFULLY HELPFUL, THANKS.</p>
<p>The cartoons were just plain childish. I rolled my eyes and checked out.</p>
<p>The entire exercise was a waste of my time.</p>
<p>The online class format works really well for this, the examples that were given were especially relevant. I liked that some of the examples concerned how to speak with members of the public who have issues with these kinds of policies as well. Let me make it clear that my answer saying I didn't learn much new information is purely because I am already a member of the community in question, so this is the every day. Still, it's good to know and learn about how the bureau is handling it.</p>
<p>The only thing this training does is hurt the transcommunity</p>
<p>The presenters spoke quickly so I missed the various identities. I don't remember subtitles. I don't mind saying I would like to have a chance to ask questions or be provided a website for more information. I recognize some of the terms but don't know the meanings.</p>
<p>The scenario starts and "next" buttons seemed slow in their response.</p>
<p>The scenarios we kind of jumpy when clicking on the different options.</p>
<p>These sessions could be done as a block at in service instead of several videos that generally repeat some information.</p>
<p>This is the most ridiculous and demeaning training I have ever had to sit through. The assumption that I need to be TAUGHT this information because you think I am going to treat people worse or better due to their orientation is insulting. FYI it's either male or female...period.</p>
<p>This same video was used in previous training material. The person with the Black Lives Matter in the background in offensive and unnecessary. That person's video was also the least helpful.</p>
<p>This training does not work well in the online format. There were several spots where an explanation was needed, and since it was online, there was no way to question what was being explained. As an example, a chart was shown with 9 phrases that should never be used to identify someone unless they use them first and give permission. However two of the phrases: "transgendered" and "transgenderers" both contain the word "transgender" which is the word that has been used throughout the video. If a word is permissible as it stands but becomes a "never use" word when you add an "ed" or "s", that should probably be explained. This entire training is based off of careful observation of the human experience. All of us know that it is not okay to call someone a "he/she" so it probably doesn't need to be explained. But the subtleties between transgender and transgenderers should be explained.</p>
<p>This training is best delivered in no format</p>
<p>This training is vile, God made male and female. Not hard to figure out, Quit being sheep and placating to a few mentally disturbed, Pure stupidity,</p>
<p>This training should not be given in any format.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

This training was a complete waste of time and was completely unnecessary.
Too much time and effort into a subject that is extremely rare, and uncommon. No class will change [over 30] years of English learning to call a singular person They.
While the idea behind this training was good, it had been done WAY too often now. If there were things to be updated, a short email would have been enough. Having to watch the entire training numerous times as it is updated to add or subtract things is creating tension. also constant surveys are annoying and interfere with work

Please feel free to provide any additional comments here:

A total waste of time.
Again... the question about "did you learn anything" is a hard question to answer correctly. "Did you learn anything new or were concepts reinforced" might be a better way to capture this?
Any real feedback would not fit the narrative being pushed so I will keep my comments to myself and keep treating everyone I have contact with with respect.
I already listed this feedback in the last video but here it is again. I find the use of the house with a "Black Lives Matter" poster in the window highly inappropriate and offensive. This video is supposed to be about LGBTQ+ and the presence of the chosen background is out of context and has no place in this video. Black Lives Matter is a political organization that funded the assault and attack of officers nationwide as well as officers here in Portland. The insertion of this background in this video pushes a political agenda and once again, is highly inappropriate. No officer or member should be forced to accept a violent political organization's agenda or it's representation to prove that they care about ALL people. In addition to inserting a political agenda this also undermined the messaging of the LGBTQ community who put themselves out there in an effort to strengthen relationships within the organization. The mere presence of that screenshot detracts from the true messaging of the queer members represented.
i am not an officer, i dont deal with the public very much.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

I believe this training is very impactful and commend the entire team for how it's constructed and how it's delivered. I must say that I see a couple things that could be improved upon that would help me feel more engaged. I can only speak on behalf of myself but if I'm feeling this way, I assume others might be as well. I've thought a lot about training, video presentations, social media style engagement, YouTube engagement, etc. I'm not an expert but feel I have a pretty good grasp on what makes a good video, what makes for good engagement, and what is impactful. The first thing is the level of excitement/passion and presentation delivery from [REDACTED]. I don't mean this negatively and really think [REDACTED] is amazing! I've spoken to [REDACTED] and emailed with her in the past and have nothing negative to say. However, the amount of passion and excitement shown in the videos is truly lacking. She seems to be reading off a prompt screen and is very mundane and monotone. I just don't believe her when she's saying the things she's reading. Compared to the guests that are interviewed and the way they talk, it's night and day. They are so excited to talk about their experiences and share how they feel, you can relate to them so much easier. Even when they are defining terms, I feel their passion and see why they want people to learn about this topic. When someone reads a definition from a screen with very little voice inflection, passion, or sincerity, it just doesn't land the way it should. My improvement suggestion is to try to deliver the lines with more passion and that should help people, like me, feel more connected to the material. The second improvement I would like to bring up is the length of training. I'm sure there is data to suggest a certain video length draws the most engagement and retention, I don't know that data. I feel on a personal level that a 10min video isn't enough for me to be truly engaged in the material. This last training had so much packed in to a 10min video that it flew by. There was video interviews, [REDACTED] reading and talking, even a neat little cartoon interactive experience! 10 min was just not long enough. If it was 10 min of [REDACTED] reading definitions, and then the interactive part, that would probably have been fine. As soon as the interviews were included, I wanted to hear more from them. I wanted an extended cut of those interviews to hear and learn from the people who were so passionate to tell me about what is important to them. I think somewhere between 15-20 min would be a more effective video length when trying to include so much content. 15 second clips of people answering questions (and even noticing them getting cut off a couple times) could be pushed out to 25-30 second clips. Those people talking about their experiences are truly the best content in this series. I hope someone reads this and thinks it's helpful. I don't mean it with any negativity and truly appreciate what everyone is doing to create this content. Keep up the good work!

I know that there had been several complaints about the Black Lives Matter flag from the first video. I was very displeased to see that the flag continued to be shown in this video. The presence of that flag brings a lot of trauma up for the members of this organization who had to endure over 100 nights of continued abuse from individuals who operated under that flag. I don't remember anything of what that individual said, because the only thing I focused on was the flag. It is a lost opportunity to teach people about this new policy. That individual's choice to fly the flag, and the Training Division's choice to allow the video, undermines any value that could have come from this training. Please remove the flag from any further trainings. If the individual pulls their support for this project, that that is their choice. Inclusion of that flag is a huge detriment to the training environment.

I liked this training. Appreciated the insights.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>I normally don't offer suggestions, but in this case I feel compelled to. This is the WORST training I have ever received. The presentation was terrible and the content is nothing we haven't had several times before. It all seems to be serving a political agenda. What made this particularly bad was how juvenile and condescending the presentation was. I felt insulted watching it. Are we all so dimwitted that you had to test us with bad animation that looked like an early 90's episode of South Park to get your point across? Who's approving these before they are placed in LMS. Really awful.</p>
<p>I realize that online training can be very convenient but in some cases, it might be more effective to follow up with an in-person discussion. The discussion of the training may be addressed during a staff meeting or roll call.</p>
<p>I think that a policy of respect and customer service is all that is needed, which I believe is already covered in other policies. A monologue about pronouns or one's sexual preferences is not needed.</p>
<p>I thought it was a great training and well needed. Probably not as well received by some, by something necessary to be received nonetheless. Well done all around.</p>
<p>I thought the training was well done because it provided information and examples but did not seem like it was condescending to the viewer.</p>
<p>In [over 10] years and thousands upon thousands of contacts...this has not been an issue. Nor have I heard of it being one. Yet we are devoting all this time to calling people out over pronouns. The nuttier part is the few times I've brought this up during a contact, everyone seems uncomfortable with me asking instead of just treating them like humans. It seems we're getting away from people just being people and forcing folks into conversations that are not wanted or needed.</p>
<p>It is useful and accurate information.</p>
<p>It's not clear why we are paying so much attention to this subject. In my time at the Bureau [over 10 years], it seems like we have been very progressive, especially compared to other police agencies. It does not seem like we have issues treating any variety of person with dignity and respect. Because the reasons for this training have not been explained, perhaps among other reasons, this training series is not being received very well by pretty much anyone I've talked to about it.</p>
<p>I've enjoyed how the series of trainings around this queer policy have had different formats. The cartoons were kind of cheesy but fun given the circumstances/how they were used (i.e. I can imagine trying to get members to act out these scenes and it's cringe worthy, so great work around). It's nice not always having talking heads and putting the information in a work-related context feels important.</p>
<p>LOL @ these "trainings"</p>
<p>No additional comments. It was a good informational training.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

Starting a conversation with pronoun discussion is an unrealistic way to conduct a police call for service. This discussion should only come into play if the elements of the crime need the clarification. Otherwise, the vast majority of officers I work with would treat any person with respect and this would not be an issue AND they do not need to go over pronoun preferences. Can't we have normal conversations and not focus on this? It's drawing attention to something many don't want attention drawn to. Has the entire population who chooses other pronouns than those assigned at birth been asked if they want officers to point their (sometimes obvious) differences out? What if they just want to blend in and not have to have this discussion? Common decency and respect is all you need.

Stop the pronoun ignorance. How dumb can you be to pretend and call an individual person, "they" or "them". How stupid are you for pretending this is legit. What has happened to common sense?

Stop wasting our time focusing on the emotional fragility of a minuscule population that's offended by everything

The BLM poster in the background for one of the speakers was in poor taste.

The slide that had the boxes with the correct terms could have been on a little longer. For many, these are new and unfamiliar terms. Especially the not OK term "Transgendered" is so close to Trans/ and transgender. For those that are learning these terms it may be helpful to provide more time to do so. The videos with the officer and communities members were helpful. Most of them looked at the camera and this helps with making a connection. There was one community member that kept looking up and never looked into the camera. This made it difficult to hear what they were saying.

There was one of these trainings where Transgender and Trans were listed as terms which should no longer be used, however everyone I've talked to in the community doesn't know why that is and why it was included in our training. I question that guidance.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

This is now the second video with the person sporting the "Black Lives Matter" sign in the window. I know comments were submitted for the last video indicating that this hinders learning, immediately puts up walls between those watching and the person presenting the content, and takes away from possible benefits of the information that this person is sharing. I am unsure if the previous comments were not viewed as relevant or important, were disagreed with, or someone felt as if addressing that issue with the person or changing the video would be too difficult. If the latter is the case then I think this would indicate that this is not the right person to be helping with police training. The crude cartoon drawing "scenario" is insulting (maybe this sounds hyperbolic but I couldn't find a better description of it). First of all, the scenario is in no way challenging and if the belief is that this is information that I actually need and I would not know what to say in that circumstance indicates to me that whoever felt that this is necessary is out of touch with where we are as an agency. Also the format of silly cartoons/choose your own adventure is in line with a game for my three year old. I take my profession seriously, I have a bachelors degree, and work hard to constantly learn and improve and having this content presented to us in this way feels like there is an implication that we are children. I echo my previous sentiments that if the goal is for the bureau members to buy into the content and engage in the material in a meaningful way (which I assume it is) then some time should be spent asking members what a good way to engage with this content could be. What things do they think would be helpful and needed around this topic. (not just in a survey or group zoom but one on one.)

This is the most patronizing, offensive training I have been to. We are being treated like children through the format and subject matter of this training. I realize the Equity office was probably trying to make this lighthearted and entertaining, but it was a colossal failure. I don't appreciate being talked down to, and the assumption I don't know how to respond appropriately to situations where someone I contact has a viewpoint or belief system inconsistent with the Bureau policies and procedures. That is exactly what I do for a living. We communicate daily with numerous people in adversarial conditions, from all walks of life. To be forced to participate in training this simplistic is highly offensive and has turned off any interest I have in participating with the Equity office. I regularly feel targeted by the Equity office as if we have a problem communicating with people we contact, and are generating complaints based on protected status. I have zero faith this is an accurate portrayal of our employees and their daily communications. If we have to be force fed training to address perceived issues with no basis in fact, make it as quick and painless as possible. Just a video like so many other trainings. It should be noted the amount of time we spend on this type of training, which I receive no benefit from, and how little tactical training we get. It's time to shift the focus to areas we are having issues with or are likely to get officers into trouble. The box-in/ ram training was about 3 minutes. That is a deadly force related training. How much time was spent on this topic? How many trainings do we need? Why are we being trained to treat people differently based on their protected classes? We should have one policy which addresses our interactions and necessary identifications of ALL people, both coworkers and citizens.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>This policy and training was a complete waste of time.</p>
<p>This socio political garbage is a waste of time. We have interacted with this community without issue for decades. This is a nonsense policy looking for a problem, and serves only to discipline officers. I also find it interesting that during the two animated scenarios, the only white male depicted is an ignorant bigot. This apparently is what you think of a vast majority of our members. Portland and the bureau is in a death spiral, and you devote how much time and money to this crap? DECK CHAIRS ON THE TITANIC.</p>
<p>This training is a complete waste of time and is insulting. We have far more serious problems in this city than correctly addressing people by their 1000 different preferred pronouns.</p>
<p>This training is essential. Please keep it coming. Everything that helps us offset implicit Bias, that helps each of us be Accepting of ALL community members we serve--immigrants, suburbanites, downtown folks, queer folx, every kind of non-religious & religious people, street people, skateboarding people.... People. All People. We will probably have to work more on skateboarding people. Not all of them are taggers who ruin marble seating at malls, etc etc.</p>
<p>This training seems to have a very condescending tone to it.</p>
<p>This training was a complete waste of our training time yet again. Please provide us with training that is useful to our job in the future.</p>
<p>This training was an utter waste of time for all involved. Everyone's job in the police bureau is customer service. Is this topic suddenly a problem? Is it generating multiple complaints? Was this video produced so that someone in the Equity and Diversity Department can justify their job? This video was a solution to a problem that doesn't exist, and if left alone, would not be any kind of issue. We have all worked with LGBTQ+ Bureau members and citizens, and there has not been an issue. Do your job, earn the respect that comes with doing a good job, treat people professionally and with great courtesy and respect and there is no issue. Quit stirring a pot that doesn't need to be stirred.</p>
<p>This training was quite offensive and all together unnecessary. I don't mind a conversation around LGBTQ issues, but this was over the top, and painted the LGBTQ crowd in a negative light. I [identify as a part of this community] and have worked very hard to get to where I am, and this training was an embarrassment to me personally. My colleagues are more confused than ever about how they are supposed to address someone, and have asked me about it. I am more confused than ever too. What should you call me? Queer? Really, that's offensive to me, as were some of the other examples. I believe that all people should be addressed with respect. How about that as our focus instead of trying to figure out someone's preferred pronouns. If I misgender someone, I will correct myself, apologize, and expect that person to be able to recover with grace. You have made an environment that expects 99% of the population to conform with a very small vocal minority. As a [LGBTQ] person in law enforcement, this was an unnecessary training and really muddied the water, and has set my accomplishments within the police community AND [this] community back ten-fold. Please stop pandering to the woke and expect the best from our officers. They really are you know.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>This was the third in a line of ridiculous, patronizing, and frankly stupid set of "training" sessions. If you come out with another one, you will damage what little hope I had for actual transpeople to live safe and effective lives within greater society. P.S. DO NOT tell me how to address a person who is not in the room, according to my perception of how they present. People's pronouns are NOT theirs - they can present ques to others on which of the two genders they are based on cultural norms, and then hope for the best. That is all anyone can do.</p>
<p>Thought-provoking and informative. thank you</p>
<p>Total waste of time. The basic rule of police work is "don't be a jerk." That applies to everyday life as well. This series of videos suggests we're all uncivilized cretins.</p>
<p>TRAINING WAS A COMPLETE WASTE OF TIME.</p>
<p>Training was completely irrelevant to law enforcement. A patrol tactic scenario or evoc or range time or defensive tactics anything actually relating to keeping me safe would have been a better use of time.</p>
<p>We are very busy on patrol and don't have time to work through 30 min videos without getting dispatched.</p>
<p>Your best training yet - hilariously ridiculous. Another colossal waste of time LOL. [REDACTED] in the video is correct - everything is too PC these days. Everyone needs to chill and stop being so sensitive. I will NEVER ask anyone for their preferred pronouns. This woke agenda is insane. I guess it's time to resign like everyone else.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

If this training did not work well in the online learning format, please provide us with specific information as to why.

All the different pronouns and verbiage used to substitute "male" and "female" made the video confusing and hard to follow. I think this could've been boiled down to a 30 second video explaining the golden rule, treat others how they want to be treated, which is exactly what PPB does day in and day out.
Being a female in this job is hard enough. I understand on how to be respectful and I will use any pronoun someone wants. However, some people I have talked to still find the word Queer as offensive and prefer transgender. This training said the opposite. I dont know who prepared this class but reality can be different than people sitting behind a desk believe it is. No matter I will remain respectful even then the training is incorrect. Thanks
Dialogue and discussion is helpful, along with the ability to ask clarifying questions
Emphasizing how individuals want to be called (especially by reps of government, e.g., the police) was important to include. In-group terminology used by out-group people can sometimes be viewed as inappropriate or appropriating. This is especially relevant to pejorative terms that have been reclaimed by in-group members.
Encouraging patrol officers to engage older members of the LGBTQ community as "queers" without in-person training seems like a really bad idea. Things this sensitive should be taught in a way that allows the audience to have full understanding of the subject matter and done in a setting where they can ask questions.
I appreciated the community members providing personal examples to help give the terms more context. This topic is challenging in the online format because there's a lot of nuance. In person conversations are really needed to bring more clarity and overcome some misconceptions and challenges presented by this policy.
I believe the information is important, but already covered in previous trainings. Didn't learn anything new.
I find the use of the house with a "Black Lives Matter" poster in the window highly inappropriate and offensive. This video was supposed to be about LGBTQ2+ and the presence of the chosen background is out of context and has no place in this video. Black Lives Matter is a political organization that funded the assault and attack of officers nationwide as well as officers here in Portland. The insertion of this background in this video pushes a political agenda and once again, is highly inappropriate. No officer or member should be forced to accept a violent political organizations agenda or it's representation to prove that they care about ALL people. In addition to inserting a political agenda this also undermined the messaging of the LGBTQ community who put themselves out there in an effort to strengthen relationships within the organization. The mere presence of that screenshot detracts from the true messaging of the queer members represented. I feel an the immediate removal of the background and an apology to all bureau members would be appropriate at this point.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>I found one speaker's choice to use a house with a "BLACK LIVES MATTER" sign to be offensive, especially with the intended audience. It was distracting, unnecessarily provocative, and inappropriate to use as course material by our training division.</p>
<p>I found this particular class was not useful. We are problem solvers and customer service oriented. I feel getting to the root of the problem and helping the community is the ultimate goal. Being told that I need to address a persons own values and how to address them before I know the reason I am going to assist them is a little odd. We as cops do a good job of customer service. We already have compassion and want to help. I don't need to be told that I need to do a better job and get approval from the person I am trying to assist before I get to the problem they are presenting to me.</p>
<p>I think this training should be on line only training to reduce potential conflicts as this topic is highly controversial.</p>
<p>I thought it was terrific.</p>
<p>I treat people with love and respect and care about the human condition. I've asked my entire career, "how can I address you," simply to be polite and respectful. We as officer contact various individuals with different pronouns each day. We are practiced. All knowledge is good. However, I've been shot at more than I've ever had issues with one's pronouns. Common sense and kindness rules, but this was an unnecessary use of time that could have been spent learning something more beneficial. PPB is likely the leader in policing when it comes to accepting people from all backgrounds. We're doing great in this area. How about we focus on how to reduce crime and worry about record levels of homicides and shootings, or why the majority of motorists elude when we attempt to contact them. We're more worried about pronouns (although important) than life safety and livability.</p>
<p>If the goal is to get buy in from members and help them learn, I believe it makes that very hard when one of the people on the video has a "Black Lives Matter" sign in their background. I am not making a statement about the sentence "Black lives matter." I am referring to the political movement "Black Lives Matter". Just as certain terms and symbols may bring up challenging memories or experiences for people of marginalized groups, the symbols of the political "Black Lives Matter" movement bring up challenging or traumatizing experiences for many bureau members. Bringing up memories of violent protests and hateful actions and language toward officers. It is frustrating to think that people within the bureau wouldn't/couldn't recognize that. Obviously officers are resilient and see and hear things like this daily and brush it off but when it comes in a bureau created and approved training that is supposed to convey an important message it seems like a misstep and unwillingness or inability to see look at this training as it may be viewed by members and the impact it may have on officers.</p>
<p>It's redundant to policies we already have in place.</p>
<p>Most of the training was redundant. Also, I believe that LGBT definitions are common knowledge. I wish the trainings focused more on providing information about Intersex and Two Spirited individuals because that is less common knowledge in my opinion.</p>
<p>One thing that struck me about this was how we were instructed to ask people "How would you like to be addressed?" when it comes to filling in their "sex" status on reports. While I agree completely that that is a great way to respect people's sexual identity, I am not sure how that will necessarily clarify selecting M/F/X for our forms. Especially for those who might scoff at modern sensibilities re: the queer community.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

This is difficult to answer. In one sense, this training will likely go very negatively if you offer it in-person. In another sense, it feels slightly insulting because you are asking members to deny their basic sense perceptions and enter another persons "lived reality" regardless of whether it is consistent with real reality. This creates many valid questions and concerns that are not answered in any of these videos and deserve to be.
This training was not useful.
This training worked great in online format.
This training would have benefited from an ability to have a discussion rather than just listening to recordings.
This training, and message from the chiefs officer, was extremely condescending. They presume that members don't already treat people with respect in every circumstances this training borderline caters to peoples fantasy rather than to remind all members to just treat people with respect. We have several members in our organization that belong to this group, and it is offensive to continuously hear that the lgbtq community is afraid of police without citing any data why that is substantiated. Quit indulging groups that only seek to demean our excellent track record of professionalism.
Unable to ask how to fit the suggestions into actual work situations.
worked well

Please feel free to provide any additional comments here:

Excellent training. You're doing great work! Keep going.
I am a compassionate person with a lot of empathy. I valued this training because I don't want to make anyone feel "less than" or uncomfortable with how I address them. With that said, I am now more paranoid that I will make a mistake than I was before this training. It's unnerving.
I am happy to call anybody whatever they want. However; I refuse to be made to feel guilty or anything similar because I referred to a male as a male or a female as a female. The queer community, at least in Portland, is rife with vitriol towards anybody that hasn't adopted their pronouns, etc, even though everyone has grown up and lived in a world with males and females. Mistakes happen and most people are happy to accept another's wish of address, just not when it's screamed at them or said with hate. It's unreasonable and we are supporting that unreasonableness and setting up cops for failure because they addressed someone as the gender they biologically are.
I appreciated hearing from members of this community.
I don't believe I need training or a directive on how to properly address people. And I don't particularly care for being held to an almost impossible standard related to pronouns where the intent of my language is subjective to the one who I'm talking to.
I don't believe these feedbacks are anonymous or incorporated and therefore you only get minimal feedback
I felt the session was a good into for people not aware of all the terminology. I found the in person training that was several years ago more informative. I believe that was put on by my union or LERC. I think continuing to educated everyone on terms associated to different orientations, genders, relationship choices, religions, race and abilities is the something that the

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>city needs to work on; and intervene when there is bullying or other issues that take away from a safe work environment.</p>
<p>I found the idea of the city telling me it is "ok" to use a word I find very offensive (queer) to be very misguided. It seems as though the city is trying way too hard to navigate a sensitive area by inserting their opinion. I would never call or ask someone if they are "queer" because two people on a city video say it is "ok". My goal is to show up and do a good job at work and I'm not sure how this relates.</p>
<p>I prefer really not to speak. If I speak I am in big trouble.</p>
<p>I really enjoyed hearing from community members since they're who we're working with and need to respect their identities to serve them well. I thought this training was well done, thanks!</p>
<p>I really enjoyed this training. I am looking forward to more interactive trainings like this. I really enjoyed the choose your own adventure component. Looking forward to this content being embedded into our advanced academy and other in person trainings as well. Lastly, would love to know how and if DPSST is providing similar training. I think it would be great to have similar trainings starting DPSST as well.</p>
<p>If the acronym for this group gets any larger, there won't be any letter of the alphabet left. It might be beneficial to switch to something like "NotCis." Actually, I think we're already there - I just shortened it by 4 characters and included every special category of non-normative all in one.</p>
<p>I'm sure you will get critical feedback on this training topic. It was well put together and will help officers have better interactions in the field. Thank you for the work.</p>
<p>I'm very concerned by the content of this training and the direction this will take the Portland Police Bureau. Words are being manipulated (and invented) to control people and manipulate them to achieve practical ends by forcing members to participate in a pseudo-reality. You are offering apparent realities whose fictive character threatens to become opaque. It forces members to adopt an irrational framework and publicly lie in order to signify "loyalty" and "kindness." This is immoral. Questions: Will this same logic be honored if it was applied differently? For example, if a member "self-identifies" as a 53 year old, and their "lived experience" says they have worked for PPB over 30 years, will you honor their "truth" and allow them to a full retirement even if objectively they are only 39 years old and have only work 15 years? It seems to me, based on the logic of this policy, it should be honored in the same way. Or, is the virtue of "acceptance" and "respect" only applicable to certain political and ideological frameworks? You may be offended by this response, but it is a rational question birthed out of the framework of relativism (which this policy supports) and should be seriously considered.</p>
<p>More of this type of "tools to talk" are needed and helpful. Whether it is around race, gender, sexual orientation. We have to engage the public on their worst days, and taking assumed bias on the PPBs part is a huge win. Also - publicize these types of efforts would be helpful after they have time to percolate within the Bureau.</p>
<p>One of the people speaking was looking up most of the time. This was very distracting and took away from what they were saying. On the other hand, the judge looked directly into the camera and created an engaging moment.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>Polyamory relationships are not exclusive to LGBTQ+ and have no place in this video. Including it in an LGBTQ+ educational video, for a bunch of cops, does nothing but reinforce negative stereotypes that LGBTQ+ members are sexually promiscuous. I guarantee some conservative members took what they saw in this video back to their conservative church groups. There are trailblazing LGBTQ+ officers who spent careers trying to change these stereotypes.</p>
<p>See previous comments</p>
<p>Survey could arrive right after training. I don't remember some of the trainings a week later.</p>
<p>Thank you for 'normalizing' the topic</p>
<p>The content was relevant to our current and ever evolving socio-cultural community dynamics. I recognize the purpose of this training is simply to ensure our members are informed, aware and equipped with cultural awareness tools to solely increase their chances of improved customer service, cultural understanding and empathy.</p>
<p>The training was great, but not much new to me as I am part of LGBT+</p>
<p>These are some of the biggest waste of time trainings we have ever had. Portland is filled with crime, and we're learning about how to call someone by their correct pronouns? The residents of Portland don't care if we know what LGBTQIA2S+ stands for. The residents of Portland want a safe, crime-free city to live their lives in. PLEASE provide us with training that is useful for our job, and a good use of our time in the future.</p>
<p>This entire curriculum of extreme left sociopolitical garbage is insulting and meaningless. This policy serves two purposes: to pander to the fringe left and to codify this nonsense in order to create an avenue of discipline. This is a solution looking for a problem.</p>
<p>This is surely a difficult subject to train officers on. I applaud the bureau for making such strong efforts, and for the high quality of the materials provided. No doubt it was difficult to put together interviews and testimonials that both represent the community but also are relatable for officers. Whoever organized this knocked it out of the park in that sense - the folks presenting their stories were representative and sincere, but did not come across as caricatures or stereotypes. Well done.</p>
<p>This particular video was a waste of time.</p>
<p>This policy direction is troubling. There are a great many identify features that can be used by a person to describe themselves. Race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, physical description, etc. Our non-bias policy lays out what are protected classes. However, I can't think of another policy that enumerates the different varieties of individual or class characteristics that a member is responsible for knowing. The equivalent would be if we were required to know if person is not just a Pacific Islander but Tongan, or Samoan or Fijian. Or if we were not only required to know if a person is Muslim but Shia or Sunni. This policy goes into granular detail about things that have no impact on the quality of service we provide such as "two spirit." How does me knowing this about a person impact the quality of service I provide? Why does this policy require me to know so much about a person's sexual proclivities? If a person sexual activity is relevant to an investigation then that is where we should be concerned with it, not as a matter of general biographical information. How does me knowing the number of sexual partners a person prefers impact the service that is provided? That would imply that we should also be asking people if they are straight and monogamous. Why are there not policies about how a person identifies racially, religiously, or ethnically? It seems odd that this one policy is narrowly tailored to benefit only one category of personal identity. It makes me wonder what kind of litigation we have opened ourselves up to for failing to recognize all the other specific characteristics of identity by policy.</p>
<p>This training was a massive waste of my time.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

This training was insulting and unnecessary. We already treat all community members with respect.
This was great! Thank you for going to the community and involving them and making them center to this training. Because quite honestly, the community is center to our work.
This was not relevant and not a good use of time
Thoroughly enjoyed the training. Found it very informational.
Thought it was useful to help get more comfortable with the topic. Learned some new info on different perspectives regarding the term "queer".
Tired of indoctrination masquerading as training.
WASTE OF TIME
We should not have special training for different types of people. We are all the same.
What an incredible waste of my time.
Yet another absolute waste of time. I don't care who you screw in your free time or if you identify as a chicken - I'm going to listen, be respectful, treat you with compassion, and work my hardest to help with whatever situation is going on. I've literally never had a problem connecting with all types of people - these acronyms and pronouns don't make a lick of difference. You are pushing people away with this BS. Myself and many others are looking for new jobs because Portland is exhaustingly woke. The city is ruined now and this kind of stuff is the reason why. Stop wasting our time with useless "trainings". We are short-staffed, we are behind, we are barely treading water trying to stay afloat out here and nothing is more insulting than having to stop and watch a video of rainbow-haired people talking about how they don't know what gender they are. We have actual real problems to be dealing with. These dumb videos are known as WOT trainings (W.O.T. = waste of time).

****INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.****

Policy Scenario Training

If this training did not work well in the online learning format, please provide us with specific information as to why.

Allowed it to be handled in one's own time.
Because no one could see me rolling my eyes for the fourth time having to be subjected to this "training"
Because we are busy and short staffed, we were given a deadline in which to view this so that made it easier.
by using this format, the information is just pushed out without any instant feedback, which would show how unpopular this sociopolitical garbage is
Convenient, concise, and could be done individually.
Could take the training when it worked with my schedule
Easy to pull up the video and convenient
Half of the training was a white screen.
I don't feel this training was a good use of my time.
I was able to work in the training around my schedule.
I would not want to take in person, this training is redundant
I'd rather do this training online than on person since it's the same message 3x now
If I had to sit in a classroom listening to it it would be torture. At least this way I could just get through it and turn it off right after.
It was short and to the point, which I think is a huge positive. And it also had two concrete examples which is nice rather than only being talked at.
It's a massive waste of my time either way.
Its hard to ask questions in the online format and its not convenient to seek out answers if confused.
its unwarranted.
no travel
NONE OF THE QUEER TRAINING VIDEOS HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE FOR ME.
Online training is convenient
Since it was straight facts, the training was fine.
small group discussions with members of the LGBTQ community would be more impacting and effective
The repetitive nature of these videos lose traction in the message in the manner in which they are delivered. Please make this training in class or one concise video.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

The substance and the way it was presented left no need for in person training or additional follow up.
There was one scenario question. This could have been handled in any of the previous trainings under this subject.
Video is absolutely fine for this.
Visuals and examples were helpful.

What was your biggest takeaway from this online training?

Again, this training is repetitive. Cartoons are dumb not real life.
All of this series has been very useful training in ways to address and show respect to human beings
Awareness
biggest takeaway is that the people that make decisions within the police bureau are marxist ideologues trying to destroy the bureau
Complete waste of time. I have never in my [over 10] years of doing this job seen a co worker be disrespectful to a queer person because they were queer. This is an attempt to fix a problem that didn't exist.
Everyone is sensitive to something, just ask them how they would like to be addressed, no matter the situation, queer or not.
Everyone, regardless of who they are and where they come from, deserve basic respect and courtesy.
How a person's chosen gender and official information should be documented in the RMS.
How ludicrous this city has become that the Police Bureau is wasting valuable time on this.
How to appropriately document a difference in someone's identification and preferred name / gender identity
How to input pronouns into a report.
How to list this identity on a report.
How to properly complete a report when a person identifies as something other than their legal name and/or gender.
How to properly document legal name/gender vs preferred name/gender in RegJIN.
I am traumatized by watching this, seriously. What a joke!
I appreciated the direction to add name and gender information that differs from pre-existing legal info in the "Remarks" section of reports.
I believe I already practice what was presented and it confirmed I am doing my job as community would like to see.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

I didn't learn anything I didn't get from the previous trainings in this same subject.
I learned new things I did not know before. The instructor seems very knowledgeable. It just seems there are more "what If" questions around the topic. It would also be nice to know the source of the research and science behind the assertions.
I learned nothing new from this training.
important to treat people with respect, maintaining their dignity, and while you may have a job to do, don't just demean them in order to perform the job.
In an attempt to appease the 'wokeness', this was a total waste of time for everyone involved.
legal id can be different than what they identify as
LOOKING AT REMARKS FOR GENDER IDENTITY
My biggest takeaway is that Queer-theory is a psuedo-reality. Simply put, it is a false construction of reality. This training does a good job of presenting a plausible but deliberately wrong understanding of realism. It teaches a cult-like "reality" in the sense that it shows the way that members of the cult experience and interpret the world around them. With policies like this, we are creating a natural playground for psychopaths and other bad actors. Furthermore, this policy is asking members to lie by accommodating an observable delusion. Demonstrating respect for an individual should never require a person to lie, to betray their conscience, or to give a false sense of support. I believe policies like this are maintained not because what they say is true, in the sense that they correspond to reality, either material or human, but because a sufficient quantity of people in the society they address are too much of a coward to challenge them. I will not be counted among those who participate in a lie.
My disagreement is in no way a reflection on the training, I am merely already versed on this issue. This training did seem to do a good job of balancing how to handle these issues gracefully without disrupting the essential functions of an officer.
Not to be rude, but I really didn't take anything away from this except for the fact our society is getting weaker and weaker.
Nothing
PROPER USE OF PRONOUNS
records keeping
Respect pronouns. Include info in the reports. Communicate sincerely when discussing accomodations.
Take away? The virtues being destroyed by junkies and vagrant and this is you focus....
That the Portland Police Bureau really is paying attention to these surveys - this training was way less pugnacious and condescending than the last offerings. Maybe this will turn out to be like Star Wars, where most of it was junk but people will say it's amazing just because they like the idea.
The best way to tell someone you are unable to meet their request.

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

The bureau thinks I'm a moron that can't handle the most basic of social interactions.
The information regarding accommodations has been taught since I started working at PPB, [over 10] years ago.
The report writing on where to put names/identity that varies from a legal identification
the use of the MNI remarks section for clarification on how a person identifies
To treat people with dignity and respect, as if they were my own beloved family member, and to respect the need to not create more trauma when interacting with LE. Set up future LE members for successful considerateness by capturing details that may vary from official ID documents.
Treat people with respect and as if an officer was interacting with your family member. Should go without saying, but i guess this hammers home the right choice.
What exactly the term Queer encompassed; I was so sheltered that I didn't realize there were more ramifications to using that term.
Where officers can put information such as gender identity in their reports.

What was or wasn't engaging about this online training? If you have any suggestions for how to make this online training more engaging, please let us know here.

Content is useless
Didn't understand what this was suppose to teach/train me???
For me personally, I feel I have had enough training in this area and I am self-aware enough for this not to be an issue.
Having no ability for conversation around these topics is not beneficial. But frankly even in person I do not believe people would feel safe having a real discussion about their feelings or thoughts about how officers can/should interact with members of the community from a specific group. (This should not be taken as saying that officers are going to have discriminatory views or opinions I am simply saying that people do have valid differing thoughts or opinions).
Having only policy and equity people present isn't the most engaging; having community members that may have been subjected to these policies is stronger.
I am not a fan of having to select the "correct" answer before continuing when the subject is entirely subjective, but hey, that's just me.
I fell asleep watching this

****INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.****

I like that the length is short enough to keep your attention and the cartoons are funny, better than watching people talk.
I think the requirement to answer questions on the information rendered a more engaging and interactive training. [REDACTED] presents well and comes off as human and non-judgmental.
It felt like a lot of monologue on the front and back end, but I appreciated the choose your response option.
It was a complete rehash of the other trainings and since there was only one question, that question could have just been added to one of the previous trainings.
It's offensive
LGBTQ AND NON BINARY IDENTITY IS CONSTANTLY CHANGING AND EVOLVING
na
Not engaging due to repetition or how people are already engaging with the community. No new material is being shared so far.
Online training is never "engaging". Though the alternative is worse.
Pacing and content were just right.
See my response to last question.
STOP WITH THE CARTOONS
The animations could have been better, The topic is one where I think many people have differing opinions and by having an online training we don't get to hear other views, questions, concerns, problems, so the online version is like here you go do your best to figure it out.
The entire topic was a complete waste of time. I can only ask one thing, Why was this necessary?
the whole thing was not engaging since this is the 3rd time, got your message!
There wasn't much new information in this training, and could probably be wrapped up into one of the others.
THEY HAVEN'T BEEN AND I DON'T KNOW WHY.
This particular portion of training mostly did not pertain to my job function, still good to know how we're handling these things as a bureau.
This training could be condensed into one session.
This training is redundant 3 now on LGBTQIA2S+...enough already I got it!
What a complete waste of time. I could think of numerous other subjects that we could have training on in lieu of this ridiculous garbage and since training time is limited, this makes absolutely no sense.
You don't need to require several training sessions to get the point across.

Please feel free to provide any additional comments here:

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

<p>Again, the cartoon scenarios are, for lack of a better word, demeaning. You are asking us to treat people with decency and respect and I believe that overall this is something that is done every day in the bureau and also a part of our culture. This scenario, especially in cartoon form, is not a good use of our time and is something so obvious as to be insulting.</p>
<p>All of these videos are a waste of time. One video with the basics would suffice.</p>
<p>Before the scenario with the drawn subjects there is a big blank page for about 45 seconds. Then only one scenario is shown and going to the effort of showing it vs saying "if requested, every effort should be made for same sex searches unless the option is not feasible."</p>
<p>Enough! This training was covered in the 1st LGBTQIA2S+ video. Everyone treat everyone with respect regardless. Address others as they want to be addressed. Got it!</p>
<p>For a historically marginalized and traumatized group, it is important that the police take steps in showing that we will do our best for everyone.</p>
<p>For me, it was very informational as I had a closed mind to the entirety of what using the word Queer was. This helped me to understand more of what is involved when someone identifies as Queer.</p>
<p>I appreciate that this information is being taught in the Bureau and that it was well done, but it's slightly frustrating that it's completely targeted at sworn members or that there aren't non-sworn scenarios if we also have to watch the training.</p>
<p>I can only imagine the amount of time and resources that were wasted training us how to greet someone.</p>
<p>I don't see the need for anymore of these trainings. I will treat anyone regardless of their race, sex, identity, etc. with respect. I don't see why we don't have a policy that just says treat people with respect. Trying to individualize every single person will not work. There are too many people and they all want special treatment because they see everyone else getting special treatment. We are creating a vicious cycle that is bound to fail.</p>
<p>I have always followed the golden rule to treat others as I would like to be treated. That philosophy for me has never changed, and this "training" added nothing or changed anything in how I will continue to treat people.</p>
<p>I liked all but the irrational idea that people of the same sex who dress in different clothes should not be searched by anyone but those whom they identify with. The reason women don't like to be searched by men is because they are biologically smaller and they innately understand the sexual differences between male and female.</p>

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMUNICATION: THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN CREATED FOR INTERNAL PPB USE AND DOJ COMMUNICATIONS ONLY. PLEASE DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE, AS THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE FULL EVALUATION RESULTS NOR TRAINING CONTEXT.

I think this could have been a quick FYI in roll call, with ?'s to follow if wanted/needed
I truly appreciated the Policy Director engaging with officers in this format and analyzing the policy changes. I hope we continue applying this format with upcoming policy changes.
I'm a member of the LGBTQ community, this training was well done and well worded. I have no issues with it and found it easy to absorb even imagining if I did not already have prior knowledge of these concepts.
It seems contradictory that we even put someone's legal name on reports if we can get in trouble for not addressing someone how they want to be identified. Seems like our Report system for recording should follow the same standards that Officers must follow.
Myself and every person I've talked to about it feels this is a bullshit is a waste of time. You expect us to go out of our way to be considerate of "trans" peoples, when these people are usually spitting and throwing hands at us. Whatever, makes no difference, you'll just keep slinging this shit at us...
na
Please don't do this again
Please stop using our limited training time on this garbage.
The remarks section is not very large, so it should be increased in capacity for more characters, especially if there is already a notes in the remarks section.
this training is garbage. i have not heard or seen any issues when engaging with the trans/queer population in portland in well over 20 years. this is woke ideology looking for a problem that doesn't exist. congratulations for doing your part to destroy ppb
waste of time
When I watched, there was only one scenario. Were there supposed to be more? There was a blank screen with no audio for several seconds before the scenario. I watched it twice to see if it was a glitch on my end, and it did the same thing both times.