



Employment Training Panel

# POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

To: ETP Policy Committee  
Gretchen Newsom, Chairperson  
Janice Roberts, Member  
Rick Smiles, Member

CC: Executive Staff  
Reg Javier, Executive Director  
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director

From: Lis Testa, Policy, Research, & Legislative Specialist

Subject: Policy Committee Meeting Summary  
Re: October 6, 2022 Meeting

---

## **POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

Thursday, October 6, 2022 at 1:00 p.m.

California Employment Training Panel  
1100 J Street, Fifth Floor, Sequoia Room  
Sacramento, California 95814

VIRTUAL MEETING: VIA ZOOM

### **1. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL**

**Gretchen Newsom**

- a. Chairperson Newsom called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.
- b. Roll Call

Committee Members Present: Gretchen Newsom  
Janice Roberts  
Rick Smiles

ETP Representatives Present: Reg Javier, Executive Director  
Elisabeth Testa, Policy Manager

### **2. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY (March 2, 2022)**

**Gretchen Newsom**

Chairperson Newsom asked if the Policy Committee Members had an opportunity to review the March 2, 2022 Policy Committee Meeting Summary; and whether there were any questions, concerns, or corrections. Hearing no corrections, Chairperson Newsom asked for a Motion to Approve the March 2, 2022 Policy Committee Meeting Summary.

ACTION: Ms. Roberts moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the March 2, 2022 Policy Committee Meeting Summary. Chairperson Newsom called for a vote, and all Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 3 – 0.

### 3. POLICY MANAGER REPORT

Lis Testa

a. Nothing this month.

### 4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Report to Committee re: Productive Lab

Lis Testa

Ms. Testa, Policy Manager, gave a presentation on Productive Lab (PL) – a delivery method for ETP training that occurs on the job with actual tools and materials and results in the production of goods that the company can use for profit.

Ms. Testa went over a definition for Productive Lab and explained it's history at ETP. She also presented the information on Productive Lab training from the Regulations and the PL Guidelines. She went over some trends that are currently happening in regards to PL training, specifically addressing trends that indicate that PL training is being abused and/or misused frequently. Lastly, she provided some items to keep in mind when considering amending the PL policies and gave some potential suggestions for policy changes that could successfully address Panel's concerns on the perceived abuse of PL training.

Ms. Newsom asked for some initial Committee comments.

Ms. Roberts said that usually, PL training is used for high tech equipment, and therefore the employee wages are usually on the higher end. But now she is seeing PL training being used as a cushion to support the rest of the contract when things get off track with the rest of their training programs. She is seeing some proposals come through where PL is the entirety of the training program, which is not the intent of PL. She recommended limiting the amount of PL training to perhaps 10% of the contract's value or training hours, and wants staff to help ensure that no non-PL courses show up in the Panel proposals (such as restroom cleaning). She also wants whatever we implement to be simple and streamlined.

Ms. Newsom agreed with everything that Ms. Roberts said. She asked what the PL reimbursement rate is. Ms. Testa responded with \$23/hour. Ms. Newsom then said that

she does not like to see the reimbursement rate higher than the wages being paid to the employee.

Mr. Smiles also agreed with the comments so far, and also said that he'd like to see some sort of limit on the amount of PL training allowed in a contract.

Ms. Newsom then opened up the discussion to the public.

Mr. Herrera said that his contracts, which are mostly for high tech medical and other high tech companies, have PL training that provides certifications for the trainees who complete the training. The PL training in his contracts is high quality, and he urged Committee to keep the bar high for PL training.

Mr. Sanger noted that applicants already provide a lot of information to the development analysts about PL training. He thinks that keeping PL training for higher skilled training is a good idea, but notes that this has greatly loosened in recent years. Staff can help applicants adjust the PL component of their training proposals during development, and doesn't want to limit PL training too much.

Ms. Leon was glad when the earlier version of PL training (SOST – see PL memo) went away. PL is better because of the lower trainer:trainee ratio, which makes the training expensive. ETP helps with the cost of training, but does not reimburse for employee wages, which is why the reimbursement rate is higher than some wages. PL training should not be for everything, but only for higher skilled trainings. She also welcomes more monitoring of PL classes, and more monitoring in general.

Ms. Kirby mentioned that language can be confusing sometimes, for example, 1:1 training is usually called On the Job Training, but at ETP PL. PL does not apply to every industry, but for manufacturing it is extremely important. The applicants do already need to provide PL justifications, and wants to keep flexibility for PL, especially for the highly qualified projects.

Ms. Meeuwsen also expressed a desire for more monitoring, and that an enhanced PL justification may be a good idea. She said that it's hard to limit PL training by industry, especially since people learn in different ways, and requested that this be kept in mind when developing an enhanced justification for PL.

Ms. Newsom then brought the discussion back to the Committee members.

Ms. Newsom said that she'd like us to ask about certifications that are obtained at the conclusion of PL training. She doesn't like the reimbursement rate being higher than the wages being paid, so she would like information on the wage progression that employees taking PL training receive. She wants this information to be more detailed – not just a note that there is wage progression, but information on how large of a pay increase they receive and how long it takes to receive it – especially because PL training is producing goods that the company uses for profit.

Ms. Roberts noted that PL training right now is out of hand and many people are taking advantage of it. This sends a message to others that PL training is a 'free for all' and standard operating procedure. The course titles she has been seeing under the PL training are poor and don't make sense, and this gives the impression that PL training is being abused. She also sees an unrealistic amount of PL training hours in many contracts, given the number of trainees participating and the low trainer:trainee ratio. She would like to limit the hours of PL allowed, and then allow them to put whatever courses they want in those limited hours.

Ms. Newsom asked if a contract has a PL component, can staff guarantee that the PL training will be monitored?

Ms. Testa said most likely not – we are currently short staffed with excessive demand, and monitoring has greatly decreased in recent years as a result.

Mr. Javier noted that since so many contracts have a PL component, that it may be difficult to monitor every project that has PL in it.

Ms. Torres noted that even before COVID, monitoring PL was difficult since it happens during production and on the production floor – it is much easier to monitor classroom training given space and safety concerns.

Mr. Herrera noted that it is difficult to allow monitors on some production floors, for example in clean rooms. He agrees with a raised wage and certification information and limiting PL to specific occupations.

Ms. Roberts said that she'd like more staff review of the PL components during development to help prevent non-PL courses being included in the curriculum, and to help control the other abuses they've been seeing recently (such as excessive PL hours).

Ms. Newsom asked if we enforce a new cap on PL hours, do we technically need to amend the Regulations.

Ms. Testa replied yes.

Ms. Roberts said that, for example, forklift training should never be in PL, but she is seeing that. She wants more staff review and noted that perhaps this could fix everything.

Ms. Newsom said she would like more information on how PL training will differ from actual work.

Ms. Roberts again said she'd like a more robust staff review.

Mr. Smiles said he'd like a more in depth justification for anyone requesting more than 60 hours of PL training.

Ms. Gretchen then summarized staff's take-aways as the following: to ask about certifications received as a result of PL training, to ask in depth questions about wage

progression at the end of PL training, to ask how PL training is different from normal work, and wants more information on the PL trainer. She would also like more explanation of the PL coursework, similar to the older task/competencies checklist ETP used to use, which asks how many hours are required for each course in order to be considered competent, and provides a listing of key skills that must be learned successfully in order to attain competency.

Mr. Sanger then requested that we just not make it too complicated. He asked if JATCs are expected to provide the same information.

Ms. Newsom said that JATCs don't have PL training since they are only reimbursed for the Related Supplemental Instruction component of their training programs.

Mr. Sanger noted that it can be hard for MECs to know all of this information ahead of time, since they don't know their full complement of participating employers, so he requested more flexibility for MECs.

Ms. Newsom asked if Cal-E-Force has a help bubble or alert text that provides a definition of PL training and guidance for what can be included or not.

Ms. Testa replied that she was not certain of what was in the system.

Ms. Newsom added the requirement for an explanation within the system to the take-aways for this topic.

Ms. Rafferty then also requested flexibility for the MECs.

#### 4. PROPOSAL ITEMS

##### a. Proposal to Committee Re: Literacy Pilot Guidelines

Ilya Launitz

Mr. Launitz presented the guidelines for the new, alternately funded Workforce Literacy Pilot Program. His presentation included many aspects of the new program, including the purpose of the program, the targeted population, the eligibility and curriculum requirements, and fiscal information such as project caps and funding sources. See accompanying memo and guidelines.

Ms. Newsom then opened the discussion up for Committee members.

Ms. Newsom expressed that she would like the eligible Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to have a prior two years of experience in providing literacy training specifically.

Ms. Roberts mentioned that concurrent enrollment doesn't seem very likely with these projects and wonders why these guidelines are allowing it.

Mr. Launitz responded that, since the training curriculum content of the Literacy projects is so different from our normal Core funded projects, that staff were leery of limiting the participation of current Core contractors in the Literacy program. He also noted that no duplicate training is allowed between the Literacy program and any concurrently held Core project.

Ms. Newsom opened the discussion for the public.

Mr. Sanger requested that the Literacy Program be kept open for MECs that did not have two years of experience in providing literacy training.

Another stakeholder asked if they could use this Literacy training in conjunction with other programs, for example, while training dental technicians, or for nurse assistants training to become RNs – these folks often need language training in addition to medical skills training.

Mr. Launitz responded that yes, you can have multiple contracts – for example, a Core funded project and a Literacy project – but that the Literacy projects are limited to only literacy training as outlined in the guidelines. Also, the support costs are a little bit higher than they are for Core funded projects, in recognition of this need.

Mr. Maslac commented that he wanted to note that the Literacy projects can pair with the Healthcare projects, which will be presented shortly.

Mr. Launitz added that the Literacy program is for those individuals who need literacy skills, especially those that need training in literacy skills as a prerequisite for continuing additional training, whether in a healthcare project or otherwise.

Ms. Miles said that the program seems very exciting and will help them to serve more women.

Mr. Little commented that an immigration bill from 1995 largely gutted the farm workforce, with the current result that the farm workforce are now aged and communication and literacy skills are a major challenge for them. This program is a great start.

Ms. Negoescu added her comments in high support for this program. She requests prioritization for projects that are being proposed between multiple groups that are coordinating with each other for the highest success. She also inquired as to a 'hybrid' delivery method that is half computer based and half instructor led.

Mr. Almeida also requested the addition of a hybrid delivery method.

Mr. Maslac said that we could waive the retention requirements for the Literacy program entirely so that the trainees can more quickly move into a second training program for work-related skills.

Ms. Newsom asked if there are certifications required at the end of the training.

Mr. Launitz responded that they are not required, but they will be asking as part of the applications if certifications are awarded at the successful completion of training.

Ms. Newsom noted that the guidelines state that the curriculum cannot be 'primarily' CBT, and asked if there was a cap on CBT training. She wants more instructor led training than CBT training. She also wants to see more robust trainer qualifications.

Ms. Greer agreed that the trainer needs to be qualified, noting that is an adult learner is not feeling successful in learning, that they will drop from the program; so trainer quality is essential.

Ms. Rafferty said that distance learning, which is used by the Community Colleges, seems similar to the hybrid delivery method that was discussed earlier. She suggested that this delivery method be considered not just for the Literacy program, but for all of ETP.

Mr. Ford asked what the retention requirements and reimbursement rates are, and also agreed that the hybrid delivery method was necessary.

Mr. Almeida said that many ESL teachers are certified as ESL teachers, rather than as teachers like college professors and asked that this be taken into consideration for the trainer qualifications.

Ms. Roberts asked what the retention periods are for the Literacy program.

Mr. Launitz replied that all current ETP standard retention periods are allowed, and which retention period will depend upon the trainee characteristics.

Ms. Newsom then asked Committee for a motion.

**ACTION:** Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Roberts seconded approval of the new Workforce Literacy Pilot Program Guidelines, with the following amendments: to add a hybrid/distance learning delivery method, to assign a reimbursement rate for that delivery method, to add more robust information regarding trainer qualifications, to ask additional information about certifications obtained after successful completion of training, to add that CBOs need to have experience in literacy specific training, to ensure that there is not a majority of CBTc, and to prioritize projects that award certifications ahead of those that do not. Chairperson Newsom called for a vote, and all Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 3 – 0.

**b. Proposal to Committee Re: Healthcare Pilot Guidelines**

**Mario Maslac**  
**Diana Torres**

Mr. Maslac and Ms. Torres presented a summary of the proposed alternately funded Healthcare Workforce Advancement Fund. His summary included information on the

purpose behind the program, funding information, and various program specifics. Please refer to accompanying Guidelines and memo.

Ms. Newsom then opened the discussion up to Committee members.

Ms. Roberts asked why there is a four-year term for this program?

Mr. Maslac responded that since wage progression is a component requirement of the program, the contractors need time to train their workers and for the workers to have advanced enough to obtain their wage progression.

Ms. Roberts asked if there will be application windows for this program.

Mr. Maslac responded that there will be several short application windows.

Ms. Roberts asked if Core funded healthcare companies will be eligible for this funding as well.

Ms. Torres responded that no, this is only for non-Core eligible contractors.

Ms. Roberts asked if this program was open to mental health workers as well as physical health workers.

Ms. Torres responded yes, and that it is termed here behavioral health.

Ms. Newsom asked for public comment.

Ms. Rychener asked about trainee eligibility, wondering if RNs were going to be allowed to participate.

Ms. Torres responded that this is geared more towards entry level healthcare positions and wage and career progression for those trainees.

Ms. Kirby asked if the Cal-E-Force applications will change, and also asked when the application windows would be announced.

Mr. Maslac said that yes, the system change for the applications will happen.

Ms. Torres noted that EDU will sponsor an application workshop.

Mr. Meyer added that the application workshops will be available for both the Healthcare program and the Literacy program.

Ms. Newsom then asked Committee for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Roberts seconded approval of the new Healthcare Workforce Advancement Fund guidelines. Chairperson Newsom called for a vote, and all Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.



Motion carried, 3 – 0.

**5. OPPORTUNITY FOR POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

No additions.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

**Gretchen Newsom**

Chairperson Newsom adjourned the meeting at 3:37 PM.