



POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

TIME/PLACE

Thursday, April 23, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.
California Employment Training Panel
1100 J Street, Sacramento CA 95814
Phone: (916) 737-4200
www.etp.ca.gov
Via Zoom

This is a public meeting and the public may attend and/or provide public comment in person or virtually.

In-person attendees should check-in at the Security Desk located in the Main Lobby on the First Floor to be directed to the Sequoia Room on the Fifth Floor.

For virtual attendees to view or provide public comment via Zoom meeting, use the link below and use the raise-hand feature during public comment to be called on.

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87840057288>

Passcode: 529966

One tap mobile: 1-855-758-1310

Webinar ID: 878 4005 7288

(For assistance, login, and raise hand or contact ETP-BSU@etp.ca.gov)

The actual order of Agenda items may be changed without notice.

ATTENDANCE

Gretchen Newsom, Chair
Rebecca Bettencourt, Member
Jennifer Fothergill, Member

AGENDA

Call to Order by Chair

Gretchen Newsom

- Welcome and Roll Call
 - Action to Approve April 23, 2026 Policy Committee Meeting Agenda
 - Action to Approve December 11, 2025 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
-

Policy Manager Report

- MEC Application Questions Update

Discussion Items

- Revisions Michael Cable

 - Welfare-to-Work Guidelines Lis Testa
-

Action Items

- Medical Skills Guidelines Lis Testa
-

Opportunity for Policy Committee Members to Request Agenda Items for Future Policy Committee Meetings

Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda

Public Meeting Adjourns

Under Government Code section 11123(a), all meetings of a state body are open and public, and all persons are permitted to attend any meeting of a state body, except as otherwise provided in that article. The Policy Committee may take action on any item listed in this Meeting Notice & Agenda. You can obtain further information about this Meeting Notice & Agenda by contacting Michael A. Cable, Staff Attorney, at (916) 327-5422, or Michael.Cable@etp.ca.gov, or sending a written request to Michael A. Cable, Staff Attorney, at Employment Training Panel, 1100 J Street, 4th Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. Written comments on agenda items should be submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. the business day before the meeting in order to afford adequate time to consider your comments.

All meetings are accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting, including without limitation auxiliary aids or services, may make a request by contacting Michael A. Cable, Staff Attorney, at (916) 327-5422, or Michael.Cable@etp.ca.gov, or sending a written request to Michael A. Cable, Staff Attorney, at Employment Training Panel, 1100 J Street, 4th Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. Providing your request so that it is received at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help ensure availability of the requested accommodation.



Employment Training Panel
STATE OF CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
In person
1100 J Street, Sacramento, CA, Sequoia Room
Thursday, December 11, 2025

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gretchen Newsom called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Gretchen Newsom

Jennifer Fothergill

Mike Hill

Rebecca Bettencourt

Executive Staff:

Jessica Grimes, Director

Peter Cooper, Assistant Director

Kumani Armstrong, Assistant Director/Chief Counsel

ETP Representatives

Elisabeth Testa, Policy Manager

ACTION TO APPROVE MEETING AGENDA

No changes to December 11, 2025 Agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Fothergill moved and Mr. Hill seconded approval of the December 11, 2025 Meeting Agenda with no changes. All Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 4 to 0.

ACTION TO APPROVE AUGUST COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

No changes to August 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

ACTION: Ms. Fothergill moved and Mr. Hill seconded approval of the August 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes with no changes. All Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative

Motion carried, 4 to 0.

POLICY MANAGER REPORT

MEC Applications: Ms. Testa informed the Committee that the Application Workgroup will be presenting later on today on the updates to the PE Demand form that were requested by Committee previously. The App Workgroup has also been provided the additional questions that Committee put forth for inclusion in the MEC applications. Additionally, this will be a standing item in the Policy Manager Report at all future Committee meetings until this work has been completed.

Phase II Guideline Reviews: Ms. Testa noted that, as a part of our work in reviewing ETP Pilots and Guidelines, we will be moving into a Phase II of this effort soon. Many of the Pilots and Guidelines are written as interpretations of our Legislation and Regulations, without making actually any changes to our programs. We will be looking at removing these as stand-alone guidelines, since they make it appear that we are changing something in the Leg/Regs when we are not. They will be replaced with Info Sheets or Quick Guides, and all of this work will also be brought before Committee in future meetings.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Medical Skills Guidelines

Ms. Testa presented information on the Medical Skills Guidelines. These had first been discussed at the August 2025 meeting, when Committee requested additional performance statistics and also potential definitions for Allied and Community Health. After reviewing this new information, Ms. Testa also reviewed the current contents of the Guidelines. She concluded her presentation by proposing eight potential updates to the guidelines, including: 1) a general clean-up for grammar/formatting/etc.; 2) removing the 50% cap on CBT training; 3) remove the allowance to fund general orientation training; 4) remove references that benefit packages have to be proportional to hours worked; 5) remove special roster requirements; 6) remove the sample curriculum attachment; 7) remove the comparison table attachment; and 8) potentially revise the eligibility requirements to include occupations from Community Health as well as from Allied Health.

Public Comment

Michelle Rychener asked if the performance statistics provided here also included the HWAF (alternately funded) Projects. She also asked, as she had made the same comment at prior meetings, that hospitals be re-added back into the Priority Industry list.

Sam Rodriguez commended ETP for considering including Community Health into the Guidelines.

Committee Discussion

Mr. Hill asked why we wouldn't fund a general orientation training. Ms. Testa responded that we don't fund any general orientation training under any of our other programs, so it's a bit odd that it was added here. Additionally, ETP does not fund any mandated trainings, such as federally required trainings.

Ms. Fothergill asked, regarding opening these guidelines up to Community Health as well, if there are certain occupations within Community Health that we should be limiting this to. She asked if there was a list of occupations we could choose from and how we could monitor this. Ms. Newsom further wanted to clarify what Committee's options were – to open it up to all of Community Health or to only certain occupations within Community Health. Ms. Testa responded that they can choose either. Ms. Testa also pointed out that Community Health contains all of the Allied Health occupations, as well as other occupations. Of these additional Community Health occupations, some would need medical skills training, while others, such as a community organizer, for example, wouldn't need medical skills training anyway – so by opening the guidelines up to all of Community Health, the occupations will self-dictate, in a way, which needs medical skills training and which do not.

Public Comment Round 2

Ms. Rychener made a second comment regarding the orientation training for nurses, noting that it is often a week long training where they are being trained on different machines, for example – that its not a normal 'orientation' training, and is concerned about it being removed from the Guidelines. Ms. Bettencourt's response was to make sure that the curriculum list of courses is descriptive and matches what the trainees are actually learning.

Committee Discussion Round 2

Ms. Newsom asked Committee for their feedback on the proposed revisions. All members were in support of all of the proposed edits. Ms. Testa will bring a revised version of the Guidelines, with all changes incorporated, to the next Committee meeting for approval to move to full Panel for a vote.

Delivery Method Naming Conventions

Committee had requested potentially looking at changing the names of some of our training delivery methods, specifically, E-Learning and Computer-Based Training (CBT). Ms. Testa explained that our current delivery method names come straight from our Regulations. She reviewed the current verbiage in the Regulations and noted the key characteristics of each method. She then introduced some potential alternate delivery method names by looking at how different educational institutions define their delivery methods. No other naming convention maps onto ETP's naming convention exactly. She then explained that, in order to change the delivery method names, a Regulation change is required. We can attempt to do this the 'easy way', through a Section 100 filing, but this may not be feasible. We can also attempt to change the Regulations through the 'hard way', using a full Regulation package.

Public Comment

Nathan Daley commented that he thinks we should keep the term CBT, but proposes for E-Learning the term "Live Virtual Classroom".

John Fox likewise commented that CBT is fine. For E-Learning, he recommends "Live Virtual Training", which is contrasted with "Live In-Person Training".

Phil Herrera noted that, in many LMS systems, there are a couple dozen delivery method names to choose from, and that it may not make sense to start messing around with ETP terminology since there doesn't seem to be any wide-spread consensus on terms anyway. He recommends instead looking at ways to really improve the entire program – including by looking at trainer to trainee ratios.

Annie Rafferty proposed using "Self-Paced" or "Self-Directed" learning instead of CBT. She also recommends a 'definition document' that explains each of the delivery methods. She also seconded Mr. Herrera's comment about the trainer to trainee ratios.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Bettencourt commented that the important things are to make sure that we've called out somehow if the training is in-person or virtual, and that the ratios for both are the same. She feels that some of the confusion comes from an 'industry understanding' that e-learning means self-paced learning. She feels 'virtual-led' is what should replace e-learning, and CBT could be called 'asynchronous'. And for CBT/self-paced – it's not that someone just goes and 'watches a video' – its that they are watching the video within a system that is tracking their time/participation/etc., and that there is a set time or duration for the training that has been provided. She wonders where these requirements are for CBT in our current rules. Ms. Testa pulls up the Regulation language and clarifies that CBT is reimbursed for the 'standard hours required to complete that course'. Ms.

Bettencourt says then that self-paced is her vote for CBT as long as it contains within it that requirement that the courses have a preset length of time that will be counted for them. Or, she also suggests changing everything to ‘synchronous’ or ‘asynchronous’, but acknowledges that folks not in the educational fields may not be comfortable with that language.

Kumani Armstrong commented that, even though the Section 100 filing may be available, most likely the Office of Administrative Law would require this to be handled through a larger, full Regulation change package.

Mr. Hill notes that this is a strong argument for not changing them now. He also notes that there is a lot of change going on right now across all industries with regards to training.

Mr. Armstrong responds that this is a good point. He also notes how Regulations should be written in a broad enough manner to accommodate changes like this, and not be so prescriptive that they then require frequent updates.

Dr. Grimes comments that one of the important distinctions we need to keep in mind when discussion delivery methods is ‘who is doing the training’ – is there actually an instructor, or is the trainee learning on their own or through a computer program of some sort. So when we discuss new naming conventions, this should be part of those considerations. She also commented that self-directed means that the trainee is deciding for themselves what they want to learn and when and how – which is completely outside of our operating parameters as an agency.

Ms. Bettencourt responds that it really is a difference between having an instructor and not having an instructor. She feels the confusion comes from folks thinking that E-Learning means with no instructor, and they confuse E-Learning and CBT with each other. She notes that the pandemic did a lot to change how training is organized among businesses – whereas before, businesses would not really consider virtual trainings – that virtual training was more a thing of academia before the pandemic, and not of business. She suggests just using ‘instructor led’ and ‘computer based’.

Ms. Newsom commented that we also would need to clarify that ‘instructor led’ means led by an actual human, and not by an AI.

Ms. Testa makes a comment for folks to remember that the Regulation for delivery methods is connected directly to the Regulation regarding ratios and also the Regulations governing rosters and recordkeeping requirements – so that if we start changing things in one place, we need to make sure of how those changes will affect the other Regulations as well.

Public Comment Round 2

Mr. Daley noted that if we just called them ‘instructor led’ and ‘computer based’, that this is most likely insufficient, since Panel often wants to know more information about the trainings, such as if they are in-person, etc.

Committee Discussion Round 2

Ms. Bettencourt noted that we probably can’t take any action now, especially since these changes will affect other things such as the ratios and rosters. She notes that at some point, the terms will need to change because of how much things change over time.

Ms. Newsom suggests that Committee land on option 3, which is to do nothing currently. Committee agreed.

ACTION ITEMS

CNA to LVN Guidelines

Committee reviewed the CNA to LVN Guidelines at the August 2025 meeting, where they proposed three edits to the guidelines as follows: 1) a general clean-up for grammar/formatting/etc.; 2) removal of a floating reference to Productive Lab; and 3) simplifying the reimbursement requirements to match ETP’s standard reimbursement schema. Ms. Testa presented a draft of the CNA to LVN Guidelines with those three edits completed. She requested an action item to move the revised Guidelines to Panel for full approval.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Discussion

None.

ACTION: Mr. Hill moved and Ms. Fothergill seconded approving the edits as presented and moving this item to full Panel for approval.

Motion carried, 4 to 0.

PE Demand List

Hana Hasan presented on behalf of the Application Workgroup. As part of the work in

revising MEC Applications, Committee requested the following be added to the PE Demand List: 1) notification of inclusion; 2) new or repeat/returning employer; 3) potential or confirmed; 4) county; and 5) industry with drop-down list. Ms. Hasan presented the current prototype for the revised PE Demand List, showing where each addition had been included. The Application Workgroup is making an additional 6th recommendation: to remove the Small Business indicator. She requested an action item approving the revisions.

Public Comment

Michelle Rychener asked what the difference was between the first and third edits – notice of inclusion vs potential or confirmed. She also asks what potential/confirmed means. She asks if a Participating Employer (PE) at first confirms and then later pulls out, and we've marked 'confirmed' on this sheet – is that PE then obligated to participate.

John Fox echoed Ms. Rychener's comments and questions. He also asks for clarification on what 'returning' means – if they participated only once 10 years ago and are coming back, do they select 'returning'. He also recommends removing the PI indicator, since it is only a guess of the applicants, and once the certification statements are actually submitted, the PI can change. Ms. Newsom asked him if, instead of just a yes/no check box, if there was a drop down to select the actual industry, if that would make a difference. Mr. Fox says yes, that would at least give you the larger industry – but the problem he sees is that sometimes, only part of the industry is PI, and he'll make the wrong guess on the PE Demand List.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Bettencourt begins with a question, saying she's noticing that no where on this PE Demand list do we see NAICS code or CEANs. Do we collect that information somewhere? Because we get it from the Single Employers and should get it from the MECs as well.

Tara Armstrong replies, regarding PIs, that each year once they've been voted on, there is a database on the ETP website that shows which NAICS codes are PI or not. She agrees that the PI box can be removed if Committee wishes. It is self-reported now, and is used to give a quick glance to the make-up of the PE population for Panel. The actual hard data is collected after Panel approval, when the certification statements are entered. This at the start is just initial data, not hard data.

Ms. Bettencourt makes a note about the potential vs confirmed item. She understands that these are just proposals, or estimates. So she doesn't understand what the difference is at this point in the process for potential vs confirmed. We've never pulled data on how many on the PE Demand list actually end up participating and all of the other data related to that. She likes having the attestation, and also the returning indicator.

Ms. Newsom asks what they would do with a new MEC if there was no potential/confirmed option. She supposes she would need to really ask well-phrased questions at Panel to ensure that the MEC had done all of the outreach to the PEs and was in a good position to be successful.

Ms. Bettencourt asks if we have something, like a letter or something, that shows that the PE has accepted participating.

Dr. Grimes responds that many MECs have a document like that for their own best practices that they use in addition to the PE Demand list.

Ms. Bettencourt responds that she is thinking of something like the union support letters but for PE participation. She then mentions that she thinks that ‘returning’ needs to be reworded because it is unclear – does this mean that if they were a Single Employer before that they would check ‘returning’, or would they check ‘returning’ only if they were a PE before, for example.

Public Comment Round 2

Chris (online comment) asked if the PI indicator would be in a drop-down and how many industries are named in there? Alayna, a member of the Application Workgroup, responds that the database on the website has every possible industry name in it.

Mr. Daley comments that you can have a Single Employer who holds their own contract, but perhaps doesn’t perform as well on it, so they move to the MEC, since there is much less work for them in applying to and administering an entire contract on their own.

Ms. Rychener comments that, in the past, they used to have to get a signature from the PE itself for the PE Demand list, and possibly if we went back to that, it would solve this issue of not knowing if the PE is aware of being included, etc.

Barry Maleki commented that he is also confused about the ‘returning’ tag. Everything fluctuates so much. They may put 20 PEs on the Demand List and then have 80 actually participate. Or folks on the PE Demand list don’t end up participating. He also asks for clarification on potential vs confirmed, because he is unclear on what that means.

Ms. Armstrong notes that, regarding the signature, she thinks it was around the pandemic when the signature requirement was removed. The MECs, when they add the PEs into their contract, are authenticating and then completing the PE forms. We can add the signature back in if desired.

Committee Discussion Round 2

Ms. Fothergill notes that Panel understands that the PE Demand list is an estimate, and that PEs are added to the contract later, and that some PEs on the Demand List don't participate. She wants to emphasize the reason that Committee was requesting some of these updates in the first place, which is that some PEs were not even aware that they had been included on these PE Demand lists in the first place. From a Panel member's perspective, it's that verification that has been missing, and the Panel members are trying to obtain the best information possible on a project before approving it.

Ms. Armstrong replies that the first edit, notification of inclusion, where it shows that the PEs have been notified that they are being included on the PE Demand List.

Ms. Bettencourt asks if we are including counties/locations for all participating locations of the company on this sheet or only the headquarters, since the location can affect their wage amounts, or if they're in a HUA or not, etc. This matters because as they've been asking of some MECs that have a geographic service area but are serving folks from way outside of that area. And she also wonders how cumbersome it is to collect and display all of that data.

Ms. Armstrong replies that we do collect all of that information, but not until the contract has been executed. We get all of their participating locations, and we collect all of the other relevant data so we can verify their NAICS codes, etc. This is just the initial picture.

Ms. Newsom brings the discussion back to formulating an action item. She notes that it seems like there is a consensus to keep #1 (notification of inclusion) and to erase #3 (potential or confirmed). Up for debate is #2 (returning or no), including what 'returning' means.

Ms. Bettencourt says maybe to phrase it differently, like 'have you ever received funding before'. She thinks it's helpful to see at a glance who is a repeat and who is not. We do ask this of Single Employers.

Ms. Armstrong proposes 'are you new to ETP, yes or no'. She also asks what time frame would be considered, if a company had been to ETP a long time ago or not.

Ms. Bettencourt says just make it a general yes/no.

Ms. Armstrong asks if we're good with #5 (industry selection). Committee replies in the affirmative. Ms. Armstrong also asks if they still want the PI indicator. Committee replies yes.

Ms. Testa adds that, when we were discussing the MEC applications over many meetings last year, in regards to the repeat/returning question – it seems that today we have been discussing if they are a repeat to ever using ETP funding at all. However, during our prior discussions, the focus was on if they were a repeat PE for that particular MEC – to see if

the MEC was just always re-using the same PEs or if they were doing outreach to find new PEs, and to not lose sight of this key characteristic.

Ms. Newsom responds that this is important because it is what allows us to see the long standing relationships between the MECs and their PEs, along with other information. So she's wondering how to rephrase the 'returning' item.

Ms. Bettencourt adds that it can also show us if the PE is participating in more than one MEC, as well – because each MEC focuses on a different area.

Ms. Newsom proposes 'are you a repeat PE to this MEC'.

Ms. Armstrong says that they are trying to avoid the word 'repeat' because of data issues.

Ms. Bettencourt notes that we do get a lot of information during and after the contract is executed. Maybe we need to look at tying some of that data to the new proposals when they come in.

Ms. Armstrong asks if they mean to increase the amount of data that's shown in the prior projects area of the proposals.

Ms. Bettencourt replies in the affirmative.

Dr. Grimes notes that we are looking right now at details, which is important. And also from a 50,000-foot level, we have some Legislative requirements about working with certain types of businesses, for example with small businesses, so she likes the idea of getting more information about which MECs the small businesses are working with. However, she notes that simultaneously, working with a MEC may be the only way that the small business can participate.

Ms. Newsom asks the Committee members what their priorities are, what information do they want here. She wants the #1 change, the notification of inclusion. She also wants the #5 change for the industry designation. She does not see a need for #4 for the county designation, since she can see their addresses.

Mr. Hill does not see a need for either #2 (repeat) or #3 (potential vs confirmed).

Ms. Newsom says that it seems like the consensus is a yes for #1 (notice of inclusion) and #5 (PI industries), and a no for #2 (repeat), #3 (potential/confirmed), and #4 (county). She asks for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Fothergill moved and Mr. Hill seconded approving the edits as follows: yes for #1 (notice of inclusion) and #5 (PI industries), and a no for #2 (repeat), #3 (potential/confirmed), and #4 (county).

Motion carried, 4 to 0.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PANEL MEMBERS TO REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE FUTURE PANEL MEETING

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Phil Herrera brings up AI, noting that many bills regarding AI have recently been passed, and he thinks it will be worth it to have discussions soon on how AI will change the training environments and potentially impact ETP.

Nathan Daley brings up SB 464. He would like ETP to make a public statement on this bill because it involves data storage, that demographic data is to be stored separately from personnel files. He wants to know if SB 464 will affect ETP contractors in any way.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Chair Newsom asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Bettencourt moved and Ms. Fothergill seconded approval to adjourn the meeting. All Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 4 to 0.

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.



LEGAL UNIT MEMORANDUM

To: ETP Policy Committee
Gretchen Newsom, Chairperson
Rebecca Bettencourt, Member
Jennifer Fothergill, Member

Date: April 23, 2026

ETP Executive Staff
Jessica Grimes, Executive Director
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director/Senior Advisor
Kumani Armstrong, Assistant Director/Chief Counsel

From: Michael A. Cable, Staff Attorney

Subject: Contract Revisions: Modifications, Assignments, and Amendments

The purpose of this Policy Committee discussion item is to discuss the policy and practice for processing a contractor's request for a revision to an ETP Training Contract ("Contract"). A "revision" generally refers to any change, alteration, update, or adjustment made to the terms, provisions, language, scope, price, or obligations of a contract.

Requests For Contract Revisions Prior to Execution of The Contract

At times but not often, contractors will request revisions to the draft Contract following Panel approval but prior to execution. What generally happens in this instance is the Panel approves a training proposal at a Panel Meeting, ETP's Contracts Unit prepares a draft Contract for the contractor's review and execution, and the contractor responds by requesting changes to certain general terms and conditions prior to execution.

Requests for Contract revisions prior to execution of the Contract usually concern ETP's indemnity clause and/or privacy policy. ETP's general practice is to not approve any changes to its form contracts, as they are based on ETP's legislative mandate, regulations, Panel approval, and policies; which are also readily available and published on ETP's website, and used with all contractors that receive ETP funding.

Requests For Contract Revisions After Execution of The Contract

Contractors regularly request revisions to their Contract after execution of the Contract. Although many of these "post-execution requests for revisions" arise after a monitoring visit or toward the end of the contract term in order to obtain better Contract performance, ETP also receives a variety of requests for revisions for all sorts of things completely unrelated to Contract performance, and at any time throughout the 2-year term of a Contract.

Common requests for Contract revisions after execution of the Contract include:

- * Curriculum changes
- * Occupation changes
- * Shifting funds among job numbers
- * Primary contact changes
- * Company name changes
- * Assumptions of Liability and assignments

Modifications

ETP defines the term “Modifications” in its Contract. Modifications generally include more technical, less-significant post-execution requests for revisions to the Contract, which are processed internally by staff without any specific Panel action. Specifically, the Contract states:

“Modifications: Certain terms and conditions of this Contract may be modified at the request of Contractor with the written approval of ETP so long as there is no increase in the approved amount of funding, and no change in the scope or intent of training.

Modifications are restricted to the following:

- a) Add or delete a Job Number;
- b) Expand or reduce the Estimated Number of Trainees in a Job Number;
- c) Change the trainee Occupations in a Job Number;
- d) Redistribute the Estimated Number of Trainees funding between Job Numbers;
- e) Add to or delete training courses identified in the Exhibit B, Curriculum;
- f) Change or extend the term dates;
- g) Revise range of hours so long as there is no change to the per-trainee cap;
- h) Add health benefits to wages or change the amount of health benefits to be included in wages;
- i) Correct a material discrepancy between the text of this Contract and Exhibit A, CCS. (See Party Intent in Section 5.)

If ETP approves a Modification pursuant to (a) through (i) above, it will prepare a written Modification indicating the effective date and transmit a copy of same to Contractor.

Modifications cannot be made after termination of this Contract.”

Assignments

An "assignment" is the legal transfer by one party (the assignor) of its rights or benefits under an existing contract to a third party (the assignee). The original contract remains in effect, but the assignee essentially steps into the assignor's shoes to perform under the contract.

ETP processes request for assignments in one of two ways, depending on the situation:

1. Assumption of Liability

ETP defines “Assumption of Liability” in its contract. Simply put, an Assumption of Liability (“AOL”) is an assignment of the Contract to a “Successor Corporation” as defined in California Corporations Code section 1107, which said AOLs are processed internally by the Legal Unit without any specific Panel action. Specifically, the Contract states:

“Successor Corporation: This Contract shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of the surviving corporation or other business entity in the event of Contractor’s merger. (Corporations Code Section 1107.) This Contract shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of the surviving person or entity in the event a controlling interest in its assets or operations is purchased, acquired or transferred, in which case ETP may require the survivor to enter a written Assumption of Liability.”

2. General Assignments

All other requests for assignments (*i.e.*, a request to assign the Contract to some other entity that is not a Successor Corporation as defined under California Corporations Code section 1107), are processed internally as authorized and instructed by Operations without any specific Panel action. Specifically, the Contract states:

“Assignment: Contractor shall not assign any rights in, nor delegate any obligations under this Contract or any portion hereof, without prior written consent by ETP.”

ETP staff notifies Panel Members of all executed Assumptions of Liability and General Assignments at Panel meetings for information purposes.

Amendments

All other contractor requests for Contract revisions after execution of the Contract – not already identified above – are processed as a request for a general amendment under the Contract, and are brought to Panel for approval and action. Specifically, the Contract states:

“Amendment: With the exception of Modifications as provided for above, this Contract may not be amended except in a writing that is signed by both parties. An Amendment or Modification can only be made based on the mutual agreement of the parties. Amendments cannot be made after termination of this Contract.”



Employment Training Panel

Memorandum

To: ETP Policy Committee
Gretchen Newsom, Chairperson
Rebecca Bettencourt, Member
Jennifer Fothergill, Member

Date: April 23, 2026

CC: Executive Staff
Jessica Grimes, Executive Director
Kumani Armstrong, Assistant Director/Chief Counsel
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director/Senior Advisor

From: Lis Testa, Policy Manager

Subject: ETP Policy Committee Meeting Agenda Item
Discussion for Policy Committee Re: Welfare-to-Work Guidelines

I. Brief Issue Statement:

As noted at the June 2024 Policy Committee meeting, ETP is beginning a comprehensive review of all of our Pilots and Guidelines per the legislation requirement in 10205(i). This memo pertains to the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines, which provide information on how to address this specific population within ETP contracts.

II. Background Information:

The Welfare-to-Work Guidelines were originally drafted to provide guidance to staff on how to interpret and implement section 10214.7 of ETP's legislation, which addresses how ETP can serve individuals who are currently receiving or who are eligible for CalWORKS. A copy of the current Welfare-to-Work Guidelines are included in today's packet for reference.

CalWORKS provides benefits for folks with children, such as a monthly cash stipend and assistance in job searches. CalWORKS is California's name for the federal TANF program (Timely Assistance for Needy Families).

ETP's legislation directs ETP to allow CalWORKS recipients to participate in the ETP program, and provides some flexibilities to normal program rules including alternate retention period options and a reduced wage requirement.

Per ETP's Data Analytics Unit, there have been no CalWORKS recipients enrolled in any ETP contract since at least FY 15/16. This is the farthest back the CEF system tracks data.

Since this program has not been utilized, and since the creation of a stand-alone guideline gives the impression that additional policies are in place for this population, and with an eye towards bringing our current policies into alignment with our legislation and regulations, staff is proposing to convert the full stand-alone Welfare-to-Work Guidelines into a simpler and streamlined CalWORKS Information Sheet.

This CalWORKS Information Sheet will take the place of the stand-alone Welfare-to-Work Guideline, and contains summarized information from legislation section 10214.7, as well as a link to the CalWORKS website. This Info Sheet can give customers and staff basic information about how CalWORKS recipients can be included in ETP contracts, and will contain links that can provide additional information on the CalWORKS program to interested parties. A copy of the draft CalWORKS Information Sheet is included in the packet for today's meeting.

III. Recommendation:

No action items beyond soliciting and receiving any feedback from the Policy Committee, contractors, stakeholders, and the public concerning the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines/CalWORKS Information Sheet. Since no policies are being changed or updated, no Committee or Panel vote is necessary.



CalWORKS Information Sheet

Background:

ETP's legislation, specifically UIC section [10214.7](#), allows ETP to fund training for individuals participating in the CalWORKS program. According to [CalWORKS.org](#), "CalWORKS is California's name for the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. It gives people with kids in the home a monthly cash benefit, help finding work, and other helpful services. CalWORKS stands for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids."

This CalWORKS Information Sheet outlines important details for this population, and replaces ETP's prior Welfare-to-Work Guidelines.

Details:

*Unless noted here, standard ETP rules apply.

***Trainees:* MUST:**

- Be eligible to receive CalWORKS; or,
- Be receiving CalWORKS benefits at the time training in an ETP contract begins; or,
- Be receiving CalWORKS benefits within one year of when training in an ETP contract begins.
- *NOTE: eligibility or receipt of other benefit programs (e.g. SNAP, Medi-Cal, Welfare-to-Work, etc.) do NOT qualify trainees for participation under this program. This program applies to CalWORKS recipients and eligible recipients only.

***Retention:* Three retention periods are possible:**

- 90 days with one employer; or,
- 500 hours in 272 days for occupations where 90 days of consecutive employment is not standard; or,

- 90 days within 120 days with no more than 3 employers.

Training:

- The 45% cap on Literacy Training hours does not apply;
- Basic Skills training is allowable.

Wages:

- Panel may waive the minimum wage requirements of UIC section 10201

For more information on the CalWORKS program, please visit the CalWORKS website directly [here](#).



Employment Training Panel

Guidelines: Welfare to Work (W2W) Training Program

Guidelines Effective: January 1, 1998, official guides: July 2006, see revision history

Revision History: 02/22/2019 Summary: Revised guidelines to remove PL limitation on training hours. 03/11/2016: Revised to clarify that Single Employers are eligible employers for W2W projects. Clarifies that retrainees may exceed the 260-hour cap with an approved justification, for this and other programs. Noted for the Productive Laboratory delivery method the maximum training hours are capped at 60 (24 for Small Business). 04/12/2013: Revised to add historical W2W info and to reflect the Panel's December 8, 2010 action to lift the previously enacted moratorium. Also updated sections to reflect current policy (i.e., revised to indicate W2W training is no longer a Pilot, revised new-hire training cost cap to hourly cap, deleted requirement that all new-hire projects contain a Welfare-to-Work component). 01/15/2009: Standardized Pilot templates with standardized main headings, added new logo, removed standard ETP criteria.

These are guidelines only. If a proposal raises the need for further modifications, that will be accomplished on a case-by-case basis with direction from Executive Staff. **Unless modified by these guidelines, all other program criteria apply.**

BACKGROUND

In 1997, in effort to reform the State's welfare program and move many Californians from welfare to work, the California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids Act (CalWORKS) was signed into law. The Panel became involved early in the development of this legislation, and in 1998, the Panel's enabling legislation was amended to authorize a Welfare-to-Work (W2W) category, allowing it to fund training for employed workers who were either current or former CalWORKS recipients. The Panel began funding W2W training projects, aimed at helping trainees maintain employment and achieve success in their jobs, that same year. As part of the implementation of the program, ETP coordinated with the Department of Social Services (DSS) to provide information on CalWORK recipients and work participation rates under federal welfare-to-work requirements. However, since its enactment there have been several issues with the program, one being the diversion of funds to the Department of Social Services, and on more than one occasion ETP has halted funding to projects that were solely Welfare to Work. In July 2006, official guidelines for ETP's Welfare-to-Work (W2W) Training Program were drafted, but only a few months later, at the Panel's December 2006 meeting a moratorium on W2W projects was enacted. Not until the Panel's December 2010 meeting was this most recent moratorium lifted since no funds had been diverted to the Department of Social Services during that current budget year, that the Welfare-to-Work moratorium be eliminated.

W2W Training projects must emphasize training for entry-level (pre-apprenticeship) positions in construction, healthcare, hospitality, services, and other targeted industries.

ELIGIBILITY

Employers: Welfare to Work training may be provided under a Multiple Employer Contract (MEC) and/or a Single Employer Contract.

- **Single Employer Contractor and Participating Employer in a MEC:**
 - Must be subject to the Employment Training Tax per UI Code, Section 10201(b).
 - Not required to meet the Panel's out-of-state competition eligibility requirements set forth in UI Code, Section 10200(1).
 - The Panel's substantial contribution requirement is waived for the Welfare to Work population.
 - For multiple employer contracts, incidental placement of unemployed trainees with public and non-profit entities is permissible, but placements must not exceed 20%. However, given the special needs of this population, the Panel may waive this requirement for good cause.
 - For multiple employer contracts, no in-kind contribution required for new-hire projects.
- **Trainee:**
 - Can be either unemployed workers or employed workers.
 - **MUST:**
 - Be receiving CalWORKs benefits at the time training begins, or
 - Be eligible to receive CalWORKs benefits, or
 - Have received CalWORKs benefits within one year of the time of the commencement of training.
 - CalWORKs gives cash aid and services to eligible needy California families. Families receive money each month to help pay for housing, food and other necessary expenses. A trainee's ETP eligibility is based solely on the trainee receiving, being eligible to receive, or having received CalWORKs benefits as described above.

A trainee's receipt of supportive services/benefits - other than CalWORKs (e.g. foodstamps, Medi-Cal, Child Support, Welfare to Work, Family Planning, Child Health and Disability Prevention (CHDP), Social Services, Child Care) – does not indicate that the trainee is a CalWORKs recipient nor does it constitute evidence that the trainee is eligible to participate in ETP-funded training.
- **Proof of a Trainee's Eligibility:** Contractors must obtain/maintain evidence of trainee's eligibility to participate in ETP funded training on file for ETP review. As trainee's ETP eligibility is based solely on their CalWORKs eligibility described

above, Contractor is responsible for obtaining *written proof* of the trainee's CalWORKs eligibility from the Department of Social Services.

Note: All CalWORKs recipients are assigned a case worker. Trainee may verify their CalWORKs eligibility by obtaining written documentation from their case worker at their local Welfare Department. At a minimum, such documentation must identify the following:

- CalWORKs recipient name and case number (or other CalWORKs identifier),
- Case Worker's name and phone number, and
- Indication that the CalWORKs recipient is receiving, is eligible to receive, or has received CalWORKs benefits including the date they last received benefits.

Training Delivery

- Standard Training Delivery requirements apply

Training Hours

- The minimum and maximum training hours are 8 and 260. An approved justification is required to exceed the maximum training hours.

Curriculum

- At least 50% of trainee's total training hours must consist of vocational skills training.
- In conjunction with vocational skills training, training may also include literacy skills, which may exceed the Panel's cap on Literacy training as provided in CA Code of Regulations, title 22, section 4420, "Literacy Training".
- A limited amount of basic skills training may also be provided.
- The standard cap on training hours for retrainees (200 hours) does not apply.

Retention Requirements

- Full-time employment is required for a minimum of 30 hours per week during the 90-day employment retention period, with up to three eligible participating employers. For occupations where it is not customary for a worker to be employed 90 consecutive days with a single employer, retention may consist of 500 hours within 150 days, with up to three eligible participating employers.

Wage

- The Panel may waive the ETP wage requirement to 25% below the ETP minimum wage (wage may include health benefits).

Reimbursement

- Project administration costs must not exceed 13% for retraining and 20% for new-hires of amount earned. In addition, both retraining and new-hire MEC projects may receive up to 12% more for support costs.
- The standard hourly training cap (260) for new-hires may be exceeded for good cause.

Additional Information

- **Recruitment**
 - Contractor must identify a plan for recruiting CalWORKs recipients, which must be submitted with the proposed training project.
 - Contractor must describe other program resources that will be used in collaboration with ETP funds to serve CalWORKs recipients.
- **Contract Data**
 - ETP will work with contractors to obtain trainee data at the start of training, e.g., trainee employment status (employed, unemployed), income level, most recent employer(s), etc. which can be used for future analysis of the effectiveness of ETP-funded training.
 - ETP will follow-up on trainees after the completion of training and employment retention to determine the effectiveness of the training in helping trainees obtain and keep secure, well-paying jobs.



Employment Training Panel

Memorandum

To: ETP Policy Committee
Gretchen Newsom, Chairperson
Rebecca Bettencourt, Member
Jennifer Fothergill, Member

Date: April 23, 2026

CC: Executive Staff
Jessica Grimes, Executive Director
Kumani Armstrong, Assistant Director/Chief Counsel
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director/Senior Advisor

From: Lis Testa, Policy Manager

Subject: ETP Policy Committee Meeting Agenda Item
Action Item for Policy Committee Re: Medical Skills Guidelines

I. Brief Issue Statement:

As noted at the June 2024 Policy Committee meeting, ETP is beginning a comprehensive review of all of our Pilots and Guidelines per the legislation requirement in 10205(i). At the December 2025 Policy Committee meeting, Committee reviewed the Medical Skills Guidelines, which provide information for providing support and including this population within ETP contracts, especially in regards to curriculum.

This presentation will review the changes to the Medical Skills Guidelines that were discussed at the December 2025 Committee meeting.

II. Background Information:

The discussion from the December 2025 Committee meeting resulted in the following recommendations for the Medical Skills Guidelines:

- 1) Performing a general clean-up for grammar/formatting/etc;
- 2) Remove the 50% cap on CBT training, since this does not align with regulations. Additionally, removing the 50% cap on CBT training mirrors other actions recently taken by Committee and Panel for other populations;
- 3) Remove the allowance to fund a general orientation for nurse trainees. ETP does not fund general orientation training. Additionally, as currently written, this provision in the guidelines only applies to new, not incumbent nurses, which ETP has no way to track;

- 4) Remove references, under the Full-Time Employment area of the guidelines, to the requirement for any benefit package needing to be 'proportional' to the hours of time worked;
- 5) Remove all references to specific roster requirements as found under the "Additional Information" area of the Guidelines. Per the Operations Division, since ETP has standardized roster requirements, separate and/or special rosters for Medical Skills training are no longer needed;
- 6) Remove the sample curriculum attachment in its entirety. Per the Operations Division, since curriculum has been standardized and since definitions for both Preceptor and Didactic Training appear in the Guidelines, the sample curriculum is not needed;
- 7) Remove the comparison table at the end of the guidelines which compares medical skills training to the CNA to LVN program;
- 8) Revise the eligibility requirements of trainees to include those not only in an Allied Healthcare occupation and to include Community Health occupations requiring Medical Skills training as well.

A draft version of the Medical Skills Guidelines, with the above changes incorporated, are included in your meeting materials for today.

III. Recommendation:

Staff is requesting an action item to approve the revised draft of the Medical Skills Guidelines and to move the revised Guidelines to the full Panel for approval.

Guidelines: Medical Skills (MS)

Effective: October 21, 2008

Revision History: 11/30/2021: Update reimbursement rate information to always refer to the current reimbursement rate table. 02/22/2019 Summary: Revise guidelines to remove PL limitation on training hours. 05/24/2018: At the May 2018 Panel Meeting, the Panel approved an update of ETP reimbursement rates (from \$22 to \$26 for classroom training) to be effective for all projects with a term date starting in FY 18/19. 10/20/2015 Clarifies that retrainees may exceed the 200-hour cap with an approved justification, for this and other programs. Also noted, for the Productive Laboratory delivery method the maximum training hours are capped at 60 (24 for Small Business). 05/10/2012 Revision Summary: update *Background*; allow training for allied healthcare occupations such as therapists, technicians, and physician assistants; allow non-clinical training for all occupations, with training delivery via a classroom, simulated laboratory, or CBT; allow Orientation/basic skills training as part of a new nurse graduate training program; update curriculum content/format; identify Chart 1 job sheet; delete Preceptor roster as an Attachment to Guidelines; and, consider 24 hours a week full time employment provided that level of weekly employment qualifies the employee for a similar employee benefit plan. 06/03/2010 Revision Summary: Revised to indicate program no longer a pilot, and incorporated into the Panel program. 01/15/2009 Revision Summary: Standardized Pilot templates with standardized main headings, added new logo, removed standard ETP criteria.

These are guidelines only. If a proposal raises the need for further modifications, that will be accomplished on a case-by-case basis with direction from Executive Staff.

Unless modified by these guidelines, all other program criteria apply

BACKGROUND

The Panel supports training for the career advancement and job security of incumbent Registered Nurses (RNs), Licensed Vocational Nurses (LVNs) **and allied healthcare**. ETP currently funds training for new graduate nurses, nurse upgrades, nurse capacity building, and allied healthcare occupations. In addition, ETP funds training for Certified Nurse Assistants to become LVNs under a separate CNA to LVN program.

Employer Eligibility

- Standard Eligibility Requirements apply

ATTACHMENT B – INFORMATIONAL TABLE

Trainee Eligibility

- Eligibility is limited to frontline workers in nursing and allied healthcare and community health care occupations requiring medical skills training. For example: RNs (including New Graduate Nurses), LVNs, CNAs, Therapists, Technicians and Physician Assistants.
- There is no requirement to receive clinical training. Any occupation may take a combination of training types on the Menu Curriculum.

Training Delivery

- Didactic Training:
 - A term used in the health care field to describe classroom training. Like classroom training, didactic training is dependent on the trainer to provide all required instruction.
 - Didactic training will be classified as class/lab training. All class/lab requirements (i.e. 1:20 trainer/trainee ratio) are applicable.
- Preceptor Training:
 - A type of clinical training during which trainee observes hands-on skills performed by a preceptor (e.g. registered nurse or other practitioner) in a productive work environment. After observation, the trainee performs the skills under the preceptor's close supervision.
 - Competencies and skills are integral to preceptor training. Training is designed to ensure trainee acquires specific skills/competencies.
 - Training is typically provided at a 1:1 preceptor/trainee ratio. However, the ratio must not exceed 1:10.
- Class-Lab/E-Learning/Computer-Based (CBT) Training:
 - Non-clinical courses such as Continuous Improvement and Computer Skills may be included for all occupations.
 - Delivery may be in a classroom, simulated laboratory, by E-Learning, or by Computer Based Training (CBT).
- **Note:** Because Clinical Preceptor is a training delivery method in the Medical Skills program, Productive Lab does not apply to the Medical Skills program.

Training Hours

- The maximum training hours is capped at 200.

Curriculum

- Didactic/Preceptor training ratio: No didactic/preceptor training ratio is imposed. Training may consist of 100% preceptor training.

ATTACHMENT B – INFORMATIONAL TABLE

- Didactic/Preceptor training: Must be clearly identified in the Curriculum.
- Orientation/basic skills training: Orientation/basic skills training is not allowable for incumbent or experienced nurses.

Retention Requirements

- Standard Retention Requirements apply

Full-time Employment:

- A trainee will be considered as employed full-time with a minimum of 24 hours of employment a week provided that level of weekly employment qualifies the employee for an employee benefit plan (sick leave, vacation, health, dental, vision, retirement, etc.).

Wage

- Standard Wage requirements apply

Reimbursement

- Refer to current reimbursement rate table.