



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.