



Employment Training Panel
STATE OF CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
In person
1100 J Street, Sacramento, CA, Sequoia Room
Thursday, April 23, 2026

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gretchen Newsom called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Gretchen Newsom
Jennifer Fothergill
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 April 23, 2026 Agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Fothergill moved and Ms. Bettencourt seconded approval of the April 23, 2026 Meeting Agenda with no changes. All Policy Committee Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 3 to 0.

ACTION TO APPROVE AUGUST COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

No changes to December 11, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

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

Motion carried, 3 to 0.

POLICY MANAGER REPORT

MEC Applications: Ms. Testa turned the policy manager report over to Tara Armstrong, head of the Technical Operations Branch. Ms. Armstrong reported that there will be some new questions added to the MEC application, and more details about the larger reorganization effort will be provided at the Panel meeting tomorrow.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Revisions

Michael Cable, Staff Attorney presented on ETP's revision process. He explained how revisions are changes to the ETP contracts, and how this flexibility is normal and necessary. He explained how sometimes ETP receives requests to change the general terms and conditions of our contracts before the contracts have been executed, and that it is our general practice to not engage in these types of revisions. He then reviewed what the current contract language says regarding revisions – namely, that there are certain revisions classified as 'modifications' that are handled in-house. All other changes are classified as 'amendments'. He noted how ETP had recently reviewed our approval process for revisions that are assignments – basically, assigning all of the duties of the contract to a new entity other than the originally approved entity – and that this review enabled us to strengthen the approval process for these types of revisions. He reassured the Committee that all revision requests are reviewed and vetted by staff before approval, and asked if Committee had any specific types of revisions that they would like to see come before them.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Newsom said that she appreciated that staff keep an eye out when reviewing revisions to elevate the ones that they feel are necessary to Panel for approval. She likes that they are seeing a few more revisions coming to Panel. She made a note, specifically, about revisions that are requesting to move funds into lower wage job numbers.

Mr. Cable responded that he felt that a big part of the ask from Committee around this topic was to have the legal team look at the issue to make sure we are handling it correctly, and he can say that we are comprehensive – all the pieces are there.

Public Comment

Phil Herrera commented that CEF works for this process. The flexibility of being able to request revisions is vital and he and his clients appreciate this. Also, anything paperless is good.

Welfare-to-Work Guidelines/CalWORKS Information Sheet

Ms. Testa presented on the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines as part of ETP's larger effort to review our policies as required by our legislation. ETP has been in the process of reviewing our pilots and guidelines for a while now – the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines are being discussed here for the first time, and will be presented a little differently than previous guidelines. These guidelines were designed to explain and implement section 10214.7 of our legislation, which provides guidance on how to include CalWORKS recipients into ETP's contracts. CalWORKS is California's name for the federal TANF (Timely Assistance for Needy Families) program, which provides a cash stipend and other benefits to people in need with children. The Welfare-to-Work program has not been utilized at ETP since at least FY 15/16. Since the presence of a separate guideline gives the impression that we have created additional program rules around this population, and to ensure we are in alignment with our legislation, ETP is proposing to eliminate the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines and replace them with a more streamlined, simplified, and direct CalWORKS Information Sheet. Both the Welfare-to-Work Guidelines and the new draft CalWORKS Information Sheet are included in the packet today for reference. No Committee or Panel vote is required to take this action since we are only following existing requirements.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Newsom said it's simple and beautiful and she likes it.

Ms. Bettencourt asked a clarifying question about wages. She noted that it doesn't seem as if most CalWORKS recipients could meet ETP's required wages – so how is that handled?

Ms. Testa responded that, if we had a CalWORKS recipient who was not able to meet ETP's regular wage requirements, the legislation section allows for Panel to waive those wage requirements for the CalWORKS recipient, so there is a method already in the legislation to handle those scenarios.

Public Comment

Robert Meyer noted that this problem most likely suffered from the beginning because the intention was too broad and it wasn't focused on occupation-based training programs.

ACTION ITEMS

Medical Skills Guidelines

Committee reviewed the Medical Skills Guidelines at the December 2025 meeting, where they proposed the following edits to the guidelines as follows: 1) a general clean-up for grammar/formatting/etc.; 2) remove the 50% cap on CBT training; 3) remove the allowance to fund a general orientation training for nurses; 4) remove the requirement that benefit packages be proportional to time worked; 5) remove specific roster requirements; 6) remove the sample curriculum; 7) remove an unnecessary comparison table; and 8) allow both Allied Health and Community Health occupations to participate. Ms. Testa presented a draft of the Medical Skills Guidelines with those edits completed. She requested an action item to move the revised Guidelines to Panel for full approval.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Discussion

None.

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

Motion carried, 3 to 0.

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

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Ms. Newsom noted that we had received some public comments in written form prior to the start of the meeting, specifically two documents from Rodriguez Strategic Partners, LLC. The documents have been distributed, printed out, and is entered into the record.

Nancy Hoffman wants to discuss a pain point that the MECs often feel, which is difficulty in obtaining the required data from their Participating Employers, specifically around trainee records. Her clients are concerned with data security, and want to minimize the number of hands that the data transfers through, etc. She has had to create multiple different work-arounds for different clients. She asks any other contractors/consultants out there to please provide what has worked for them – she will be at the Panel meeting tomorrow if they want to discuss. She is also specifically wondering why the Participating Employers cannot enter the information themselves into CEF, and why we need the full 7 digits of the SSN instead of just the last 4 digits.

Ms. Armstrong responded that they are actively looking at adding an API (Application and Programming Interface) which should help with this. She understands the concerns with data privacy.

Ms. Rychener explained that her organization has also had to create work-arounds for this with certain Participating Employers, and she'd be happy to connect with the first commenter at the meeting tomorrow to discuss.

Dr. Grimes commented on the second part of the original comment – the need for the full SSN. She noted that since we are a performance-based program, we use a base wage file to verify the training, so we are locked in to using the full SSN currently.

Mr. Daley gave a comment that they also run into this issue with Participating Employers and the workarounds don't always work.

Mr. Rodriguez gave a verbal public comment to accompany the two documents he provided ahead of time. He requests that Panel consider focusing on Job Creation, especially given the data provided in the reports he submitted earlier.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Chair Newsom asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Motion carried, 3 to 0.

Meeting adjourned at 1:42 p.m.