



Tim Rainey
Executive Director



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
HEALTH WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
CAREER PATHWAY SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

**April 16, 2012
1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.**

**Woodlake Hotel
500 Leisure Lane
Sacramento, CA**

I. Introductions:

- **Sub-Committee Members introduced themselves. Members present included:**
 - **Steve Barrow, Chair**
 - **Lupe Alonzo-Diaz, Kevin Barnett, Cindy Beck, Dena Bullard, David Cherin, Diane Factor, Laura Long, Cathy Martin, Perfecto Munoz, David Quackenbush, Chad Silva, Annette Smith-Dohring Abbie Snay, Sheila Thomas, and Linda Zorn.**
- **Also present included:**
 - **Tim Rainey, Javier Romero and Moreen Lane, CWIB**
 - **Staff to the Sub-Committee:** Jeff Oxendine, Jennifer Lachance, and Evlyn Andrade, UC Berkeley Facilitation Team

II. Chair's Remarks

- Steve Barrow welcomed the Sub-Committee and thanked them for being willing to work on Phase II of the Career Pathway work. He indicated that the first phase had been a significant success and that the completed pathways, recommendations and associated action plans had been approved by the Council earlier in the day. He indicated that there was considerable interest in the Pathways Committee Summary Report among key stakeholders statewide and nationally. He was pleased that the funding and consultants were secured by CWIB for Phase II of the Sub-Committee's work. He introduced Jeff Oxendine and Jennifer Lachance, consultants from UC Berkeley, to facilitate the remainder of the meeting.

III. Review of the Sub-Committee Work to Date, Next Steps and Deliverables

- Jeff Oxendine reviewed the Sub-Committee’s process and accomplishments from Phase I. He then outlined the scope of work and process for Phase II (see attached Power Point presentation). Jennifer Lachance reviewed the ground rules for participation and introduced the criteria used for selecting pathways for development in Phase I. There was consensus agreement on scope and ground rules for Phase II.

IV. Review and Approval of the Physician Assistant Pathway and Recommendations

- Dr. Michael De Rosa, representing the California Association of Physician Assistants, presented the proposed pathway, recommendations and action plan for strengthening the supply, distribution and diversity of physician assistants (PA). Highlights of comments and suggestions by Sub-Committee Members included:
 - Of the estimated number of PA graduates per year in California (420-450):
 - It would be helpful to have data on the regional distribution of graduates and need
 - About half of the need/demand will be covered with current graduation rates
 - It would help to know how many PA graduates go into specialties vs. primary care.
 - It would be helpful to know the number of applicants attending school outside California due to impacted programs in California
 - Tuition reduction on the “front-end” (i.e., scholarships) may be more effective than loan repayment at attracting candidates to practice in primary care and underserved settings.
 - It would be helpful to know more about how faculty shortages would impact expansion.
 - Could an alternative pathway (e.g., EMT to PA) be established if the master’s degree requirement was removed or if it was possible to offer degrees from masters-granting institutions but training in other areas (e.g. rural community colleges)?
 - Given the potential importance of preserving the capacity of community colleges in California (3 current programs) to offer PA degrees, California may need to seek a waiver to the change in national accreditation requiring that the training institutions offer master’s degrees.
 - There is a need to increase preceptorship for PAs to help increase training capacity, particularly in rural and underserved areas. Several innovative approaches were proposed:
 - Can a satellite training approach work?
 - How can technology impact this shortage?
 - Can remote supervision work?
- Proposed new action plan items to consider:
 - Create incentives for PAs to go into primary care
 - Explore funding and partnership opportunities with OSHPD (make it broader than Song Brown)
 - Address loan repayment vs. tuition reduction programs
 - Expand Objective 3 to add a specific strategy to reach out to other states
 - Add an objective to consider increased partnership with CSU and other master’s degree granting institutions

V. Discussion – Next Set of Health Occupations for Pathway Development and Cross-Cutting Issues

- Jennifer Lachance facilitated a discussion regarding selection of additional pathways for the Sub-Committee to develop during Phase II. As presented in the scope of work, Jeff Oxendine noted that the Sub-Committee’s charge would involve review and approval of the direct care and physician assistant pathways that had been drafted but not acted on in Phase I. It would also include 2-3 additional pathways, depending on the availability of experts and capacity of the consultants and Sub-Committee within the time frame.
- The Sub-Committee first reviewed the prioritization criteria used during Phase I and updated the list to create the criteria for Phase II.

- After considerable discussion and a prioritizing exercise by the Sub-Committee, the following pathways were selected:
 - Medical Imagers (including specialty modalities)
 - Dental Hygienists
 - Health Information Technology (HIT) professionals
- Mr. Oxendine noted that further exploration was needed regarding the need for and capacity to work on Dental Hygienists and HIT professionals. He agreed to explore the viability of developing pathways in these areas. In the event that pursuing these pathways was not viable, the Sub-Committee agreed that Health Administrators would be the next pathway for development.
- Cathy Martin agreed to convene a subgroup of experts to develop the medical imaging pathway. It was noted that the group should obtain input from non-hospital imaging providers as well.

VI. Next Steps

VII. Public Comment

VIII. Adjournment