

COURT REPORTERS BOARD
MANDATORY CONTINUING EDUCATION MEETING
CRB GOAL - PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS #3
MARCH 29, 2007

In attendance: Greg Finch (Court Reporters Board, Member), Yvonne Fenner (Court Reporters Board, Member), David Brown (Executive Officer, Court Reporters Board), Janeece Sargis (Staff, Court Reporters Board), Lisa Kaplan (Lobbyist, California Court Reporters Association), Carlos Martinez (California Court Reporters Association), Toni Pulone (Deposition Reporters Association), Georgeann Wiles, (California Official Court Reporters Association), Brianna Lierman Hintze (Legislative Representative, Department of Consumer Affairs) and Laura Freedman Eidson (DCA/Board attorney).

Location: Office of Greg Finch

Summary of Intent of Meeting: To identify for the Mandatory Continuing Education (MCE) task force those barriers and challenges the Board will face in implementing CE requirements for licensees.

Summary of Results of Meeting:

- Formation of task force to oversee MCE proposal and to develop timelines and other details;
- Review and/or augment existing language/reports on subject;
- Involve/inform the public in every step of the process;
- Obtain letters of support for the concept of MCE from associations and other interested parties;
- Develop a proposal to present to licensees and the public for input and discussion;
- Develop final proposal to present to the Legislature.

Details of Discussion: David Brown began the meeting by giving an overview of the history of MCE proposals for court reporters. In 2005, DCA indicated that they would not support MCE so the board, at that time, decided to table the proposal until a later date. Now that there are new board members, and the board is fully appointed, MCE has been identified as one of the board's goals.

Overall, everyone at the table was in support of the MCE proposal and thought this was a good time to attempt legislation. Since it is a new session with many newly elected members, the political climate may be at an optimum for this proposal.

Carlos Martinez indicated that the Judicial Council is now requiring mandated continuing education for court employees. This could provide additional support in the parallel between the need for continuing education for those involved in the court process.

COURT REPORTERS BOARD
MANDATORY CONTINUING EDUCATION MEETING
CRB GOAL - PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS #3
MARCH 29, 2007

Lisa Kaplan mentioned that there have been several MCE bills passed recently and signed by the Governor. One such bill was AB 120, Chapter 540, Statutes of 2006. This bill required MCE as a condition of license renewal for physical therapists and physical therapy assistants. Another bill was AB 3030 (2004), introduced by the Committee on Agriculture, which dealt with continuing education requirements for State Veterinarian employees. (Staff researched the status of this bill after the meeting and found that it did not pass).

Lisa also suggested fiscal questions regarding the court reporter MCE proposal; fiscal documents/research and support letters should be in hand before presenting to the Legislature and Administration. She also indicated that if DCA is not in support this time around, the Board should consider moving forward by taking the proposal to representatives of the Administration for their input and support. It was suggested that if support letters on the specific content of the proposal could not be arranged in time for a presentation, that the Board solicit letters of support for the intent of the concept.

Individual comments on the overall proposal of MCE were that since so often deposition reporters are typically isolated and don't always have access to updated information regarding the profession, the DRA board would be in strong support. COCRA most likely would support the concept, although there may be individual reporters who oppose MCE. It was suggested that the board solicit affected associations (CCRA, COCRA and DRA) for a letter of support for the concept of MCE.

It is imperative that the board has the following information researched and outlined for the legislature at the time the proposal is presented:

- Cost impact
- Harm/benefit analysis (provide documentation/examples of information CSRs are not typically getting—i.e. requirement that they notify the board of change of address or reporters not knowing the difference between how to handle state and federal cases)
- Consumer protection details
- Background of why proposal has failed in the past
- What has changed since last attempt at proposal
- Outline of minimum qualifications
- Show that the board has done a thorough review and analysis of all aspects of the proposal
- Review and answer questions asked when this concept was previously attempted

To ensure the public is both informed and involved in the process of developing the MCE proposal, it was suggested that all CSRs be notified of meetings, that

COURT REPORTERS BOARD
MANDATORY CONTINUING EDUCATION MEETING
CRB GOAL - PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS #3
MARCH 29, 2007

meetings be held in both Southern California and Northern California, and that every meeting be publicly noticed. The California State Regulation public notification process might be a good one to reference as this process moves forward.

Brianna Lierman Hintze, from DCA, suggested:

- the board looks at what other states and industries are doing in the area of MCE.
- the MCE proposal is completed by the next Sunset Review date.
- a two-prong approach should be taken: consumer protection and minimum qualifications.
- the board justify why the proposal is *not* a barrier to practice
- that CEUs are made easy for licensees to access (internet)
- the board consider using the term “continuing education” instead of “continuing competency”, as the term “competency” can be subjective and difficult to define.

Yvonne asked that if MCE were added as a *condition of licensure*, would a “sunrise packet” of information be required? David clarified that a “sunrise packet” of information is only required if there is a *change in scope of what licensure covers* or if a board is *establishing a new licensure category*. MCE merely adds a statutory licensure requirement so sunrise information would not be needed. It was suggested that the board use the questions in that package to develop information for MCE.