



general fund. The Board is currently staffed by 56 people.

## MAJOR PROJECTS:

**Minority Nurse Task Force.** The Nursing Practice Committee of the BRN and representatives of minority nursing organizations formed a task force and met in September to discuss the possibility of seeking legislation which would attract minority groups to the field of nursing through scholarship funds, consulting services, and recruitment and retention programs. (See CRLR Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1986) p. 52.) The Administrative Committee of the BRN recommended that the task force meet quarterly and that a smaller subcommittee meet more frequently to assist the Legislative Committee regarding minority issues.

**Standardized Procedure Survey.** The final report on the 1985 BRN survey was presented at the November meeting. The survey results indicate that there is a common lack of understanding among survey respondents regarding when a standardized procedure is required. Many respondents, particularly those who had not attended any standardized procedures workshops, indicated that they use standardized procedures for activities which do not, in fact, require their use. Many respondents also demonstrated a lack of familiarity with the Nursing Practice Act (section 2700 of the Business and Professions Code). The BRN staff recommended continued educational activities regarding the use of standardized procedures and the Nursing Practice Act. Workshops and newsletter articles were suggested as a means of disseminating the information. The groups of nurses in great need of information and guidance include nurses in advanced practice and nurses working in outpatient settings, such as correctional institutions.

## RECENT MEETINGS:

BRN staff proposed a fee schedule to cover all necessary costs of implementing AB 4372 (Isenberg), the furnishing and dispensing bill (see CRLR, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1986) p. 53). The staff suggested an application fee of \$50, a renewal fee of \$35, and a late penalty of \$150. The proposed fees and appropriate justification will be forwarded to the Department of Consumer Affairs for review and approval. A notice of proposed regulations was published in January, and a public hearing is tentatively scheduled for March, 1987.

A regulatory hearing was held on October 30, and the Board subsequently

adopted clean-up regulations in the following areas: repeal of section 1404, Chapter 14, Title 16 of the California Administrative Code, which duplicates information found in other sections of the code; amendment of section 1412 to reflect the current passage standards for the GED exam used by the state Department of Education; repeal of section 1416, which contains obsolete information regarding applicant re-examination; and amendment of section 1419.4 regarding issuance of duplicate licenses and reference to an incorrect fee. The final rulemaking file is being prepared by BRN staff and will be forwarded to the Office of Administrative Law for approval.

The Board scheduled a January 13 hearing in Sacramento on its proposed amendment of sections 1424, 1425, and 1426 of Chapter 14, Title 16 of the California Administrative Code. The areas under consideration include the administration and organization of nursing programs, reporting qualifications and changes in teaching areas of faculty members, faculty responsibilities regarding academic counseling, and additions to the required curriculum which were inadvertently deleted.

The Board unanimously adopted the Diversion/Discipline Committee's recommendation regarding the relationship of nursing to mid-level practitioners of medicine. The Committee reaffirmed that registered nurses are legally responsible for all orders they implement regardless of the order's source. The nurse must know who has legal authority to give direction for patient care; clarify any order that is unclear, seems inappropriate, or changes the course of patient care; be an advocate for the patient; and ensure that the patient receives legally safe and timely medical care.

The Board voted to support a proposed change in NCLEX score reporting. The National Council of State Boards of Nursing is concerned about the use of passing (numerical) scores by employers and schools to make hiring decisions. The NCLEX is designed to make pass/fail decisions about medical readiness for practice, not to identify outstanding abilities.

## FUTURE MEETINGS:

March 19-20 in San Diego.  
 May 21-22 in Sacramento.  
 July 23-24 in San Francisco.  
 September 17-18 in Los Angeles.  
 November 19-20 in San Francisco.

## BOARD OF CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS

*Executive Officer: Richard Black  
 (916) 445-5101*

The Board of Certified Shorthand Reporters (BCSR) licenses and disciplines shorthand reporters, recognizes court reporting schools and administers the Transcript Reimbursement Fund, which provides shorthand reporting services to low-income litigants otherwise unable to afford such services.

The Board consists of five members, three public and two from the industry, who serve four-year terms. The two industry members must have been actively engaged as shorthand reporters in California for at least five years immediately preceding their appointment.

## MAJOR PROJECTS:

**Examinations.** The Certified Shorthand Reporters (CSR) examination was administered to 385 candidates in November. The results of the two-day exam indicate a 30% passage rate overall, with a 40% passage rate for first-time examinees.

The BCSR has adopted the following exam policy statement: "The Certified Shorthand Reporters Board desires to reassess what important job skills and knowledge are needed by a competent entry level shorthand reporter and to insure that its tests cover these areas." In implementing this policy, the Board expressed an interest in formally validating its examinations. Such validation would insure that the examination is fair, and also that it would be defensible in any test-related litigation.

The Board heard a presentation by a test program analyst from the Department of Consumer Affairs' Central Testing Unit (CTU) concerning services which the CTU could provide to the Board. This presentation emphasized that the CSR examination should be clearly job-related and referenced to an appropriate criterion. Validating a test requires defining job elements and measuring their relative importance. Validation usually involves conducting an occupational analysis, which would require (1) recruiting "subject-matter experts" from the trade and the schools to define job tasks and the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to carry them out; (2) asking other experts to rate the tasks as to relative significance; and (3) surveying recent licensees with regard to how frequently they perform each task. The Board has asked a subcommittee to review two previously-conducted occupational analysis studies (one by the



# REGULATORY AGENCY ACTION

National Shorthand Reporters Association and the other by the Board itself) to determine whether either study could be useful in the upcoming exam validation process. The Board voted to engage the services of the CTU to prepare an exam validation study pending the subcommittee's report to the Board in February. Such a study would take one year to complete and cost approximately \$5,000-\$7,500.

The Board responded to a concern regarding the timing of notification of exam results. Previously, all candidates who took any portion of the CSR exam (English, Professional Practice and Dictation) were notified of the results simultaneously. Concerns were raised that candidates who were repeating the written portions of the exam only (English and Professional Practice) were waiting from ten weeks to three months for their test results, when in fact the results of those exam portions were available much sooner. At the November meeting, the Board adopted a new notification procedure, whereby candidates who take only the written portions of the exam will be notified of those results as soon as they are available.

The Board decided not to offer an interim examination for those applicants who must retake the written portion of the exam only. The Board cited concerns about the wide distribution of exam questions among prospective applicants prior to taking the exam and indicated that offering the exam only twice a year would better maintain the integrity of the exam.

## RECENT MEETINGS:

At the November and December meetings, the Board held informational hearings on a number of possible changes to the BCSR regulations. Some of these changes include the following: the period during which one may renew a certificate after it has expired would be reduced from five years to three years; court reporting schools would be required to have CSR students report twenty hours of court trials of administrative hearings, and twenty hours of depositions during apprenticeship training; and court reporting schools would be required to file an annual report with the Board to identify staff and curriculum changes. The Board will be discussing these proposed changes again at future meetings.

In December, the Board discussed the possibility of amending section 8005 of the Business and Professions Code which refers to the position of the executive officer of the Board. The

Board is interested in increasing the position to a full-time position, and has instructed the staff to develop a plan to implement this change, if legislative approval is necessary.

## FUTURE MEETINGS:

February 7 in San Francisco.

May 8-9 in San Francisco.

## STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD

*Executive Officer:*

*Mary Lynn Ferreira  
(916) 924-2291*

The Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB) licenses structural pest control operators and field representatives. The latter can function only under a licensed operator and secure pest control work for the operator. Each structural pest control firm is required to have one licensed operator, regardless of the number of branches the firm operates. A licensed field representative can also hold an operator's license.

Licensees are classified as: (1) Branch 1, Fumigation, the control of household and wood-destroying pests by fumigants (tenting); (2) Branch 2, General Pest, the control of general pests without fumigants; or (3) Branch 3, Termite, the control of wood-destroying organisms with insecticides, but not with the use of fumigants, and including authority to perform structural repairs and corrections. An operator can be licensed in all three branches, but more often will limit the variety of his or her expertise for purposes of efficiency and subcontract out to other firms.

SPCB also issues applicator certificates. These otherwise unlicensed individuals, employed by licensees, are required to take a written exam on pesticide equipment, formulation, application and label directions if they apply pesticides. Such certificates are not transferable from one company to another.

SPCB is comprised of four public and three industry representatives.

## MAJOR PROJECTS:

*Proposed Regulatory Amendments.* On October 25 in Pasadena, the Board held a public hearing on proposed amendments, additions, and deletions to Title 16, California Administrative Code, sections 1991(a)(8) and 1997. (See CRLR Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1986) pp. 53-54.) The proposed amendment to section 1991 addresses reporting and investiga-

tion requirements under Business and Professions Code section 8516(b)(9) regarding the removal, covering, or masking of termite pellets after treatment of infestation. The specific purpose of the proposed regulation, as set forth in the Board's initial statement of reasons, is to determine whether section 1991(a)(8) should be amended or modified for instances where only a limited property inspection has been performed. After the October 25 public hearing, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to section 1991(a)(8) with modification of one word and the deletion of the last sentence. The modified amendment would relieve the licensee from making a complete investigation following a fumigation to mask, cover, or remove termite pellets, and would allow the licensee to mask, cover, or remove only those pellets discovered in the limited areas in which inspection was performed for the purpose of recommending fumigation. (See CRLR Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring 1986) pp. 57-58 and CRLR Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1986) pp. 53-54.)

The proposed amendment to section 1997, concerning fees for the filing of inspection reports and completion notices, establishes a reduction in the inspection report filing fee from \$2.50 to \$1.50. (See CRLR Vol. 6, No. 3 (Summer 1986) p. 44.) The proposed reduction in inspection fees, however, was not sufficient to comply with the 24-month limitation set forth in section 128.5 of the Structural Pest Control Act. The Board, therefore, modified the proposed amendment at its October 25 meeting, reducing the fees for inspection report filing from \$2.50 to \$1.00, and for completion notice filing from \$1.50 to \$1.00.

*Continuing Education.* All SPCB licensees must complete continuing education prior to license renewals. (See CRLR Vol. 5, No. 4 (Fall 1985) p. 44.) SPCB randomly audits a percentage of all renewed licenses for compliance with the continuing education points requirements. Audited licensees are asked to submit verification of their participation in approved continuing education activities. Licensees who are unable to verify their continuing education participation are referred to Board specialists. Recent statistics indicate that of the 331 people audited (114 operators and 217 field representatives), 324 met the requirements, 23 cases were referred to Board specialists, 7 accusations were filed, and 4 licenses were terminated.

A method for evaluation and appraisal of the continuing education program was discussed at the October 25 meeting.