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 orderer'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 ensure that the patient receives legally safe and timely medical care.

The Board has asked a subcommittee to define job tasks and the knowledge, experts" from the trade and the schools require (1) recruiting "subject-matter procedure 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
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-destructors 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-destructor 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-