



PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION COALITION

Summary of Professional Certification Coalition Strategy Call

September 6, 2018

I. Introduction

- a. *Membership update:* 75+ members signed up as of Sept. 6; consistent growth in membership, among a wide variety of industries.
- b. *Media:* PCC has engaged several reporters about our efforts, which led to the publication of an article in Financial Planning magazine headlined *CFP Board, FPA get busy after Missouri bans CFP designation*, highlighting the issue. The Financial Planning article, in addition to further media coverage relating to PCC, will be made available here <https://members.profcertcoalition.org/media-coverage>. To the extent that PCC members work regularly with publications in their fields, we encourage you to reach out to them or put them in contact with the PCC to continue this momentum.

II. Ohio Legislation

- a. A number of PCC members have transmitted letters to the Ohio legislature and several have received responses back from legislators. Please continue to send PCC any feedback/intelligence you receive from legislators or other sources in Ohio.
- b. Our best intelligence indicates that the Ohio legislature will meet rarely, if at all, prior to the November election. This increases the likelihood that OH SB 255 will not be passed by the House prior to the election. However, the intelligence we've gathered also indicates that SB 255 is well positioned to move fast through the House in the post-election "lame duck" session. As such, we will need to persuade the bill sponsor and legislative leaders to amend the bill to reflect our concerns; at this stage, we do not think that "killing" the bill is realistic, nor do we think such a posture would serve us well politically. We understand from our Ohio sources that the bill sponsor is quite reasonable and that he may well be receptive to our arguments.
- c. Some members suggested the value of highlighting lawmakers' campaign promises, such as economic development, and tying those promises to our goals for the bill. The PCC believes there is merit to this approach and encourages members to pursue it.

- d. For now, we are holding off from hiring a lobbyist on-the-ground in Columbus; instead, we will reach out as an organization to key lawmakers to determine what progress we can make on our own. The Steering Committee will re-evaluate over the next several weeks whether to hire a local lobbyist.

III. Outreach to other organizations

- a. The PCC will begin conducting outreach to key stakeholder organizations that have been influencing legislation related to professional certification and occupational licensure. The organizations on the recently circulated *Preliminary Target List for PCC Stakeholder Outreach* fall into three main buckets:
 - i. *Libertarian/ Conservative*: Pushing for change to occupational licensure and deregulation, generally. Groups include: American Legislative Exchange Council, Americans for Prosperity, and Institute for Justice.
 - ii. *Liberal/Progressive*: Concerned about barriers to entry for employment that certification or occupational licensure may cause, especially for ex-offenders and veterans. Groups include: Center for American Progress and State Innovation Exchange.
 - iii. *Governmental/Think Tanks (non-partisan)*: Organizations that are studying this change and making non-partisan/non-ideological recommendations. Groups include: Brookings Institution, Council of State Governments, Federation of Association of Regulatory Boards, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors' Association, and U.S. Department of Labor – Employment and Training Administration.
- b. A member suggested that we consider reaching out to organizations that conduct certification testing, such as Pearson and Prometric. Given that our certification organization members operate as customers to those companies, we encourage individual PCC members to reach out to these companies. We are pleased that PSI Services and other organizations that provide services to certification organizations have joined the PCC, and it will strengthen the Coalition to add other similar members to our ranks.

IV. Member identification of new initiatives of concern/member priorities

- a. We have accomplished a great deal in the past two months, growing from an idea to a substantial membership organization, and rolling out our bill monitoring, in-depth bill analyses, and media-related functions. We expect shortly to finalize an evidence-based white paper setting forth the basis for PCC's positions, which we and members can deploy in our outreach efforts to legislators and stakeholder groups.

- b. If members have any feedback, concerns, or intelligence, please contact info@profcertcoalition.org for follow-up.
- c. As we move forward with these initiatives, we will make available any press releases, in addition to the white papers and other materials we have completed, on the PCC website.

V. Questions from members

- a. *Are these bills going to affect private organizations, specifically in the IT sector? The industry has large organizations that would be perfect to lobby.*
 - i. We have been in touch with leaders in the IT industry, and will continue to pursue mobilizing the tech sector. We encourage members to contact stakeholder groups in their respective professions/fields in order to reflect support for the PCC's positions across the market.
- b. *Can you prepare a general article that we could tailor to our specific industry's media?*
 - i. In response to this request, the PCC will create a template article/press release and will add it to the *Members Only* portion of the PCC website.
- c. *What type of certifications are we protecting, just for personnel or also equipment certifications?*
 - i. The PCC is focused on protecting professional certifications earned by individuals.
- d. *We have noticed that the projected costs of establishing governmental certifications to compete with private certification programs (as proposed – purposefully or unintentionally – in the Ohio bill) are dangerously conservative. A California program to certify lab personnel had an estimated cost of \$73,000 per year, while this would certainly cost a great deal more. How can we correct these forecasts while also advancing our agenda?*
 - i. We believe this is a vital talking point, given that the “fiscal note” associated with many occupational licensure reform bills drastically underestimates the cost of establishing a government certification program. We will include this in our messaging to key lawmakers/stakeholders, as appropriate. We will stress that professional certification organizations know more about certification programs and their operational costs than government officials and that such organizations should be trusted to certify individuals.