

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2013**

**Bill Number:** H.25

**Name of Bill:** An act relating to health care professional transparency

**Agency/ Dept:** on behalf of DFR, DVHA, DOH, GMCB, Robin Lunge **Author of Bill Review:** David Reynolds

**Date of Bill Review:** 2/5/13

**Status of Bill: (check one):**

☒ **Upon Introduction**      ☐ **As passed by 1<sup>st</sup> body**      ☐ **As passed by both bodies**      ☐ **Fiscal**

**Recommended Position:**

☐ **Support**      ☐ **Oppose**      ☒ **Remain Neutral**      ☐ **Support with modifications identified in #8 below**

**Analysis of Bill**

**1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

To require health care professionals to identify their title and license, certification, or registration type in advertisements, handouts, and identification tags.

**2. Is there a need for this bill?** *Please explain why or why not.*

It will provide enhanced transparency

**3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?**

Would require Dept. of Health to adopt rules to require health professionals they regulate to wear photo IDs disclosing license, certification, or registration

**4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?**

Would require the Office of Professional Regulation to adopt rules to require health professionals they regulate to wear photo IDs disclosing license, certification, or registration; would require Attorney General to investigate any complaints whereby someone has deceived the public/patients about qualifications.

**5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? (for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)**

Minimal implications and cost; would expect little opposition.

**6. Other Stakeholders:**

**6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?**

Bill is supported by the State Medical Society

**6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?**

None known

*Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to \_\_\_\_\_*

**7. Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.*

Not seen as a major or critical issue in light of larger issues

**8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:** *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

Appears okay as written.

DRAFT