

# Fact Sheet: Shortage of Certified Shorthand Reporters in California

July 2025



## Background

The California Supreme Court, in a 2018 opinion, stated that “the absence of a verbatim record of trial court proceedings will often have a devastating effect” on a litigant’s ability to have an appeal decided on the merits.<sup>1</sup> The verbatim record is captured and transcribed exclusively by certified shorthand reporters (court reporters) in case types where a court reporter is required<sup>2</sup> and electronic recording is not authorized.<sup>3</sup> Parties may arrange for a court reporter’s services in other case types.<sup>4</sup> However, a declining number of court reporters threatens access to justice for court users, especially Californians who can’t afford to pay for their own court reporter.

## Number of Court-Employed Reporters Falls Short of Need

According to the fiscal year (FY) 2024–25 Schedule 7A, courts employ approximately 1,071 FTE (full-time equivalent) court reporters. In addition to court reporters employed by the courts, courts also contract with pro tempore<sup>5</sup> reporters to help meet the need. To meet minimum requirements,<sup>6</sup> it is estimated that California courts may need up to an additional 428 full-time court reporters.<sup>7</sup>

California trial courts reported in recent surveys that since Jan. 1, 2023:

- 48 of the 58 courts have actively recruited for court reporters, with 40 courts actively recruiting between January 1 and Mar. 31, 2025, alone;
- 233.5 (FTE) court reporters were hired, 45.6 (FTE) of whom came from other courts (19.5% of all hires) and 73.2 of which were voice writers (31.3% of all hires); and
- 242.8 (FTE) court reporters have left employment at the courts, for a net loss of 9.3 (FTE) reporters.<sup>8</sup>

## Recruitment and Retention Challenges

California courts are challenged to recruit and retain court reporters to meet the needs of court users and legal requirements. These challenges include an ever-decreasing number of California-licensed court reporters and difficulty competing with private employers in the labor market.

## Declining availability of California-licensed court reporters

There were 4,625 active California-licensed court reporters residing in the state as of June. 1, 2025. However, between FY 2009–10 and FY 2022–23 the total number of licensees declined 25.6% and the number of new license applications declined 37.6%.<sup>9</sup> Potential indicators that the decline will continue include:

- *Challenging pathway to licensure:* One hundred and twenty-one new individual licenses were issued statewide in 2023–24<sup>10,11</sup> Of the 351 individuals who applied to take the skills (dictation) portion of the past three California certified shorthand reporter exams (held July 2024, Nov. 2024, and Mar. 2025), 50.1% passed. The Nov. 2022 exam was the first to include voice writing; a total of 136 individuals have since passed the skills exam as voice writers.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Jameson v. Desta* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 594, 622.

<sup>2</sup> Felony and juvenile cases.

<sup>3</sup> Electronic recording is not authorized except in limited civil, misdemeanor, and infraction proceedings when a court reporter is unavailable (Gov. Code, § 69957(a)).

<sup>4</sup> Courts must also provide an official court reporter in civil cases when a party with a fee waiver requests one, and the proceeding cannot otherwise be electronically recorded.

<sup>5</sup> Refers to an individual who is retained by the court on an intermittent or contractual basis.

<sup>6</sup> Covering all case types where a court reporter is required or electronic recording is not authorized.

<sup>7</sup> “Need” is calculated by applying the Resource Assessment Study estimate of court reporter need by multiplying the assessed judicial need for each included case type by a factor of 1.25, except for Civil Unlimited and Estates and Trust, which are multiplied by a factor of 0.625

<https://courts.ca.gov/news-reference/research-data/court-workload-analysis>.

<sup>8</sup> Shortage of Court Reporters in California Dashboard, <https://courts.ca.gov/news-reference/research-data/shortage-court-reporters-california>.

<sup>9</sup> Department of Consumer Affairs data portal, [www.dca.ca.gov/data/annual\\_license\\_stats.shtml](http://www.dca.ca.gov/data/annual_license_stats.shtml).

<sup>10</sup> Department of Consumer Affairs, Licensee List (as of June 2025), [www.dca.ca.gov/consumers/public\\_info/index.shtml](http://www.dca.ca.gov/consumers/public_info/index.shtml). Total includes delinquent licensees and those who reside out of state. Excluding them, 83 new licenses for FY 2023–24 remain.

<sup>11</sup> Only eight court reporting programs recognized by the state remain open (down from 17 schools in 2010), [www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/applicants/school\\_info.shtml](http://www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/applicants/school_info.shtml). However, students may also qualify for California’s Certified Shorthand Reporter exam by obtaining national certification demonstrating proficiency in machine shorthand reporting or voice writing.

<sup>12</sup> Court Reporters Board, School Examination Statistics, [www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/applicants/examstats.shtml](http://www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/applicants/examstats.shtml).

# Fact Sheet: Shortage of Certified Shorthand Reporters in California

July 2025



- *Court reporters likely nearing retirement:* The National Court Reporters Association reported the average age of its court reporter members to be approximately 56 years old as of June. 1, 2025.<sup>13</sup> In California, approximately 46.1% of all active licenses were issued at least 30 years ago.<sup>14</sup> An estimated 50% of court reporter employees were eligible for retirement as of Dec. 1, 2023.<sup>15</sup>

## Compensation

Court reporters in California courts are paid, on average, 51% more than other nonmanager court positions. At the same time, the declining number of court reporters in California has created a tight and competitive labor market, exacerbating compensation pressures. According to the FY 2024–25 Schedule 7A, court-employed reporters' median total salary plus benefits is estimated to be \$200,101. This is significantly lower than the cost to hire a court reporter through a private company: \$2,580/day for a deposition and \$3,300/day for a trial, on average.<sup>16</sup> Additionally, transcripts must be purchased from court reporters. In 2021, the Legislature increased the statutory transcript fees by approximately 30%.<sup>17</sup> In FY 2023–24, California courts spent \$23.7 million on transcripts.<sup>18</sup>

## Current Recruitment and Retention Efforts

Trial courts are implementing a variety of incentives to recruit and retain court reporters. Between January 1, 2023, and Mar. 31, 2025, approximately 91.4% of trial courts utilized at least one incentive to recruit and retain court reporters. These incentives included signing bonuses (70.7%), retention and longevity bonuses (72.4%), increased salary ranges (75.9%), finder's fees (44.8%), student loan or tuition reimbursement incentives (41.4%), and more.<sup>19</sup> For example, the Los Angeles court is currently offering a \$20,000 signing bonus, a \$15,000 student loan and equipment allowance, and a \$15,000 finder's fee for court employees who refer a court reporter; Riverside offered up to \$32,500 in retention payments over three years; and Contra Costa provides a \$50,000 tuition reimbursement fund for existing court employees to use toward pursuing court reporter certification.

## Importance of the Verbatim Record

Between Apr. 1, 2023, and Mar. 31, 2025, of 2,485,828 reported family, probate, and unlimited civil hearings in California, an estimated 1,782,223 hearings had no verbatim record (71.7%).<sup>20</sup> The lack of a verbatim record will “frequently be fatal” to a litigant’s ability to have an appeal decided on the merits.<sup>21</sup> For example, victims seeking protective orders, such as victims of domestic violence or elder abuse, may have difficulty appealing the denial of a protective order because they don’t have a record. In civil matters, an appellate court may be unable to review a party’s claim of error in the trial court. In criminal proceedings, the lack of a sufficient record may impact a defendant’s constitutional rights of due process and equal protection.<sup>22</sup> California appellate courts have also ordered new criminal proceedings where a reporter’s notes were destroyed or lost, there were substantial issues on appeal, and there was no adequate substitute for the notes.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>13</sup> National Court Reporters Association, [www.ncra.org/home/about-ncra/NCRA-Statistics](http://www.ncra.org/home/about-ncra/NCRA-Statistics).

<sup>14</sup> Department of Consumer Affairs, Licensee List (as of June 2025), [www.dca.ca.gov/consumers/public\\_info/index.shtml](http://www.dca.ca.gov/consumers/public_info/index.shtml).

<sup>15</sup> Estimation based on data collected in a December 2023 survey of California Trial Courts.

<sup>16</sup> Data provided by a survey of 49 private consumer attorneys. It is unknown how much of the court reporter rate charged by companies is provided to the reporter in the form of compensation and how much is kept by the company.

<sup>17</sup> [Sen. Bill 170 \(Stats. 2021, ch. 240\)](#).

<sup>18</sup> 2023–24 Schedule 7A total court statewide transcript expenditures, excluding Electronic Recording.

<sup>19</sup> Court Reporter Recruitment, Retention, and Attrition dashboard, [www.courts.ca.gov/76328.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/76328.htm).

<sup>20</sup> Courts were asked to provide the estimated number of hearings without a verbatim record and the number of total hearings for each of these case types or in the aggregate. Not all courts were able to provide complete hearings data, meaning the true number of hearings without a verbatim record is likely greater.

<sup>21</sup> *Jameson*, *supra*, 5 Cal.5th at 608, fn. 1.

<sup>22</sup> *In re Armstrong* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 565; *March v. Municipal Court* (1972) 7 Cal.3d 422.

<sup>23</sup> *People v. Jones* (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 298; *People v. Apalatequi* (1978) 82 Cal.App.3d 970; see Pen. Code, § 1181(9).