



BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Sacramento, Glendora, and City of Industry, CA
Thursday, August 21, 2025

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

Gilda Dominguez, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order on August 21, 2025, at 1:00 p.m., then recessed to committee meetings and resuming Board proceedings at 4:17 p.m. Ms. Dominguez called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members Present

Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist, Board Chair
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist, Board Vice Chair
Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist
Karen Chang, Public Member

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep “Deepi” Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
David Bouilly, DCA SOLID (Webex Moderator)
Shelly Jones, DCA SOLID

2. Swearing in New Board Member and Appointment to Board Committees

Ms. Dominguez swore in Francis David as a member of the Board, whereupon Mr. David took the oath of office administered by Ms. Dominguez.

Cherise Burns welcomed Mr. David to the Board.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

3. Review and Possible Approval of the May 15, 2025, Committee Meetings Minutes

Ms. Dominguez opened the discussion on the review and possible approval of the minutes.
Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of the minutes.

Ms. Dominguez asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Amy White moved to approve the May 15, 2025 Meeting minutes.

Tamara Chambers seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chambers, David, Sanders, Chang)

4. Review and Possible Approval of the May 16, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes

Ms. Dominguez opened the discussion on the review and possible approval of the minutes.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of the minutes.

Dr. Tamara Chambers said that there were a few typos and asked if the following changes can be made:

- replace "that changes" with "the change" at the end of the last paragraph on page 6
- add the letter "s" to the word "year" at the end of the first paragraph on page 7
- removed the letters "ed" from the word "furthered" in the second to last paragraph on page 8
- add the word "one" before the word "hundred" at the end of the first paragraph on page 9
- replace the word "was" with "were" at the beginning of the second paragraph on page 9

Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Amy White moved to approve the May 16, 2025 Meeting minutes as amended.

Charles Sanders seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chambers, David, Sanders, Chang)

5. DCA Update – DCA Board and Bureau Relations

Ms. Dominguez invited staff from DCA Board and Bureau Relations to provide an update.

Shelly Jones provided an update on the Governor's reorganization plan, hybrid telework policies, the Department of Finance state travel guidelines, and DCA's Annual Report.

Ms. Dominguez asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

6. Board Chair's Report

Ms. Dominguez welcomed Mr. David to the Board and reported on the Board meeting calendar. Ms. Dominguez asked where the next meeting will be located. Ms. Burns said that Board staff is working with Cerritos College to secure a meeting location.

Ms. Dominguez reported on the committee membership and asked for updates on Committee discussion.

Ms. Dominguez reported on discussions from the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee.

Tod Borges reported on discussions from the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee.

Dr. Amy White reported on discussions from the Audiology Practice Committee.

Mr. Borges commented on indirect supervision and programming hearing aids and asked if it means the initial programming. Dr. White said it also means programming a hearing aid that is back from repair. Mr. Borges commented and recommended the level of supervision being based on the degree of physical contact with the person. Dr. White said that Board staff will take it into consideration when revising the proposed regulatory text.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE Sacramento, Glendora, and City of Industry, CA Thursday, August 21, 2025

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

Gilda Dominguez, Committee Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order on August 21, 2025, at 1:06 p.m. Ms. Dominguez called roll; three members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist, Committee Chair
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep "Deepi" Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
David Bouilly, DCA Solid (Webex Moderator)

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding Scope of Responsibility, Duties, and Functions of Speech-Language Pathology Assistants Related to Swallow Therapy as Stated in Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1399.170.3

Ms. Dominguez invited Maria Liranzo to discuss possible action to amend regulations regarding speech-language pathology assistant (SLPA) scope of responsibility, duties, and functions related to swallow therapy. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and proposed regulatory changes.

Ms. Liranzo asked if there should be coursework requirements for SLPAs to perform swallow therapy given that occupational therapists are required to complete coursework to provide advanced practice in swallowing assessment, evaluation, or intervention.

Ms. Dominguez commented on occupational therapy assistant (OTA) training curriculum and work settings and said that OTAs are recognized by Medicare as clinicians whereas SLPAs are not recognized by Medicare as clinicians which may not make it feasible or practical for SLPAs to provide this area of therapy to the Medicare population at this time. Ms. Dominguez asked what the Committee thought about SLPAs providing this therapy to pediatric patients and emphasized that this wouldn't include infants or neonates. Ms. Dominguez said that a course content requirement could be something considered for SLPAs who want to provide this therapy.

Francis David asked if this would be for SLPAs to do swallowing therapy. Ms. Dominguez said that it would and said that SLPAs would be able to do everything under the supervision of a speech-language pathologist (SLP) except for changing the treatment plan or diagnosing. Ms. Dominguez commented on the American Speech Language Hearing Association's SLPA scope of practice related to swallowing and feeding.

Ms. Dominguez asked what the Committee thought of the information provided so far. Mr. David said that he wouldn't allow his SLPAs to perform swallowing type therapy and wouldn't feel comfortable having his SLPAs do the therapy on pediatric patients unless they have advanced training. Mr. David said that swallowing is not currently included in SLPA training curriculum, and it would be dangerous to have SLPAs provide this therapy without additional training. Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of what was previously discussed as this is Mr. David's first meeting and said that discussions included a discussion to require 240 hours of supervised experience in swallowing therapy before a SLPA can provide their therapy on their own under direct supervision.

Mr. David asked if the supervised experience would not have any form of classes. Ms. Liranzo said that is correct and said that is why the Board staff has brought it up as a discussion question. Cherise Burns said that occupational therapists are required to complete both education and experience to provide advanced practice in swallowing assessment, evaluation, or intervention

Ms. Burns stated that if the Committee wants to allow SLPAs to do this advanced level of practice that is currently restricted and also is not currently in their education or field work, what the Board might want to require is to set standards for determining a SLPAs is competent to do so. Ms. Burns said that after reviewing SLPA training programs and bachelor communication science disorder

programs there's isn't much in the curriculum related to swallowing and an education requirement might be necessary. Ms. Burns also said that there are many ways that this can be provided and commented on how SLPs are provided training in Fiberoptic Endoscopic Evaluation of Swallowing (FEES) outside of their primary education.

Ms. Dominguez commented on an OTA training for advanced practice in pediatrics, being 54 hours for 3 units and asked how feasible it would be for programs to add something like that to their curriculum. Ms. Burns said that she believed it would not be feasible because there is no room in the curriculum to add it at the moment and instructors might not be comfortable teaching it, which is why it may need to be a coursework and training done outside of the SLPA training program similar to how SLPs get training on FEES outside of their master's program.

Dr. Tamara Chambers asked if the expectations for SLPs going through a FEES coursework is one semester or is it a certain number of hours. Ms. Burns said that there is no coursework requirement as most SLPs would have completed one course in anatomy and physiology of swallowing and another on swallowing and dysphasia that includes a lab during their master's program. Ms. Burns said that SLPs will seek extra training through a multi-day course that includes training and the required 10 procedures supervised by an otolaryngologist to comply with statutory requirements. Ms. Liranzo said that continuing education (CE) providers will take on the role of educating and training the community when there's opportunities like this generally in a classroom setting to get more people competent and Board staff expect the same for SLPA swallow therapy. Ms. Liranzo also said that it would be the Board's responsibility to establish the minimum requirement for allowing SLPAs to perform swallow therapy with bolus material and keep the public safe, especially since it previously mentioned that current SLPA training programs don't have the capacity nor the space in their curriculum to include this. Ms. Burns said that SLP FEES training was never required by the Board and that it was the professional community that did it this way to ensure that everyone is properly trained and competent.

Ms. Dominguez asked if coursework means like a CE course. Ms. Burns said that it could be a CE course or a course through a university continuing education program. Ms. Burns said that if the Board were to allow this there would be opportunities to create those kinds of courses.

Mr. David asked what kind of courses would be required and said that anatomy and physiology should be one. Ms. Liranzo said that this is one of the two courses the Board currently looks for in foreign educated SLP applicants and said Board staff are recommending something similar for SLPAs to perform swallowing therapy with bolus material. Ms. Burns said that most semesters are 15 hours per unit and one semester long course would be a total of 45 hours.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the education would be in addition to the supervised experience. Ms. Burns said that it would be.

Dr. Chambers asked if there was a way to mirror an existing requirement. Ms. Burns said that nothing currently exists for the practice of speech-language pathology or audiology, outside of the FEES example, and the closest model is the occupational therapy advanced practice requirements. Ms. Burns noted that the Board of Occupational Therapy is reviewing their advanced practice requirements in swallowing assessment, evaluation, or intervention and considering a reduction in supervised hours. Ms. Burns said the Board would want to look at how long feeding therapy with bolus material takes and ask how many times of that length of therapy should be required of SLPAs to be considered competent. Ms. Dominguez said that is shouldn't be anything under 45. Mr. David

said that it should be a higher number of hours because of clinical decisions that may need to be made during the feeding therapy.

Mr. David asked how feasible it would be to have a certification course. Ms. Liranzo said that it is very common that these requirements could become a certification course and said that it is not necessary to specify it in regulation to allow these requirements to be obtained through other means, such as an employer in a hospital setting. Ms. Burns commented on regulatory text specifying requirements without creating too many restrictions.

Ms. Dominguez asked if 240 hours is feasible. Mr. David said that there isn't a lot of feeding in the clinics he is at and noted that the occupational therapist handles the feeding.

Ms. Dominguez asked how long they would spend with a patient. Mr. David said that 60 minutes is authorized per session.

Ms. Liranzo noted that the Committee determined it would like to add an education requirement and asked if it wanted to require 45 hours of education. Ms. Dominguez said that it should be 3 units. Ms. Burns said that 3 unit is 45 hours because the Board defines one semester unit is equal to 15 hours. Ms. Liranzo noted that the education should at least cover anatomy and physiology of swallowing and another on swallowing and dysphasia from an approved CE provider. Ms. Burns said that the Board may not want to specify that it should not be from an approved CE provider to allow employers to provide the training such as skilled nursing facility or hospitals who generally do not apply to be an approved CE provider. Ms. Dominguez said that she doesn't see them happening in a skilled nursing facility until government payers change the definition of a skilled clinician. Ms. Dominguez also said that it should be more regulated for consumer safety. Dr. Chambers expressed agreement for a more regulated education requirement. Mr. David said that a standard curriculum would be preferred. Ms. Liranzo said that the Board has requirements on how courses are provided if they come from an approved CE provider.

Dr. Chambers asked if requiring the education from an approved CE provider is feasible. Ms. Liranzo said that it would be feasible and said that ASHA has many providers. Ms. Burns commented on Board requirements for approved CE providers and said that ASHA has similar requirements.

Mr. David said that the supervisor should be a SLP who performs swallowing and feeding therapy as part of their practice. Ms. Liranzo said that this could be specified. Ms. Liranzo also said that the statutory requirement for an SLP to perform FEES has similar requirements.

Ms. Dominguez asked if Board staff are asking if 240 hours of fieldwork experience is excessive. Ms. Burns said that it is being asked because the Board of Occupational Therapy is considering reducing the required supervised hours for advanced practice in swallowing assessment, evaluation, or intervention. Ms. Burns said SLPAs are required to complete 100 hours of fieldwork experience for licensure and 240 hours would be 240 sessions if each session is one hour each.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the SLPA would only be following a plan of care and would not be able to make modifications or assessments. Ms. Liranzo said that this would be their scope and noted Board staff are not familiar with what is included in the swallowing therapy.

Ms. Burns asked how frequent is swallowing and feeding therapy with bolus material in a typical

practice for SLPAs to get these hours. Dr. Chambers said that the hours have to be enough to allow SLPAs to see many different kinds of patients and manage different emergency situations and responses. Dr. Chambers said that the hours need to be robust but not overwhelming. Mr. David recommended 100 hours, and also said that swallowing therapy for oral phase and pharyngeal phase are different.

Ms. Dominguez said that it would be the SLPs responsibility to assign the patient to the SLPA and noted that previous discussions included a discussion to prohibit SLPA from performing swallowing therapy with bolus material on patients with medical conditions such as excessive movement. The Committee expressed agreement to require 100 hours of supervised experience.

Mr. David asked what will count as supervised experience and suggested that it should be direct supervised therapy. Ms. Burns said that it could be specified as direct patient care hours supervised by the SLP. Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with the suggestion.

Dr. Chambers asked if they are going to have time to get all the hours completed after their coursework through a graduate school. Ms. Dominguez said that it will be after they completed their coursework and asked if they are currently completing 100 hours. Ms. Burns said that they are completing their hours through either a SLPA training program or a program after completing their bachelor's degree in communication science disorder or speech pathology through a university. Ms. Burns said that the programs designed for bachelor's degree applicants usually includes one or two courses and the fieldwork experience. Ms. Liranzo noted the supervised experience must be direct supervision from a SLP who performs swallowing and feeding therapy as part of their practice and it must be direct client care with the patient. The Committee expressed agreement.

Ms. Dominguez said that there needs to be a tracking mechanism. Ms. Liranzo said that previous discussions included a discussion to require a written verification stating that they are competent and completed the supervised hours readily available for Board inspection, and asked if the verification for Board inspection should be an original or a copy. Ms. Dominguez asked what the current requirement is for FEES. Ms. Liranzo said that they are required to have a written verification stating that they are competent and completed their supervised passes, and they are to keep it on file and readily available for Board inspection. The Committee expressed agreement to mirror the current requirement for FEES.

Ms. Burns asked if the supervision for the supervised experience should be immediate supervision and said that immediate supervision requires the SLP to be physically present in the room whereas direct supervisor the SLP is on-site. Ms. Liranzo said to clarify that the Committee expressed in previous discussions that the supervision should be immediate. The Committee expressed agreement that the 100 hours should be immediate supervision.

Ms. Liranzo noted that the Committee expressed agreement with mirroring the current requirement for FEES written verification with no changes. Ms. Dominguez suggested that it includes the SLP signature and license number. Mr. David and Dr. Chambers expressed agreement with the suggestion.

Dr. Chambers asked if the different phases of swallowing should be specified. Mr. David said that he would be more comfortable if SLPAs handle oral phase rather than pharyngeal phase. Ms. Dominguez said that all the phases of swallowing are connected. Ms. Burns said that the Board requires clinical experience to be from a variety of age ranges and similar language could be used

to cover the different phases of swallowing. Mr. David asked if it should also include a variety of ages and said that swallowing physiology and anatomy changes with age. The Committee expressed agreement that the supervised experience should cover all the phases of swallowing and a variety of ages.

Ms. Burns asked if the SLP needs to be licensed in California or can they be licensed in any state or territory when supervising SLPAs for supervised experience hours. Ms. Dominguez said that they should be licensed in California.

Ms. Burns asked what kind of approval SLPAs need from the SLP to perform this procedure and if it needs to be in the patient's record. Mr. David said it should be written orders. Dr. Chambers said that it should be what is standard to that setting. Ms. Dominguez asked what it looks like for OTA. Ms. Liranzo said there aren't laws and regulations to this area of practice. Ms. Dominguez asked if this is approval from the SLP for the procedure or the SLP approval of the SLPA to provide it. Ms. Liranzo said that the question is about the SLP approval of the SLPA to provide it. Ms. Burns said that this could be done as part of the patient records where the SLP notes that they approve of the SLPA to provide swallowing services.

Ms. Liranzo said that Board staff recommend adding all these requirements under CCR section 1399.170.1 regarding responsibilities, duties, and functions of a speech-language pathology assistant and cross referenced that section in CCR section 1399.170.2 regarding types of supervision required for duties performed by a speech-language pathology assistant.

Ms. Dominguez asked if there is a section regarding FEES where this can be added. Ms. Burns said that all the FEES requirements are in statute, and nothing is specified in regulations. The Committee expressed adding it to existing sections.

Ms. Dominguez noted that CRR section 1399.170.3 would need to be revised. Ms. Liranzo said that subsection (h) would be revised to remove oropharyngeal swallow therapy with bolus material from sentence. Ms. Liranzo asked if special consideration is needed for feeding and swallowing in schools. Mr. David said that most schools do not provide feeding and swallowing therapy.

Nicole Wilson-Friend, SLPA Director for the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA), commented on SLPAs looking for ways to grow in their profession and encouraged the Board include them in the discussion.

Benjamin Reece on behalf of San Joaquin Delta College suggested including community colleges as providers where SLPAs can fulfil the proposed requirements and encouraged the Board to include SLPAs and SLPs from hospitals where these procedures are done in the discussion.

4. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding General Application Requirements and Speech-Language Pathology Aide and Audiology Aide Requirements and Scope of Activities, Duties and Functions as Stated in Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Liranzo to discuss possible action to amend regulations regarding general application requirements and speech-language pathology aide requirements. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to the proposed text.

Ms. Dominguez asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment.

Tamara Chambers moved to recommend the regulatory text for Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157 to the Board to initiate the rulemaking process, as noticed, and direct Board staff to prepare the regulatory text for Board review and approval.

Francis David seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, Chambers, David)

5. Discussion and Possible Action to Recommend to the Full Board to initiate a Rulemaking to Amend Requirements for Continuing Professional Development for Speech-Language Pathology Assistants as Stated in Business and Professions Code (BPC) 2538.1 and Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.170.14 and 1399.170.15

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to recommend amendments to requirements for continuing professional development (CPD) for SLPAs. Ms. Burns provided a background on CPD requirements for SLPAs and SLPs, and proposed legislative changes that would allow SLPAs to complete CPD through approved CPD providers. Ms. Burns said that the legislative proposal currently recommends defining independent study programs and excludes master's degree coursework toward SLP licensure.

Mr. David asked what the working definition of independent study programs is currently. Ms. Burns said that there is no definition, and the legislative proposal would define it as self-study. Ms. Burns also said that a supervisor is responsible in directing SLPA CPD coursework, but this may not happen as often as it should.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the Board has seen any independent study programs. Ms. Burns said the Board has not seen any and what they see are self-study courses selected by the SLPA. Ms. Liranzo commented on independent study programs typically being corresponded courses where materials are mailed to the student.

Ms. Dominguez asked if independent study programs are being used. Ms. Burns said that it not what Board staff are seeing during audits and instead are seeing SLPAs are taking online courses through CPD providers without any direction from their supervisors.

Mr. David asked if the courses they are taking are specific to speech or could they take courses like CPR. Ms. Liranzo said that they are required to take courses concerning communication and related disorders.

Mr. David asked if there are guidelines for in-person or self-study courses. Ms. Burns stated that there is not requirements for SLPAs but there are for SLPs and Audiologists.

Ms. Dominguez asked if independent study programs could be removed. Ms. Burns said that it could be removed but recommended keeping it in case SLPA supervisors are using independent study programs but the Board has not seen them yet. Ms. Dominguez said that she doesn't understand how an independent study program differs from the requirement of a SLPA supervisor to

direct SLPAs on their coursework. Ms. Burns recommended defining independent study programs through regulations to allow the Board to look into this more. Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Ms. Burns asked if master's degree coursework toward SLP licensure should be excluded. Mr. David said that it should be excluded because the master's degree coursework prepares a person for a different role whereas CPD is meant for education on how to be an effective SLPA.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Nicole Wilson-Friend, SLPA Director for CSHA, commented on the Board's effort to provide clarity to SLPA CPD requirements and encouraged the Board include SLPAs in the discussion.

Tamara Chambers moved to recommend to the Board the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board's Sunset Review as amended.

Francis David seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, Chambers, David)

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

**HEARING AID DISPENSING COMMITTEE
Sacramento, Glendora, and City of Industry, CA
Thursday, August 21, 2025**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

Tod Borges, Committee Chair, called the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee (Committee) meeting to order on August 21, 2025, at 2:45 p.m. Mr. Borges called roll; four members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser, Committee Chair
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep "Deepi" Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
David Bouilly, DCA Solid (Webex Moderator)

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Mr. Borges asked for public comment for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

3. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Postfitting Counseling and Foreign Body In The Ear Canal as Stated in Business and Professions Code (BPC) Sections 2538.11, 2538.36, and 2539.6 and Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.125 and 1399.126

Mr. Borges invited Maria Liranzo to provide an update on discussion and possible action regarding postfitting counseling and foreign body in the ear canal. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to the proposed regulatory text.

Ms. Liranzo asked if another name should be used instead on “ear dam” because there are other names used online (ear impression pad or foam stops), and the last Occupational Analysis Report uses the words “blocking material (e.g., cotton)” and recommended the words “ear impression blocking material” could be used. The Committee expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Dr. Amy White asked how a person’s competency of the location of the second bend of the ear canal could be verified. Cherise Burns said that it is a part of the practical examination. Mr. Borges said that it could be a part of the training requirement. Dr. White recommended requiring the supervised removals also include the identification of the second bend of the ear canal. Ms. Burns said that the topic of anatomy is a portion of both the written and practical examination. Dr. White asked if it would be onerous to include that as part of supervised removal. Mr. Borges said that he doesn’t think so. Dr. Charles Sanders and Dr. Tamara Chambers expressed agreement to include the identification of the second bend of the ear canal as part of the supervised removal.

Mr. Borges asked if the definition of significant air-bone gap could mirror the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) guidelines. Ms. Liranzo said that it could. Dr. White asked what the FDA’s guidelines were. Mr. Borges said that the FDA specifies the octave frequencies at 500 Hz, 1000 Hz, and 2000 Hz. Dr. White, Dr. Chambers, and Dr. Sanders expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Navdeep Miller recommend that the text should read “they performed a minimum of five (5) supervised hearing aid dome removals to include identification of the second bend of the ear canal” and asked if it should be a verbal identification. Mr. Borges said that it should be verbal. The Committee expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Mr. Borges asked for public comment. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

4. Discussion Regarding Hearing Aid Dispenser Trainee Supervision and Operations at Primary and Branch Locations of their Supervisor as Stated in BPC Sections 2538.27, 2538.28, 2538.30, 2538.33, 2538.34, 2538.35, and 2538.53 and Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.114, 1399.116, 1399.117, 1399.118, and 1399.119

Mr. Borges invited Ms. Burns to provide background information regarding Hearing Aid Dispenser Trainee (Trainee) supervision and the operations at primary and branch locations of their supervisor.

Ms. Burns said that the proposed legislative change would clarify that a branch license is required for the supervisor, a Hearing Aid Dispenser or Dispensing Audiologist, and not their trainee. Ms. Burns also said that the proposed legislative changes would clarify that a branch license is required when a Hearing Aid Dispenser engages in the practice of fitting or selling hearing aids. Ms. Burns further said that the proposed legislative changes also include a definition to the words “temporary basis” among other substantive changes. Dr. White said that replacing the word duplicate with branch is clearer.

Mr. Borges asked if the definition of temporary basis could be more specific quantitatively. Ms. Burns said that it could and recommended that it be further clarified through regulations. Dr. White expressed agreement with the recommendation as the Board may want further discussion on duration and frequency of practicing on temporary basis at another location.

Mr. Borges said that he doesn’t think the changes remove confusion that implies a Trainee is allowed to maintain a branch license. Ms. Liranzo said that the word “licensee” was replaced with “hearing aid dispenser” which means a fully licensed Hearing Aid Dispenser and does not include anyone with a Trainee or Hearing Aid Dispenser Temporary license. Mr. Borges said that it doesn’t specify it in the proposed regulations. Ms. Liranzo said that a Trainee cannot manage or independently operate a business that engages in the fitting or sale of hearing aids statutorily and only the word “manage” would be defined in proposed regulations related to the Trainee. Dr. White said that requiring a higher level of supervision would prevent a Trainee from independently operating a business and that is why it’s being proposed.

Mr. Borges asked if the supervision of Trainees would fundamentally change with the proposed regulations. Dr. White said that it would and said that it has been a while since the Board looked at the proposed text for Trainee supervision.

Ms. Burns said that Trainees are associated to a Hearing Aid Dispenser license, but Board staff is seeing Trainees with no supervisors at the location they are listed working from on their business website. Ms. Burns also said that clarifying who needs a branch license and what it is for should address the issue.

Mr. Borges asked if there has been a preponderance of complaints or issues with trainees working on their own. Ms. Burns said that there have been instances of it in complaints and while there is no preponderance of it, the Board does not get a lot of complaints in general.

Mr. Borges said that the proposed legislative changes removed confusion raised during the previous discussion.

Mr. Borges asked for public comment. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Amy White moved to recommend to the Board the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board’s Sunset Review as noticed.

Charles Sanders seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0. (Ayes: Borges, Chambers, Sanders, White)

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

AUDIOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE Sacramento, Glendora, and City of Industry, CA Thursday, August 21, 2025

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

Dr. Amy White, Committee Chair, called the Audiology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order on August 21, 2025, at 3:43 a.m. Dr. White called roll; four members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist, Committee Chair
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Karen Chang, Public Member
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep "Deepi" Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
David Bouilly, DCA Solid (Webex Moderator)

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Dr. White asked for public comment for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding General Application Requirements and Speech-Language Pathology Aide and Audiology Aide Requirements and Scope of Activities, Duties and Functions as Stated in Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157

Dr. White invited Ms. Liranzo to discuss possible action to amend regulations regarding general application requirements and audiology aide requirements. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to the proposed text.

Dr. White asked what the differences are between a speech-language pathology (SLP) aide and an audiology aide. Ms. Liranzo said that speech-language pathology aide will not have indirect supervision whereas an audiology aide will. Ms. Burns said that speech-language pathology aides do not provide therapy whereas speech-language pathology assistants (SLPAs) do.

Dr. White said that the audiology aide could also be the front office staff performing clerical works such as checking in hearing aids, processing the mail, and scheduling patients, and they should be able to do these tasks without an Audiologist present. Ms. Liranzo said that this would differ from SLP aides as they would require their supervisor in the same building for similar tasks. Dr. White asked why there is a difference. Ms. Burns said that the difference is that Board staff are seeing SLP supervisors wanting to use SLP aides to provide some level of services to patients under indirect supervision akin to SLPAs, so for their regulations we want to make sure that tasks allowed under indirect supervision are not direct patient care tasks.

Dr. Sanders asked if the language as written would prevent an audiology aide from cleaning a cochlear implant or hearing aid without an Audiologist present. Dr. White said that it would prevent it if the patient were present. Dr. Sanders said that this could cause problems because this is how a lot of places are operating, especially during the lunch hour.

Dr. White asked how the text should read in order to allow cleaning of equipment and hearing aids when a patient is present without an Audiologist present. Navdeep Miller commented on the challenges on specifying in writing the supervision of audiology aides and asked if there was anything other than cleaning that would be in a similar situation. Dr. White said servicing and handing out supplies like wax guards, cleaning brushes, or batteries. Dr. Chambers asked if we could specify tasks. Ms. Liranzo commented on the challenges of specifying tasks and creating restrictions. Ms. Burns said that a short list of examples can be provided. Ms. Liranzo said that Board staff will work with Ms. Miller to revise the draft text that includes what was discussed today.

Dr. White asked for public comment. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

BOARD MEETING MINUTES Sacramento, Glendora, and City of Industry, CA Friday, August 22, 2025

1. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

Gilda Dominguez, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order on August 22, 2025, at 9:01 a.m. Ms. Dominguez called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members Present

Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist, Board Chair
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist, Board Vice Chair
Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist
Karen Chang, Public Member

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Michael Magat, Assistant Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep “Deepi” Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
David Bouilly, DCA SOLID (Webex Moderator)

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment for items not on the agenda. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

3. Executive Officer’s Report

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to provide the Executive Officer’s report.

Ms. Burns provided an administration update on the filling of the Assistant Executive Officer position.

Ms. Burns reported on outreach efforts including attending the virtual town meeting held by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association regarding the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services changes to billing for services provided by required professional experience temporary license holders, and the California Board of Occupational Therapy Practice Committee on education and supervision requirements for advanced practice in swallowing assessment, evaluation, or intervention.

Ms. Burns reported on the budget including 2024-2025 fiscal year budget report and fund condition.

Dr. Amy White asked if the Board had to use the special authority to request additional funding for enforcement actions. Ms. Burns said that the Board had to request the augmentation for Office of the Attorney General expenditures but not for Office of Administrative Hearings expenditures.

Ms. Burns provided a brief report on the Board’s regulations and deferred to the regulatory report.

Ms. Burns reported on licensing including processing times.

Ms. Burns reported on hearing aid dispensing practical examination results.

Ms. Burns reported on enforcement including complaints and subsequent arrest notifications, citations and fines, formal discipline cases pending at the Office of the Attorney General, probation monitoring, and Attorney General outcomes adopted by the Board, and continuing education (CE) and continuing professional development (CPD) audits.

Tod Borges asked what the most predominate reason for failing CE/CPD audits. Ms. Burns said they were not completing the right CE/CPD such as wrong renewal cycle, not from an approved

provider, and completing all hours through self-study. Ms. Burns also said there is some confusion for Dispensing Audiologists regarding the completion of fifty (50) percent related to hearing aids and fifty (50) percent related to audiology. Ms. Burns further said that there weren't a lot of problems with indirect courses, and most people are taking direct client care courses. Ms. Burns said that Board staff will follow up with California licensees who are providing courses without approval and providing a disclaimer that they are not an approved provider.

Ms. Burns commented on the licenses issued and licensee population statistics and said there is a steady increase.

Ms. Burns commented on enforcement statistics and said that complaints returned to pre-pandemic levels this last year and the increase to citation and fines issued is due to failing CE/CPD audits.

Ms. Burns commented on changes to investigations that DCA Division of Investigation will handle and said that Board staff will do more of the work that DCA Division of Investigation was doing such as onsite investigations and interviews for certain cases.

Ms. Dominguez welcomed Mr. Magat and commented on the budget and processing times.

Dr. Tamara Chambers asked for the reason why the average days to discipline increased in 2024-2025 but the number of cases went down. Ms. Burns said that there were complex cases that had to stay open until the criminal conviction was resolved and others took a long time to investigate.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

4. Legislative Report: Update, Review, and Possible Action on Proposed Legislation

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Liranzo to provide the legislative report. Ms. Liranzo reported on the legislative calendar and deadlines and changes to bills being monitored by the Board.

Ms. Liranzo reported on bills that are two-year bills including Assembly Bill (AB) 364 regarding maintenance of personal information, AB 970 regarding child abuse and neglect reporting, AB 1015 regarding discrimination and harassment prevention training, AB 1110 regarding notice of safety rules and regulations, and AB 1192 regarding reporting of child abuse or neglect.

Ms. Liranzo reported on chaptered bills including AB 784 regarding special education and specialized deaf and hard-of-hearing services. Ms. Liranzo said that this bill would clarify that specialized deaf and hard-of-hearing services may be included in an Individualized Education Program as a stand-alone service.

Ms. Liranzo reported on new bills on the recommended watch status including AB 322 regarding precise geolocation information, Senate Bill (SB) 82 regarding dispute resolution provisions in contracts for consumer goods and services, and SB 294 regarding The Workplace Know Your Rights Act.

Ms. Liranzo reported on bills amended since the Board last met including AB 346 regarding in-home supportive services and licensed health care professional certification, AB 485 regarding unsatisfied

judgments for nonpayment of wages, AB 742 regarding licensing applicants who are descendants of slaves. Amendments included changes to expedite applications, SB 81 regarding health and care facilities and information sharing, and SB 446 regarding health and care facilities and information sharing.

Mr. Borges asked when SB 470 would extend the teleconferencing requirements to. Ms. Burns said that it would be extended for the newer provisions. Ms. Burns commented on the Board using the traditional teleconference requirements via Webex.

Mr. Borges asked if SB 470 isn't passed, would it require all in-person meetings. Ms. Burns said it would if not noticing locations and commented on the newer teleconferencing requirements such as requiring cameras to be on from teleconference location and not publicly noticing locations if the person has a medical condition.

Ms. Liranzo reported on bills related to artificial intelligence that Board members had questions on including AB 45 regarding privacy and health, AB 364 regarding maintenance of personal information, AB 410 regarding bots disclosure, AB 489 regarding artificial intelligence using deceptive terms or letter of health care professions, and AB 322 regarding precise geolocation information. Ms. Liranzo said that most of the bills would require consumers to file complaints or seek legal remedies through other entities such as the Attorney General and California Privacy Protection Agency. Ms. Liranzo also said that AB 489 regarding artificial intelligence using deceptive terms or letter of health care professions is the only bill in which the Board had enforcement authority. Ms. Liranzo further said that most of the bills would require the licensees or their businesses to be held responsible.

Dr. White asked if a summary of the bills will be provided for further discussion on interpretation of the law, enforcement, and educating licensees. Ms. Liranzo said that the Board doesn't provide specific details related to operating or running a business and licensees are advised to seek legal advice from their own legal counsel. Ms. Liranzo also said that this will apply to most of the bills outside of the Board's jurisdictions. Ms. Burns said a legislative advisory will be sent with information on chaptered bills and known impacts to licensees at the end of the year or the beginning of next year like it always does. Ms. Burns also said that a complaint can be filed with the Board on these issues and enforcement staff will help consumers with where they need to go next if it's outside of the Board's jurisdiction. Ms. Burns further said that the Board does not provide legal advice on how to organize your business and day-to-day operations of businesses, that should be obtained through private legal counsel or professional associations.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

5. Legislative Items for Future Meeting

Ms. Dominguez asked for legislative items for future meeting.

Ms. Liranzo said SB 744 regarding accrediting agencies will be added to the watch list.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

6. Discussion and Possible Action to Propose Amendments to Statutorily Approved Continuing Professional Development Providers as Stated in Business and Professions Code (BPC) Section 2532.6

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to present proposed statutory amendments regarding approved continuing professional development providers. Ms. Burns provided a background and a summary of the proposed statutory amendments.

Dr. White commented on coursework Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists working for the Veterans Affairs are required to attend that are provided by the American Medical Association and expressed agreement with the proposed statutory amendments.

Mr. Borges expressed agreement with the proposed statutory amendments and asked what it means to be an exempt provider. Ms. Burns said that they do not need to submit their course for approval and courses are reviewed during the audit. Ms. Burns also said that licensees will be required to provide explanation for courses that may not appear to be related to their practice.

Mr. Borges commented on continuing education courses for Hearing Aid Dispensers requiring approval before it is offered and asked if this is not the case for speech-language pathology and audiology.

Ms. Burns said that the provider is approved for speech-language pathology and audiology, and the Board has the ability to audit courses after the approval. Ms. Burns also said that this could be something the Hearing Aid Dispensers can consider in the future. Ms. Burns further said that the Board does not have the capacity to audit all CPD providers, but it will be worked into the auditing process. Mr. Borges expressed agreement with considering the speech-language pathology and audiology provider approval process for hearing aid dispensing courses.

Dr. Chambers expressed agreement with the proposed statutory amendments and commented on her own experience with courses related to the practice that may be offered by different providers.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Tod Borges moved to adopt the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board's Sunset Review as noticed.

Amy White seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chamber, David, Sanders, Chang)

7. Discussion and Possible Action to Propose Amendments to Statutory Requirements for Continuing Professional Development of Speech-Language Pathology Assistants as Stated in BPC Section 2538.1(b)(6)

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to present proposed statutory amendments regarding SLPA continuing professional development requirements. Ms. Burns provided a background and a

summary of the proposed statutory amendments. Ms. Burns noted that the Speech-Language Pathology Committee did recommend that “independent study” be defined at a later time through regulations and amended to the proposed statutory amendment to remove the proposed definition.

Dr. White asked what the thought was behind not defining independent study. Ms. Dominguez said that the Speech-Language Pathology Committee wanted an operational definition of it. Ms. Burns said that Board staff hasn’t seen any instances of independent study programs being used during the auditing process and instead staff are seeing speech-language pathology assistants taking self-study courses they selected on their own.

Dr. White said that she didn’t want to take away something that may be utilized. Ms. Burns said that it was not removed and will continue to exist in statutes but that it should be something that is clarified and can be done through regulation.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Amy White moved to adopt the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board’s Sunset Review as amended.

Tamara Chambers seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chamber, David, Sanders, Chang)

8. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed Amendments to Obtain Statutory Authority for Implementing a Retired License Status for Board Licensees

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to present proposed statutory amendments regarding retired license status. Ms. Burns provided a background and a summary of the proposed statutory amendments.

Dr. White asked what the difference is between an inactive status and a retired status. Ms. Burns said that inactive is for licensees not practicing and in order to reactivate you have to pay all the renewal fees and complete a renewal period of continuing education, whereas retired status is a one-time fee. Dr. White said that someone could place their license on retired states for just moving out of state and not be retired from the profession.

Mr. Borges expressed concerns with licensees on retired status returning to active status after a long period of time. Ms. Burns said that the Board should discuss if it should be allowed only if the licensee continuously maintains a current, valid, active, and clear license in another state or United States territory as this is something other boards allow. Mr. Borges, Ms. Burns, and Dr. White commented on what is required to return to active status from an inactive status vs. what would be required in a retired status after a long period of time such as continuing education and the examination required for licensure. Mr. Borges said that he doesn’t find this to be a problem if it’s continuous practice in another state.

Francis David asked if the status before they go into retired status is being consider. Ms. Burns said that the license has to be current and can be either active or inactive, but it cannot be suspended, revoked, surrendered, subject to disciplinary action; have an accusation on file; or be under

investigation. Ms. Burns also said that many would currently be in an inactive status so this language would allow them to apply for retired status, whereas other boards would require that they go to active status before going into retired status. Ms. Dominguez asked if all this is detailed and included in the text. Ms. Burns said that it is.

Ms. Burns said that the Board should discuss if licensees on retired could use the title “retired” or abbreviations denoting retired status. Mr. Borges said that they could be working in another state. Ms. Burns said they could. Mr. Borges said he doesn’t understand the retired status for those that are actually retired. Ms. Burns and Dr. White commented that some people may have a negative connotation to inactive status. Dr. White recommend that the abbreviation denoting retired status shouldn’t be used and allow the use of title “retired.” Mr. Borges said that he doesn’t understand why someone would use such a title. Dr. White said that a person can’t represent themselves as an Audiologist without an active license and this would allow it for those no longer practicing.

Dr. White, Ms. Dominguez, and Mr. Borges expressed agreement with the proposed statutory amendments as presented.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Charles Sanders moved to adopt the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board’s Sunset Review as noticed.

Amy White seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chamber, David, Sanders, Chang)

9. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Technical Statutory Clean-up

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to present proposed statutory amendments for technical clean-up during Sunset. Ms. Burns provided a background and a summary of the proposed statutory amendments.

Dr. White asked if there are any concerns of trainee or temporary licenses being business owners. Ms. Burns said that it should be covered under BPC section 2538.30 that prohibits them from managing or independently operating a hearing aid dispensing business.

Mr. Borges asked if removing limited liability company from BPC section 2530.2(b) means that a hearing aid dispenser can’t establish a business as a limited liability company but can work for one. Ms. Burns said there are separate rules for the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology and the practice of hearing aid dispensing that this section only covers speech-language pathology and audiology.

Dr. White asked if externs need to be specified in BPC section 2530.5(e). Ms. Burns said no because externs refer to required professional experience (RPE) temporary license which is a different section.

Dr. White said that there were a few typos and asked if the following changes can be made:

- Remove the word “and” before “speech reading” at the top of page 4
- Add the word “an” before “audiologists” at the top of page 4
- Correct the spelling of the word “their” in BPC section 2532.4(a) on page 10, and again on the bottom of page 18 in BPC section 2538.18.

Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Dr. White asked if a Dispensing Audiologist can’t sell a hearing aid to someone under the age of sixteen without another Audiologist approval. Ms. Burns said that it may be a copy from the hearing aid dispensing sections. Ms. Liranzo said that it is a copy from hearing aid dispensing but no one probably questioned it when it was up for consideration in the legislature. Ms. Dominguez asked how it should read. Dr. White recommended that it be removed. Ms. Liranzo said that if it is removed then it would have to be added under BPC section 2539.14 as an exemption. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Dr. Chambers asked how BPC section 2539.1(b) should read since the paragraph is being removed. Ms. Burns said that it should say “the Board” as the Board would continue to allow licensees to maintain separate license if they chose to. Ms. Burns also said that there is a small number of licensees who do this, but most prefer to combine it into a Dispensing Audiologist license. Ms. Burns further said that licensees are required to complete the renewal requirement for each license and pay the separate fee if they are maintained as separate licenses.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Karen Chang moved to adopt the legislative proposal to be included as part of the Board’s Sunset Review as amended.

Tod Borges seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chamber, David, Sanders, Chang)

10. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Audiology Practice Committee Recommendation Regarding Consumer Protection and Licensing Issues Related to Potential Creation of an Audiology Assistant License Type

Ms. Dominguez invited Dr. White and Ms. Burns to discuss the Audiology Practice Committee’s recommendation on the creation of an audiology assistant license type.

Ms. Burns provided a background on the request from the California Academy of Audiology (CAA) to discuss the possibility of creating a new license type for audiology assistant, and a summary on Board and committee discussions regarding the Sunrise process required to create a new license type.

Dr. White said that the Audiology Practice Committee recommended the Board to decline to create a new license type for audiology assistants through the Sunrise process and instead encourage the professional community to create it through legislation. Dr. White also said that the Audiology

Practice Committee recommended the Board extend its help to provide technical support with the legislative process to create this license type.

Dr. Charles Sanders asked if a letter could be provided to CAA stating this information. Ms. Burns said that a letter can be provided to respond to their request for discussion and recommended the Board to vote on supporting the creation a new license type for audiology assistants and direct Board staff to provide technical support.

Dr. Marcia Raggio, Northern California Legislative Liaison for CAA, commented on the association working to create an audiology assistant license type and Board support to move forward.

Amy White moved to respond with a letter stating support for associations to work on creating an audiology assistant license type and direct Board staff to assist with technical support.

Tamara Chambers seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chamber, David, Sanders, Chang)

11. Update on Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Changes to the Interpretation of the Medicare Benefit Policy Manual Related to Required Professional Experience (RPE) Temporary License Holders' Treatment of Medicare Patients and Billing for Services

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to provide updates on CMS changes to the Medicare benefit policy manual related to required professional experience temporary license holders' treatment of Medicare patients and billing for services.

Ms. Burns said that changes to the definition of qualified speech-language pathologists had removed RPE's which caused new billing and supervision requirements for RPEs. Ms. Burns also said she attended a virtual town hall organized by ASHA in June to discuss the changes and ASHA's efforts to reverse these changes. Ms. Burns further said that ASHA received notification from CMS in July that it would reverse the changes to the definition of qualified speech-language pathologist. Ms. Burns reminded the Board and public that the supervision requirements for RPE licensure remain the same and, if a higher level of supervision is required by another entity, that it should be provided in accordance with their guidelines. Ms. Dominguez said that she is glad that it was fixed.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

12. Discussion of the February 2025 Occupational Analysis of the Speech-Language Pathologist Profession

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to discuss the February 2025 occupational analysis of the Speech-Language Pathologist profession. Ms. Burns provided a background the occupational analysis of the speech-language pathologist profession and presented the February 2025 report.

Mr. Borges asked how often these reports are conducted. Ms. Burns said every five to seven years. Ms. Burns also said that audiology will be next, followed by hearing aid dispensing. Ms. Burns further said that there has been a delay in conducting them due to budget constraints.

Ms. Dominguez expressed appreciation for distributing and obtaining the information.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

13. Discussion on Hearing Aid Dispensing Licensing Examinations as stated in BPC sections 2538.17, 2538.25, 2538.31, and 2538.32, and Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.112, 1399.120, 1399.121, 1399.122, and 1399.152.4

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to discuss hearing aid dispensing licensing examinations. Ms. Burns provided a background on a letter endorsed by the Hearing Healthcare Providers/California recommending the adoption of the International Hearing Society's (IHS) International Licensing Examination for Hearing Health Professional (ILE). Ms. Burns also provided a background on legal requirements related to examinations used for licensure purposes and the current board administered examination used for hearing aid dispensing licensure.

Amy Welch Gandy, Chief of DCA Office of Professional Services (OPES), provided a presentation on DCA's national examination review process.

Karen Chang asked if there was a cost that the Board would pay to OPES to conduct the review. Ms. Burns said that the cost to review a national examination would be \$31,036 and highlighted the attachment in the meeting material with detailed information about the cost.

Ms. Burns commented on adopting a national examination for hearing aid dispensing and what would happen if there weren't enough California specific questions in the national examination. Ms. Burns said that some healing arts boards have both a national examination and a Board specific examination to cover law and ethics, and highlighted the attachment in the meeting material with a list of healing arts boards licensing examination providers.

Mr. Borges asked who would administer the ILE if adopted by the Board. Ms. Burns said it appears that the written portion may be administered by IHS but the practical examination would still be administered by the state using the ILE examination, and deferred to IHS representatives in the audience for more accurate information.

Dr. White said that the written examination is very accessible and offered at testing centers that doesn't seem to create a barrier to licensure; however, the practical examination has always been a challenge with getting enough people through each time it is offered. Dr. White also said that it would be worth considering ILE examination if it addresses and fixes the challenges the board has with the practical examination. Mr. Borges said that it could potentially increase reciprocity with other states as the Board would be using examinations other states are using. Mr. Borges also said that the practical examination has always been a challenge and would be curious to learn how the ILE practical examination is conducted, such as if questions are presented in the negative and if their standards differ from the Boards. Dr. Sanders said that the reciprocity with California wouldn't work if another exam on California laws would need to be taken. Mr. Borges said that it would have to be determined by an examination review that another exam on California laws would be required.

Ms. Chang asked if this is a worldwide exam. Ms. Burns said that it is only the United States and Canada.

Dr. Sanders said that most other states are only using the written examination and not the practical which should be a question to ask IHS. Mr. Borges said that there could be a difference in standards and is open to looking into ILE if possible. Dr. White said that she would want more information on the content of the exam and how the practical exam would be administered before contracting with OPES to conduct a review. Dr. White said that if the Board still has to administer the practical exam, but with different content, it may not fix the challenges the Board currently has. Mr. Borges said that it would require training all the examiners on a new exam. Dr White said that she would also want to see if there are any additional costs associated with verifying examination status or results and commented on prior experience of recurring membership fees for continual verification of status or results. Dr. Sanders said that his concern is costs and if it solves the Board's challenges with the current practical examination.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the costs would be passed on to the licensees through a fee increase. Ms. Burns said that it would come out of the Board's budget and not through a fee increase.

Ms. Burns suggested that the Board can invite IHS to provide the Board with more information on the ILE.

Dr. White asked if there is an update from Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact. Ms. Burns said that they are not issuing privileges yet. Ms. Burns also said that any reciprocity agreements are reviewed by OPES, and highlighted attachments in the meeting material with DCA policies covering this information.

Mr. Borges asked if the survey is used for the review. Ms. Burns said that it is part of an occupational analysis and it would be the 2020 Occupational Analysis of the Hearing Aid Dispensers Profession report or the most recent report at the time that will be used when reviewing examinations for hearing aid dispensers, and highlighted the report as an attachment in the meeting material.

Mr. Borges asked for the details of the national examination review. Ms. Welch-Gandy said that the development procedures, grading system, and content are all looked at, and highlighted an attachment in the meeting material that lists materials required for OPES review.

Mr. Borges said that there should be further discussion. Ms. Dominguez expressed support for further discussion and requested a presentation from IHS. Ms. Chang also expressed support for further discussion.

Dr. Sanders asked what the cost would be to have a California specific law exam. Ms. Burns said that it may cost around the same amount as a written test, which is about \$30,000 every year.

Dr. Sanders asked if this could save the Board money. Ms. Burns said that it might cost the same but paid to a different vendor. Ms. Burns also said that the Board would still have to complete the linkage study to determine that information. Ms. Chang said that she had the same concerns regarding costs.

Mr. David asked if the Board is able to get a cost analysis. Ms. Burns said that it would have to be reviewed by OPES to determine if a California specific law exam is required, and deferred to Ms. Welch-Gandy. Ms. Welch-Gandy said that cost from other boards to administer a law exam could be

provided but otherwise a review would have to be conducted. Ms. Burns requested that the information be provided for a future discussion.

Mr. Borges asked about one of the attachments. Ms. Burns said that it is the proposed text to amend regulation regarding the hearing aid dispensing examination and dispensing audiologist examination requirements.

Mr. David said if that creates barriers for out-of-state applicants to have extra requirements. Ms. Burns said that it is already a barrier to have to travel to California to take and pass the practical examination.

Ms. Burns commented on pathways for out-of-state applicants and deferred to the next agenda item for further discussion.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments.

Sierra Sharpe, Director of Professional Development at International Hearing Society, commented on presenting to the Board about ILE, participating in an OPES review, reciprocity with other states, and grading system. Ms. Sharpe said that there is no annual fee once a person passes an ILE exam and the IHS ongoing fee to be a member of IHS is separate from passing the ILE exam. Ms. Sharpe also said that the ILE written exam is administered by IHS but the practical exam is currently administered by the state licensing board and noted that other options are being looked at to help alleviate the burden from licensing boards. Ms. Sharpe further said that questions are not presented in the negative.

Thomas Tedeschi, Chief of Audiology, Amplifon Americas, commented as the requestor of the agenda item that the Board should consider an agenda item where IHS presents on the ILE and commented on reciprocity with other states, ILE exam development procedures, and law and ethics exam requirements in other states.

Joe Bartlett commented on ILE distant learning program and examination requirements for renewal.

14. Discussion on Hearing Healthcare Provider Letter Regarding Workforce Shortages and Recommendations to Address those Shortages through Licensure Reciprocity and Changes to Regulations regarding Hearing Aid Trainee as stated in Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.114, 1399.116, 1399.117, 1399.118, and 1399.119

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to discuss workforce shortages and recommendations to address those shortages. Ms. Burns provided background on a letter endorsed by the Hearing Healthcare Providers/California recommending licensure reciprocity and changes to regulations regarding hearing aid trainee to address workforce shortages.

Ms. Burns commented on the role and function of the Hearing Aid Dispensing Trainee (Trainee) and said that Hearing Aid Dispensers do not have support personnel like aides or assistants. Ms. Burns also said that a Trainee is a temporary license for the purpose of getting the education and experience required for licensure and is not a license type created to help address workforce issues.

Ms. Burns commented on the recommendation to maintain current supervision requirements for Trainees and changes to the supervision requirements for Trainees that fail the written examination.

Ms. Burns said that the proposed regulation to increase the level of supervision and specify training requirements is to enhance a Trainee's ability to pass the examination and enter the workforce as a licensed Hearing Aid Dispenser more quickly.

Ms. Burns commented on the recommendation to allow the supervision of more than one Trainee and said that a Trainee is dissimilar to a required professional experience (RPE) temporary license holder in the amount of education and experience the individual obtains prior to the RPE license. Ms. Burns also said that the Board could consider discussion of support personnel for hearing aid dispensers if there is a need. Ms. Burns said that workforce data wasn't provided with the letter and the Board should request that information from HHP

Ms. Burns commented on the recommendation to allow licensure by reciprocity. Ms. Burns said that the Board doesn't have any reciprocity agreements but has pathways for out-of-state applicants, and commented on different pathways and expedited processes. Ms. Burns also said that any reciprocity agreement has to be reviewed by DCA Office of Professional Services (OPES) to ensure they are substantially similar to California requirements.

Dr. White asked if the proposed regulations include supervision requirements for exam failures. Ms. Liranzo said that the proposed regulations would not change the current requirement which is one hundred (100) percent supervision if the Trainee fails an examination.

Dr. White commented on the confusion over the role and function of a Trainee, and said that it is a mentor-mentee relationship for the benefit of the trainee and not the dispensers. Dr. White also said that if Trainees are viewed and used differently then there should be discussion of assistants or aides to help dispensers. Dr. White further said that dispensers have front office staff to help as long as they are not touching the patient. Mr. Borges commented on the confusion over the role and function of Trainee could be due to the current supervision requirements.

Ms. Burns commented on discussion regarding workforce needs and addressing any shortages in hearing aid dispensing, and said that it could be a future agenda item for further discussion.

Dr. White commented on an educational requirement for Hearing Aid Dispensers like the audiology and speech-language pathology RPE. Ms. Liranzo said that the Board has the authority under BPC section 2538.17 to specify and require a course of instruction for licensure. Dr. White asked how that would work. Ms. Burns said that the Board can direct staff to contact educational institutions for more information on the preparation and administration of a course of instruction. Dr. White asked if that is how the speech-language pathology assistant programs were created. Ms. Burns said that the licensure was created through a legislative bill sponsored by a professional organization. Ms. Burns also said that people were already getting a bachelor's degree in communication science disorders. Mr. Borges commented on the feasibility of an educational program and said that expanding the scope of practice might need to be a discussion to make it more feasible. Dr. White commented on scope of practice for Hearing Aid Dispensers in other states and professional organizations, and whether the profession wants an educational component for licensure.

Dr. White commented on her experience with Trainees and said that they usually need to be taught everything. Dr. Sanders said that he is asked where a person can learn to be a dispenser if they don't know a dispenser. Dr. White said that this a common question among bachelor's level students.

Ms. Burns said that community colleges and the legislature are open to looking at new ways to provide pathway to enhance the workforce.

Mr. Borges asked if there is a fee to waive the one Trainee supervision requirement and how long the approval process is. Ms. Burns said that there is no fee, and it takes about a few weeks to process the request. Ms. Burns also said that the status of current a Trainee could influence the approval to supervise additional Trainees.

Dr. White commented on her experience with bachelor's students trying to get their Hearing Aid Dispenser license with or without a Trainee. Ms. Burns said that she has heard of one employer requiring an internal training program before applying for a Trainee license.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments.

Sierra Sharpe, Director of Professional Development at International Hearing Society, commented on participating in a linkage study and reciprocity with other states.

Thomas Tedeschi, Chief of Audiology, Amplifon Americas, commented on reciprocity with other states and creating a licensure type for support personnel.

Joe Bartlett, Legislative Director of HHP, commented on IHS distance learning program and HAD scope of practice.

15. Regulatory Report: Update, Review, and Possible Action on Board Regulation Packages

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Liranzo to present on Board regulation packages. Ms. Liranzo provided an update on Board regulation packages.

Dr. White asked if there is a timeframe regarding the Hearing Aid Dispensers and Dispensing Audiologist examination requirements. Ms. Liranzo said that a timeframe cannot be provided but the Board is required to provide a rulemaking calendar to the Office of Administrative Law and may have more information after that.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

16. Future Agenda Items

Ms. Dominguez asked for future agenda items.

Mr. Borges requested a discussion on the ILE.

Mr. David requested a discussion on foreign education for SLPA licensure.

Ms. Dominguez noted the requests.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

17. The Board Will Meet in Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including Proposed Decisions, Stipulated Decisions, Defaults, Petitions for Reductions in Penalty, Petitions for Reconsideration, and Remands.

The Board did not meet in closed session.

18. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.