



**Speech-Language Pathology Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
May 22, 2008**

Department of Consumer Affairs  
2005 Evergreen Street  
"Hearing Room"  
Sacramento, CA  
(916) 263-2666

**Committee Members Present**

Lisa O'Connor, M.A.  
Carol Murphy, M.A.  
Jennifer Hancock, M.A.

**Staff Present**

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer  
Lori Pinson, Staff Analyst  
George Ritter, Legal Counsel  
Cynthia Alameda, Staff Analyst

**Board Members Present**

Alison Grimes, Au.D.  
Naomi Smith, Au.D.  
Robert Hanyak, Ph.D., Au.D.

**Board Members Absent**

Paul Donald, M.D.

**Guests Present**

Ian McDonald, Achieva Corporation  
Rebecca Binge, University of California, San Francisco

**I. Call to Order**

Chairperson O'Connor called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

**II. Introductions**

Those present introduced themselves.

**III. Approval of Meeting Minutes for April 22, 2008 Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee Teleconference Committee Meeting**

The Committee reviewed the teleconference meeting minutes of April 22, 2008 and proposed minor edits.

**M/S/C:                    Murphy/Hancock**

The Committee voted to approve the April 22, 2008 Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee minutes as amended.

**IV. Review Proposed Procedural Changes for Evaluating the Training and Competency of Foreign Educated Applicants**

**A. Examine Curriculum and Clinical Guidelines that may be Provided to Transcript Evaluation Services for the Purposes of Determining United States Degree Equivalency**

The Committee examined the curricula of five California speech-language pathology training programs in order to develop an outline of major content areas that should be covered in a speech-language pathology (SLP) training program.

Chairperson O'Connor provided a sample guideline of the graduate level content areas covered in all of the programs reviewed.

Ms. Hancock stated that it is very difficult to assess the parity of course offerings by examining only the course titles, as the actual content of courses offered in the United States (U.S.) versus those offered in foreign countries may be very different in terms of theory and clinical constructs.

After reviewing the curriculum of the California training programs, it was determined that while there was considerable consistency in the core curriculum, both elective courses and the designation of course complexity varied between graduate and undergraduate levels. Ultimately, the Committee concluded that even if a reliable and comprehensive evaluation tool could be developed by the Committee and provided to the transcript evaluation services, the evaluation services must still make independent judgments as to whether courses listed on the foreign transcripts are equivalent to or capture the relevant content areas of speech-language pathology courses required in U.S. master's programs.

Chairperson O'Connor stated that most California training programs do not accept transfer units from foreign institutions beyond the undergraduate units, as the California training programs do not deem the graduate coursework as completed in foreign institutions as equivalent to that obtained in the U.S.

The Committee discussed the option of disallowing any foreign training at the graduate level and only accepting foreign training up through the undergraduate or bachelor's level, thereby requiring all applicants to have obtained the SLP training from an accredited program.

Chairperson O'Connor inquired of Mr. Ritter whether the Board could disallow any foreign training at the graduate level and require all foreign applicants to have obtained the graduate coursework in speech-language pathology at a U.S.-accredited program.

Mr. Ritter stated that the Board must have a justified reason to create such a barrier and should not proceed with a restructure based on an assumption of academic inferiority. He suggested that the Committee may wish to research recognized national credentialing systems that may provide a greater understanding or delineation regarding the equivalency in U.S. and foreign training.

Chairperson O'Connor stated that she would contact the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) to determine how the organization confirms equivalency with the training model of foreign institutions and whether ASHA is familiar with an international credentialing organization that reviews speech-language pathology training.

Ms. Del Mugnaio agreed to research the process employed by the California Medical Board and the Board of Occupational Therapy for reviewing the education and training of foreign applicants.

The Committee tabled a recommendation on the issue until further information is available.

## **B. Report from Committee Members on Review of the Current Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Examination**

Ms. Murphy and Ms. Hancock reviewed the TOEFL and reported the following:

- The exam is much too basic.
- The human raters who assessed exam participants are located all over the world and may have different language contexts.
- No pass or fail score is identified.
- The speaking portion of the exam may be rehearsed and re-recorded multiple times by the exam participant.
- The speaking portion of the exam as administered does not represent “real speech.”
- The exam prompts test takers on how to succeed on the exam; it is extremely easy to score well.
- There is no speech-language pathology option for exam participants to check when registering for the exam.

The Committee determined that the TOEFL is much too remedial for assessing speaking proficiency for speech-language pathologists and decided to review the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), as the latter examination is geared toward measuring the language/communication abilities of international working professionals as opposed to students. The Committee will provide a report at the next scheduled meeting.

## **C. Examine Sample Performance Evaluation Forms for Rating the Clinical Competence of Required Professional Experience Temporary License Holders**

Chairperson O’Connor provided samples of Required Professional Experience (RPE) evaluation forms as developed by speech-language pathology employers, as well as the ASHA clinical skills inventory and rating form.

The Committee examined the sample forms with the intent to develop a standardized RPE evaluation tool that may be used by RPE supervisors as a resource when documenting the performance of their RPEs. The Committee determined that whatever form is ultimately decided upon would be optional for RPE supervisors and should be posted on the Board’s website as a resource.

Chairperson O’Connor referenced a Monthly Performance Review form developed by Sweetwater School District and stated that the form appeared to capture the information the Board would be interested in without being overly complicated.

The Committee agreed that the form developed by Sweetwater could be modified into a Board RPE evaluation tool and requested that Chairperson O’Connor draft a similar form to be disseminated to the other Committee members for input. A final document would be available for consideration at the August Advisory Committee meeting.

Chairperson O’Connor adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Annemarie Del Mugnaio  
Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer