

BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Teleconference - Sacramento and Glendora
Friday, April 3, 2026

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 Friday, April 3, 2026, at 9:00 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 and Budget Analyst
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep "Deepi" Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Ann Fisher, DCA 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.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE
Teleconference - Sacramento and Glendora
Friday, April 3, 2026

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 Friday, April 3, 2026, at 9:07 a.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
Michael Magat, Assistant Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation, Regulation and Budget Analyst
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep “Deepi” Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Ann Fisher, DCA 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 (SLPA) Related to Swallow Therapy as Stated in Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 1399.170.1, 1399.170.2, and 1399.170.3

Ms. Dominguez invited Maria Liranzo to discuss possible action to amend regulations regarding SLPA scope of responsibility, duties, and functions related to swallow therapy. Ms. Liranzo provided a background on the proposed regulatory changes and summary of changes to the proposed text.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the letter “s” can be replaced with the letter “g” in the word “dysphasia” throughout the proposed text and said that dysphasia is a communication impairment whereas dysphagia is a swallowing disorder. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the Committee wished to prohibit out-of-state SLPAs from using their out-of-state experience towards the one hundred (100) hours requirement. Cherise Burns said that a SLPA, who moves to California, may have experience from a state that permits them to perform therapy with bolus material and asked if these experiences should be excluded from the one hundred (100) hours requirement.

Francis David asked how we could ensure that the requirements are the same in another state. Ms. Burns said that the requirement for the work to be completed under immediate supervision of a licensed speech-language pathologist (SLP) who performs feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus material as part of their practice and direct client care with patients that cover all phases of swallowing and a variety of age would remain the same but it would not specify that it needs to be under a California licensed SLP. Ms. Dominguez said that out-of-state SLPAs should be permitted to use their out-of-state experience towards the one hundred (100) hours requirement provided that the experience comes from a state that permits a SLPA to perform therapy with bolus material. Ms. Dominguez noted that the meeting materials include a list of neighboring states where they are not allowed to perform therapy

with bolus material. Mr. Francis and Dr. Tamara Chambers expressed agreement with allowing out-of-state SLPAs to use their out-of-state experience as stated by Ms. Dominguez.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee intended the written verification to be a one-time verification and not with every supervisor, and noted the proposed text was revised to ensure that it is a one-time written verification. Mr. David asked if it would be the final verification. Ms. Liranzo said that it would be the final verification and the proposed text was revised to require that the supervisor at the time the SLPA completes the required education and experience, will provide the written verification. The Committee expressed agreement with the written verification being a one-time verification.

Ms. Liranzo asked whether the Committee intended the verification of the SLPA's experience to be for any SLP for any portion of the SLPA's experience rather than with every SLP for all of the SLPA's experience, and said that the proposed text was written to require that the SLP signing the written verification must verify with any SLP for any portion of the SLPA's experience. Ms. Burns said that the Board comes across this issue with Required Professional Experience (RPEs) when the supervisor is completing the final verification of the RPE's hours. Ms. Burns further said that the supervisor may not be able to get a hold of a SLP who passed away or moved to another state or country, and in this situation, those hours are counted toward the RPE hours provided that enough of the other hours are performed at an acceptable standard of care. Ms. Dominguez asked if removing the word "any" would remove that barrier. Ms. Burns said that it does remove that barrier. The Committee expressed agreement to require the SLP signing the written verification to verify with any SLP for any portion of the SLPA's experience.

Ms. Liranzo asked if SLPAs should be prohibited from performing therapy with bolus material on medically fragile patients. Mr. David asked if the supervisor is physically in the room under immediate supervision. Ms. Liranzo said that they are physically in the room with the SLPA under immediate supervision. Dr. Chambers said that the patient may not be a candidate for therapy with bolus material if they are acutely ill and in an unstable condition and recommend that SLPAs are prohibited from performing therapy with bolus material on medically fragile patients. Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Mr. David asked if there is a definition for medically fragile patients. Ms. Liranzo said that there is a definition for medically fragile patients. Ms. Liranzo recommended adding it in front of the language regarding contraindications and deferred to the Board's regulatory counsel for language and location. Deepi Miller said that it can be added in front of the language regarding contraindications and it could be written to say, "the patient is not medically fragile patients or has no contraindications." Ms. Dominguez said that there could be clients with cognitive impairment that SLPAs could work with and asked if it could be clarified further. Ms. Liranzo asked if it would fall under unwillingness or inability to cooperate with the procedure. Ms. Dominguez said that it could. Ms. Miller recommended adding "inability to consent" as a contraindication.

Mr. David asked how the changes would look like in the proposed text. Ms. Liranzo said that the proposed text would now read as "for purposes of this section, contraindications may include, but are not limited to, cases of severe movement disorders, severe agitation, unwillingness or inability to cooperate or consent with the procedure, patients with an advanced airway, and neonate and infant patient." Ms. Miller asked if the Committee wished to

remove the words “cognitive impairment” and add the word “consent” to “unwillingness or inability to cooperate with the procedure.”

Mr. David asked if there was a way to define cognitive impairment to include the level of cognitive impairment. Ms. Miller said that there could be a way of achieving that without using the words “cognitive impairment” because defining it could be overinclusive or underinclusive. Ms. Dominguez said that cognitive impairment would have an impact on the person’s ability to cooperate or settle in, especially if they are agitated, or refuse to, or are unwilling to do the procedure due to the lack of awareness of the task at hand. Ms. Miller recommended the that proposed text could include the patient’s understanding of the procedure and it could read as “unwillingness or inability to cooperate with, consent to, or otherwise understand any aspect of the procedure.” The Committee expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Ms. Miller asked if there are states where the law doesn’t prohibit SLPAs from performing therapy with bolus material, but it also doesn’t state it explicitly. Ms. Dominguez asked if this is for out-of-state SLPAs. Ms. Liranzo said that this would be SLPAs with out-of-state experience. Ms. Dominguez said that Attachment B lists states that prohibit SLPAs from performing therapy with bolus material, states that prohibit intervention protocols like modified barium swallow studies, and states that don’t have laws or regulations on SLPA scope of practice. Ms. Dominguez further said that she would want to confirm that the state allows SLPAs to perform therapy with bolus material and ensure that we maintain knowledge of any changes. Ms. Liranzo recommended that it becomes a requirement of the SLP verifying the hours for the written verification.

Ms. Miller asked if the Committee would still want the written verification to be from a California licensed SLP if the SLPA’s experience is from out of state. Ms. Dominguez said the Committee would still want the written verification to be from a California licensed SLP. Ms. Liranzo said it would have to be from a California licensed SLP because other states may not have this kind of requirement.

Ms. Liranzo asked what SLPAs need to know about aspiration and if it would fall under the course content already listed or as its own item. Ms. Dominguez and Mr. David said that it would be part of signs and symptoms of swallowing disorders or dysphagia. Ms. Liranzo said, “signs and symptoms of swallowing disorders or dysphagia” will end with “including aspiration” in CCR section 1399.170.1(c)(1)(A)(iii). The Committee expressed agreement with the changes.

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Committee to not recommend the proposed text to the Board but allow staff to revise the text and bring it back to the Committee.

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

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 a.m.

AUDIOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE
Teleconference - Sacramento and Glendora
Friday, April 3, 2026

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

Dr. Amy White, Committee Chair, called the Audiology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order on Friday, April 3, 2026, at 9:44 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
Karen Chang, Public Member
Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Michael Magat, Assistant Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation, Regulation and Budget Analyst
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep “Deepi” Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Ann Fisher, DCA 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, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157

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

Dr. White asked if the word “shall” have the same meaning as “must.” Deepi Miller said the word “shall” does have the same meaning as “must” and it can be replaced if hearing screening is not a required task of an aide. Ms. Burns recommended rephrasing the sentence so that the training depends on whether the task is assigned to the aide.

Dr. Tamara Chambers asked how supervisors demonstrate that they trained the aide. Dr. Charles Sanders said the supervisor attests to it when they sign and submit the form to the Board. Ms. Burn commented on the enforcement of competency through the complaint

process. Ms. Burns said that, during an investigation, staff will request and look for documentation of the training. Dr. Sanders said that the supervisor must list the activities they are going to allow the aide to perform along with the training when they register an aide. Ms. Liranzo said that it will also be asked as part of renewal once that process is established.

Ms. Miller asked Ms. Liranzo if the requested changes were clear. Ms. Liranzo said that CCR section 1399.154.10(d) will begin with "If the aide conducts hearing screening,".

Dr. Sanders asked about the word "binary" in hearing screening. Dr. White said it means you either heard it or didn't hear it because it is not a threshold search. Ms. Liranzo said that is how she understood it to mean based on the Committee's last discussion that it was a yes/no or pass/fail type of test or screening. Ms. Liranzo also said that she could not cite the section in the Practice Act because it uses a specific license type, so it was written word-for-word in the regulations. Dr. Sanders said that he thought it said binaural, which is a different type of screening or test.

Karen Chang said that there is a typo on page 13 of 17 of the proposed regulatory text and it should say "servicing hearing aids" and not "servicing hear aids." Dr. White noted that the typo is in CCR section 1399.154.9(f)(2). Ms. Burns noted the change.

Charles Sanders 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 amended, and direct Board staff to prepare the regulatory text for Board review and approval.

Tamara Chambers seconded the motion.

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

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

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m.

BOARD MEETING MINUTES Teleconference - Sacramento and Glendora Friday, April 3, 2026

3. 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 Friday, April 3, 2026, at 10:16 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
Karen Chang, Public Member (left at 12:26 p.m.)
Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Michael Magat, Assistant Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation, Regulation and Budget Analyst
Tim Yang, Enforcement Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel
Navdeep "Deepi" Miller, DCA Regulatory Counsel
Ann Fisher, DCA Webex Moderator
Fabiha Aziz, DCA Webex Moderator

4. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment for items not on the agenda.

Cherise Burns read a written comment from Roxanne Moyen Safa requesting that second language proficiency be a part of the information in the public license search database and said that she lost valuable time looking for a provider who speaks Farsi to treat her parent that suffered a stroke because the information was not readily available.

5. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Board Responses to the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee's Background Paper with Identified Issues, Background and Recommendations and the March 24, 2026 Joint Sunset Review Oversight Hearing

Gilda Dominguez invited Cherise Burns to provide an update on the Board's Sunset Review. Ms. Burns provided a background and update on the Board's Sunset Review and said that the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Hearing occurred on March 24, 2026. Ms. Dominguez and Dr. Amy White commented on the hearing. Dr. White said that the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee asked the Board one question and it was about the letter from the California Academy of Audiology regarding the creation of a new license category for audiologist assistants. Ms. Burns said that the Board received a public comment from a law student regarding the creation of statutory authority for ongoing and proactive inspections programs, the ability to meet disciplinary timeframes, more public board members on the board so that the majority are members of the public, and inspection timeframes and disciplinary targets. Ms. Burns also said that the Board has 30 days to respond to the questions from the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee Background Paper and presented the draft Board response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the first issue regarding additional public members on the Board. Tod Borges said that increasing the number of board members would increase Board expense and asked if the Board would get additional funding.

Ms. Burns said that it would have to request it. Mr. Borges said that quorum could be an issue with more board members and noted the vacant positions the Board currently has. Dr. White said that her biggest concern is the quorum and asked if the response should be revised. Dr. Charles Sanders and Karen Chang expressed concern with the issue of quorum if more members are added to the Board. Ms. Burns asked if the response should be revised to highlight the concerns the Board has expressed. The Board said that it should. Ms. Burns suggested the response can say that the Board is open to more members but that it has concerns. The Board expressed agreement with the recommendation. Ms. Burns noted the changes to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the second issue regarding aides. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the third issue regarding occupational analysis for national examinations. Mr. Borges asked if there will be Board discussion to consider a national examination for hearing aid dispenser written examination and said that he didn't see it discussed in the draft response. Ms. Burns said that the question is asking why an occupational analysis should be required for national examinations, which is only for the practices of speech-language pathology (SLP) and audiology. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the fourth issue regarding examination fees for the hearing aid dispenser written and practical examinations. Francis David asked if there were any recommendations for the fee increase. Ms. Burns said that there will be an increase of \$25 for the written and \$100 for the practical through the regulatory process. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the fifth issue regarding retired license category. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the sixth issue regarding temporary license and the National Practitioner Data Bank. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the seventh issue regarding continuing education and continuing professional development providers. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the eighth issue regarding audiology assistants. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the ninth issue regarding the reciprocity and the Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the tenth issue regarding federal changes to financial aid borrowing limits for the professions of SLP and audiology in California. Dr. Tamara Chambers said that this will have an impact and is interested to know

how it goes. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the eleventh issue regarding online business and the selling of hearing aids. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the twelfth issue regarding the impact of emerging technology such as artificial intelligence and the delivery of services to SLP and audiology patients and the public. Ms. Chang said that the response should note that the Board is cognizant of the rapidly evolving technology and will continue to monitor it. Ms. Burns noted the changes to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the thirteenth issue regarding the technical changes to the Board's licensure Act. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion on the draft Board response to the fourteenth issue regarding the continuation of the Board. Ms. Burns noted that no changes were requested to the response.

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

Dr. Amy White moved to approve the Board's Response to the Committee's Background Paper, as amended, and delegate to the Executive Officer to make technical or editorial changes necessary for submission to the Committee by the April 23, 2026, deadline.

Gilda Dominguez seconded the motion.

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

6. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Pursuing Federal Bureau of Investigation Rap Back Capabilities through Sunset Review Process

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to discuss possible action regarding the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) rap back program. Ms. Burns provided a background on the FBI rap back program.

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.

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

Dr. Tamara Chambers seconded the motion.

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

7. Legislative Report: Review, Discussion, and Possible Action on Proposed Legislation

Ms. Dominguez invited Maria Liranzo to provide the legislative report. Ms. Liranzo reported on the legislative calendar and deadlines, and implemented legislation. Ms. Liranzo noted legislation added to the list of implemented legislation which were Assembly Bill (AB) 82 regarding health care and legally protected health care activity, and AB 144 on Health, which specifies requirements for health care practitioners invited to provide professional services at the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Ms. Liranzo reported bills on watch status including those that died.

Ms. Dominguez asked for Board discussion on the legislative calendar and deadlines, implemented legislation, and bills on watch status. There was no Board discussion.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments on the legislative calendar and deadlines, implemented legislation, and bills on watch status. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

Ms. Liranzo reported bills with position recommendations.

Ms. Liranzo provided a background on AB 2233 regarding behavioral health treatment plans and said that Board staff recommended a Support position. Ms. Liranzo deferred to Ms. Chang for more information.

Ms. Chang said that the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee recommended a Support position and noted that the Board received a comment on similar practice for SLP services. Ms. Chang said that while this isn't specific to SLP services, SLPs do provide services to people with autism, which this bill addresses.

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

Karen Chang moved to approve a Support position on AB 2233 regarding behavioral health treatment plans, and direct Board staff to provide a letter to the author of the bill stating that it addresses similar concerns raised by stakeholders regarding similar practice for SLP services.

Francis David seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Liranzo provided background on SB 1130 regarding crimes and invasion of privacy related to wearable recording devices, and said that Board staff recommended a Neutral if Amended position. Ms. Liranzo deferred to Ms. Chang for more information.

Ms. Chang said that the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee recommended a Neutral if Amended position, and said that hearing aids may be transmitting data to another device or internet for the purpose of helping a person afflicted with impaired hearing transcribe sound or speech into text. Ms. Chang also said that this bill could create barriers for consumers to use these features for this purpose and recommended that the text is amended to include similar language found in Penal Code section 3662 regarding electronic amplifying or recording device to eavesdrop which reads: *"This section does not apply to the use of hearing aids and similar devices, by persons afflicted with impaired hearing, for the purpose of overcoming the impairment to permit the hearing of sounds ordinarily audible to the human ear."*

Ms. Liranzo recommended revising the recommended text as she thinks this could impact speech-to-text functionality between hearing aids and phones more than the hearing of sounds. Dr. White said that speech-to-text functionality is mostly driven by the phone but that could change and noted a hearing aid that does foreign language translation in real time. Dr. Sanders said that there is and noted that there are glasses that do speech-to-text where the person can see the text in real time on the glasses. Dr. Sanders also said that he doesn't think either device stores data. Ms. Liranzo said that it may be useful to add similar language in this section for consumers who wear hearing aids.

Dr. Sanders commented on the expectation of privacy in public or private. Mr. Borges said that California is a two-party state so permission from the other person is required. Ms. Liranzo said that the recommended language would exclude consumers of hearing aid if it's for the purpose of overcoming hearing impairments. Dr. Sanders said that there are pads that transcribe information so that people can talk to another person, but he doesn't think they store the information and noted that Veterans Affairs is looking into this pad.

Dr. White asked if the Board needs to add something about text in the proposed amendments. Ms. Burns said that the Board can direct Board staff to work with the author of the bill to exclude hearing aid and similar devices. The Board expressed agreement to direct Board staff to work with the author of the bill. Dr. White and Dr. Sanders recommended the Board take an Opposed Unless Amended position. Ms. Burns said that when taking an Opposed Unless Amended position it usually means that it will change to a Support position once amended. Mr. Borges asked if the Board can't take an Opposed Unless Amended position and change it to Neutral position once amended. Ms. Burns said that it can, but it is less common. Mr. Borges expressed agreement with the recommendation that the Board should take an Opposed Unless Amended position.

Mr. David asked if this includes Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) devices that record and transcribe. Ms. Liranzo asked if they are considered wearable. Mr. David said they can wear them around their neck. Ms. Chang asked what AAC devices are. Mr. David said that AAC devices are Augmentative and Alternative Communication devices used to communicate. Dr. White asked for the definition of wearable. Ms. Liranzo said that it is any device that can be worn on or attached to the body. Ms. Liranzo said that AAC devices can be included in the proposed amendments. Mr. David said that it would be for the purpose of communicating. Ms. Liranzo noted the purpose.

Ms. Chang said that bill may have been intended devices like the Meta Ray-Ban and asked about glasses with hearing aids. Mr. Borges said that the glasses mentioned earlier were not a

hearing aid. Dr. Sanders said that there are glasses that do close captioning where the person can see the text in real time on the glasses and noted that the lens doesn't need to be prescription lenses.

Ms. Chang asked what the intent of the bill was and if it was for devices like the Meta Ray-Ban. Ms. Liranzo said that it was for those types of devices, but the definition might be too broad and that it might include other wearable devices. Dr. White said that there were pens that allow students to record what the teachers were saying. Dr. Chambers said that there are devices used by total laryngectomy patients.

Ms. Chang recommended working with the author of the bill and asked if the Board can do that instead of taking a position. Ms. Burns said that position letters are how the public engages with the author of a bill and committees assigned to the bill if a bill needs to be amended.

Ms. Chang asked what position the Board could take after the bill has been amended if it takes an Opposed Unless Amended position. Ms. Burns said that it can take a Neutral position though it is not common. Ms. Dominguez asked if the Board could change its position after the amendments are made. Mr. Borges said that it would be a future board discussion after the bill has been amended. Ms. Burns said that the Board will take an Opposed Unless Amended position and work with the author so that speech and hearing devices that are wearable are excluded so that it doesn't impact consumers of hearing and speech services. Ms. Burns also said that the Board can look at the amendments once they are made and change its position to Neutral. The Board expressed agreement with Ms. Burns recommended action.

Ms. Chang noted that the amendments would not be similar to Penal Code section 3662 regarding electronic amplifying or recording devices to eavesdrop because the language doesn't include communication devices.

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

Karen Chang moved to approve an Opposed Unless Amended position on SB 1130 regarding crimes and invasion of privacy as it relates to wearable recording devices, and direct Board staff to provide a letter to the author of the bill stating that it creates barrier for a person afflicted with communication disabilities and amend the language and the language in the Penal Code section 3662.

Dr. Charles Sanders seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Liranzo provided background on SB 1368 regarding hearing aid dispensers, and said that Board staff recommended a Support position. Ms. Liranzo deferred to Ms. Chang for more information.

Ms. Chang said that the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee recommend a Support position, and said that this will be the Board's Sunset bill. Ms. Chang noted that the Board

should direct the staff to provide a letter once it has been amended as it currently has only one of the proposed changes.

Mr. Borges asked if the definition for “temporary basis” is too vague. Ms. Burns said that statutes can be vague and, when they are, they usually require regulations to make them more specific. Ms. Burns noted that it will be a future Board discussion. Dr. White said that there was an extra word in 2538.34. Ms. Burns noted the amendments.

Dr. White asked if this is a spot bill. Ms. Burns said that it’s a placeholder while the Committee reviews the Board’s report and proposals.

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

Karen Chang moved to approve a Support position on SB 1368 regarding hearing aid dispensers, and direct Board staff to provide a letter to the author of the bill after the bill has been amended expressing support.

Tod Borges seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Liranzo reported bills with watch status recommendations and said that Board staff do not recommend an official position on these bills but instead to watch them. Ms. Liranzo deferred to Ms. Chang for more information.

Ms. Chang said that the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee recommended a Watch status on these bills as they will keep licensees informed of changes to laws that would impact how they practice or how the Board operates and no official Board position is required.

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

8. Solicitation of Legislative Agenda Items for Future Meeting (The Board may discuss other items of legislation in sufficient detail to determine whether such items should be on a future board meeting agenda and/or whether to hold a special meeting of the Board to discuss such items pursuant to Government Code section 11125.4)

Ms. Dominguez asked for legislative agenda items for future meeting. Ms. Liranzo said that Board staff have six bills:

1. AB 667 regarding applicants’ language preferences and interpreter services.
2. AB 1979 regarding the use of artificial intelligence for activities requiring professional judgment from a licensed health care professional.
3. AB 2027 regarding the use of worker data to train an artificial intelligence system to replicate, automate, or replace a worker’s job.

4. AB 2140 regarding reporting claims against licensee.
5. AB 2680 regarding Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program certification requirements.
6. SB 435 regarding publicly available sensitive personal information.

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

9. Discussion and Possible Action on the Board's Rulemaking Calendar with the Office of Administrative Law

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns and Ms. Liranzo to discuss possible action on the Board's rulemaking calendar with the Office of Administrative Law. Ms. Burns provided a background on the Board's rulemaking calendar with the Office of Administrative Law. Ms. Liranzo discussed the Board's regulatory review process and regulatory priorities.

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

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

10. Review and Possible Approval of the December 4 - 5, 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.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the letter "s" could be replaced with the letter "g" in "dysphasia" on page 4 of 18. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Ms. Dominguez asked if a date was chosen for the last Board meeting in 2026 and, if so, it could be included in the Minutes on page 17 of 18. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes

Dr. Chambers said that the letter "s" is missing from her last name on page 6 of 18.

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

Dr. Charles Sanders moved to approve the December 4 - 5, 2025 Meeting minutes as amended.

Francis David seconded the motion.

The motion carried 6-0. (Ayes: Dominguez, White, Borges, Chambers, David, Sanders)

11. DCA Update – DCA Board and Bureau Relations

Ms. Dominguez invited Lucy Saldivar to provide an update from DCA Board and Bureau

Relations. Ms. Saldivar provided an update on DCA's Acting Director Christine Lally; renewal reminders for licensees affected by the Los Angeles fire in 2025; restructuring of the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency into two agencies; travel and expenses for Board business; and Board member training including unconscious bias training and Board Member Orientation Training.

Mr. David asked if there are any changes to travel for Board business due to the current situation in the world. Ms. Saldivar said that there are no changes but she will keep board staff informed if there are any.

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

12. Board Chair's Report

Ms. Dominguez reported on the Board meeting calendar including upcoming dates and locations.

Ms. Dominguez asked for updates on Committee discussion.

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

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

Ms. Dominguez reported on discussions from the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee and said that the committee recommended renaming it from the Legislative Ad Hoc Committee to the Legislative and Regulatory Ad Hoc Committee so that it can discuss and recommend to the Board regulatory priorities.

Mr. Borges asked what the Audiology Practice Committee intended when it listed programming hearing aids as clerical and servicing hearing aids that audiology aides can perform. Dr. White said that it was downloading previous settings to a hearing aid. Ms. Liranzo said that this was the intent and recommended rephrasing it so that it captures it better. Dr. White asked if the text could be updated without coming back to the committee. Ms. Liranzo said that she can add it as an item for Board discussion when the text is presented to the Board.

Mr. Borges asked if real ear measurement could be added to the list of prohibited testing. Ms. Liranzo asked if real ear measurement is a diagnostic test. Mr. Borges said that it is not per se, but it is part of fitting a hearing aid. Ms. Burns recommended adding it to the proposed California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1399.154.11(k). Dr. White recommended adding it to the proposed CCR section 1399.154.11(d). Ms. Liranzo said that she can add it as an item for Board discussion when the text is presented to the Board.

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

13. Executive Officer's Report

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

Ms. Burns provided an administration update and said that there is one vacant position that the Board is working on filling and expects that it will be filled next month.

Ms. Burns reported on outreach efforts including meetings with the California Speech Language Hearing Association (CSHA), California Academy of Audiology (CCA), and Hearing HealthCare Providers/California, and a presentation with Ms. Dominguez to students at the University of Southern California SLP program.

Ms. Burns reported on the budget including enforcement costs, augmentation for Attorney General (AG) and Office of Administrative Hearing (OAH) costs, and disencumbrance of funds for procurement contracts that won't be spent in their entirety.

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 and noted the licensing report included in the meeting materials.

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

Ms. Burns reported on Board enforcement including complaints and subsequent arrest notifications, citations and fines, formal discipline cases pending at the AG, probation monitoring, AG outcomes adopted by the Board, and continuing education (CE) and continuing professional development (CPD) audits. Ms. Burns noted the enforcement statistics included in the meeting materials.

Mr. Borges asked what a citation looks like. Ms. Burns said that it has an order of abatement to make up those hours and may have a fine that can range from \$100 to \$2,500.

Mr. Borges asked if there is a table that lists the fine for different number of CE/CPD hours missing. Ms. Burns said that there is no table as mitigating factors are taken into consideration and may impact the fine amount, and noted that regulations dictate this process. Ms. Burns also said that licensees should always request an informal conference for a CE/CPD audit because the discussion can shed light on mitigating factors that can be considered and can often times discover there was a qualifying event for an exemption.

Dr. Chambers asked if there was an exemption category in the CE/CPD audit report and noted that the number doesn't add up. Ms. Burns said that there are a few that are in between stages in the process, who may not be included in the count and others who received an education letter who also wouldn't be included.

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

14. Update and Discussion of Board Progress in Meeting 2025 – 2028 Strategic Plan Goals

Ms. Dominguez invited Michael Magat to provide an update on the Board's progress in meeting its 2025-2028 Strategic Plan Goals. Mr. Magat provided an update on goals the Board had worked on and their progress, and noted that the Board will continue to make progress on other goals and provide updates at a future meeting.

Ms. Burns said that she has met with the Governor's office to discuss the balance of different work settings licensees work during the appointment process for more balance input into Board decisions and their impact on different work settings.

Ms. Dominguez expressed gratitude for the updates on the Board's goal in its strategic plan.

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

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.

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.

16. Solicitation of Future Agenda Items

Ms. Dominguez asked for future agenda items.

Ms. Liranzo and Ms. Burns said that Board staff has a few items:

1. Discussion and possible action to revise the Board's Administrative Procedure Manual to make changes to the information related to the Legislative Ad Hoc Committee.
2. Discussion on regulatory priorities.
3. Discussion on the Board's ability to collect and display data regarding secondary language.

Mr. David asked to add discussion to allow foreign educated bachelors for SLPA licensure.

Ms. Dominguez asked to add discussion to display of license.

Mr. Borges asked when the hearing aid dome removal regulatory proposal will be added to the agenda. Ms. Liranzo said that an update on it will be part of the regulatory priorities discussion.

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 2:38 p.m.