STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY& HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 263-2666 Fax: (916) 263-2668 | www.speechandhearing.ca.gov

BOARD MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
DoubleTree by Hilton San Francisco Airport
835 Airport Blvd., Tiburon Sausalito Room
Burlingame, CA 94010

August 20, 2015 – 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. (or until completion of business)
(Alison Grimes, Board Chair, Dispensing Audiologist; Patti Solomon-Rice, Vice Chair, Speech-Language Pathologist; Rodney Diaz, Public Member, Otolaryngologist; Jaime Lee, Public Member; Deane Manning, Hearing Aid Dispenser; Dee Parker, Speech-Language Pathologist; Marcia Raggio, Dispensing Audiologist; Debbie Snow, Public Member; Amnon Shalev, Hearing Aid Dispenser)

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

2. Introductions, Overview of Strategic Planning, Ground Rules

3. Strategic Planning Session

4. Recess until August 21, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.

August 21, 2015 – 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. (or until completion of business)
(Alison Grimes, Board Chair, Dispensing Audiologist; Patti Solomon-Rice, Vice Chair, Speech-Language Pathologist; Rodney Diaz, Public Member, Otolaryngologist; Jaime Lee, Public Member; Deane Manning, Hearing Aid Dispenser; Dee Parker, Speech-Language Pathologist; Marcia Raggio, Dispensing Audiologist; Debbie Snow, Public Member; Amnon Shalev, Hearing Aid Dispenser)

5. Reconvene / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum

CLOSED SESSION

6. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (a) (1), the Board will Meet in Closed Session for the Executive Officer Evaluation

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

7. Strategic Planning Session

8. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

9. Approval of the June 19, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes

10. Executive Officer's Report
    a. Administration Update
    b. Budget Report
    c. Licensing Report
    d. Practical Examination Report
    e. Enforcement Report

11. Proposed Regulations – Discussion and Possible Action on:
    a. Title 16, CCR, Sections 1399.152, – RPE Clock Hours
    b. Title 16, CCR, Sections 1399.160.1, 1399.160.2, 1399.160.3, and 1399.160.7- Self-study Hours
    c. Title 16, CCR, Section 1399.127- Hearing Aid Dispensers Advertising

12. Future Agenda Items and Future Board Meeting Dates
    a. November 5-6, 2015 - San Diego
    b. February 4-5, 2016 - Sacramento
    c. May 11-12, 2016 (Location to be determined)
    d. August 11-12, 2016 (Location to be determined)
    e. November 9-10, 2016 (Location to be determined)

13. Adjournment

Agendas and materials can be found on the Board's website at www.speechandhearing.ca.gov.

Action may be taken on any item on the Agenda. The time and order of agenda items are subject to change at the discretion of the Board Chair and may be taken out of order. In accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, all meetings of the Board are open to the public. If you wish to participate or to have a guaranteed opportunity to observe, please plan to attend at the physical location.

The meeting facility is accessible to persons with a disability. Any person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting the Board office at (916) 263-2666 or making a written request to Breanne Humphreys, Board Operations Manager, 2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, California 95815. Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

A-Level Objectives for Each Goal Area

Action Verb	+	Item or Goal	+	Benefit or Why
Create	+	an onboarding program	+	to ensure their successful transition to the Board.
Recruit and train	+	3 additional Subject Matter Experts	+	to reduce investigative cycle times.

Enforcement:

1.
2.
3.
4.

Licensing:

1.
2.
3.
4.

Legislation and Regulations:

1.
2.
3.
4.

Outreach:

1.
2.
3.
4.

Program Administration:

1.
2.
3.
4.

2015 Environmental Scan
Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board

Prepared by Elisa Chohan
SOLID Planning Solutions
Department of Consumer Affairs
July 2015

Table of Contents

Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2
INTRODUCTION 3
ACRONYMS 4
ENFORCEMENT 5
LICENSING 7
LEGISLATION AND REGULATION 8
OUTREACH 9
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION 10
APPENDIX A: COMMENTS 11
APPENDIX B: MAJOR TRENDS AND CHANGES 48
APPENDIX C: DATA COLLECTION METHOD 54
APPENDIX D: SURVEY DATA RELIABILITY 55

Introduction

One of the first steps in developing a strategic plan is to conduct a scan and analysis of the environment in which an organization operates. This analysis allows us to take a look at the factors that can impact the organization's success. This is a summary of the results of the environmental scan recently conducted by SOLID for the California Speech-Language and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board in July 2015.

The purpose of this environmental scan is to provide a better understanding of stakeholder, Board member and Board staff thoughts about the Board's performance within the following categories:

- Enforcement
- Licensing
- Legislation and Regulation
- Outreach
- Program Administration

This document outlines areas where Board members, staff and stakeholders are in agreement and disagreement while providing additional insight to assist the Board in developing goals and objectives for their upcoming strategic plan.

Please review this information carefully in preparation for the upcoming strategic planning session. At this planning session we will discuss and evaluate this information as a group to help us identify new strategic objectives the Board will focus on during the 2016 – 2018 strategic plan period.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Elisa Chohan with SOLID at (916) 574-7763 or Elisa.Chohan@dca.ca.gov.

Acronyms

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association	ASHA
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	CTC
California Speech-Language-Hearing Association	CSHA
Continuing Education Units	CEUs
Hearing Aid Dispensers	HADs
Office of the Attorney General	OAG
Office of Administrative Law	OAL
Required Professional Experience	RPE
Speech-Language Pathologist Assistants	SLPAs
Speech-Language Pathologists	SLPs

Enforcement

The health and safety of California consumers is protected through the active enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the practices of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers.

Enforcement includes complaint intake, internal investigations, licensee disciplinary actions, the hearing process, investigation cycle times and the enforcement knowledge of Board staff. Enforcement also includes the Board's relationships with the Office of the Attorney General and with the Office of Administrative Hearings, as well as proactive Board activities that mitigate the need for enforcement.

Enforcement Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	12%	19%	0%
Effective	68%	56%	100%
Poor	16%	25%	0%
Very poor	4%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Enforcement Strengths

1. Consumer protection is the main focus of Board members and staff.
2. Staff are described as: competent, hardworking and capable.
3. Board members are active, well informed and come to consensus for decisions well.
4. Recently implemented process improvements have increased efficiency.
5. Board members are well trained in their roles and responsibilities.
6. The recent addition of posting enforcement decisions on the Board Web site is a strength.
7. Communication between staff, the Executive Officer and Board members is a strength.

Enforcement Weaknesses

1. The regulatory authority and action taken on noncompliance is weak.
2. There is a lack of staff and an inefficient distribution of workload has caused timeliness issues.
3. Enforcement timeframes are too long.
4. There is a lack of consumer education about the enforcement process.
5. The role and authority of a Board member is limiting.

For the detailed comments that led to this summary please see the Comments section on page 12.

DCA Performance Measures Summary

The performance measures demonstrate DCA is making the most efficient and effective use of resources. Performance measures are linked directly to an agency's mission, vision, strategic objectives and strategic initiatives. The chart below shows the number of days between the stages of investigating a consumer complaint for the Board. The column labeled "target" is the goal the Board has established for itself. The remaining columns show the actual number of days to move a complaint from one step of the investigation process to the next.

The Board is not meeting its targets for the first two quarters of 2014-2015 fiscal year.

Glossary of Performance Measure Terms

Volume - Number of complaints and convictions received.

Intake - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to the date the complaint was assigned to an investigator.

Intake & Investigation - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to closure of the investigation process. Does not include cases sent to the Attorney General or other forms of formal discipline.

Formal Discipline - Average number of days to complete the entire enforcement process for cases resulting in formal discipline. (Includes intake and investigation by the Board and prosecution by the Attorney General.)

Probation Intake - Average number of days from monitor assignment to the date the monitor makes first contact with the probationer.

Probation Violation Response - Average number of days from the date a violation of probation is reported, to the date the assigned monitor initiates appropriate action.

		Q1 July-September 2014	Q2 October-December 2014
Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Actual
Volume (number of complaints)	---	25	18
Intake (days)	5	25	9
Intake & investigation (days)	90	101	410
Formal discipline (days)	540	1,281	1,691
Probation intake (days)	14	N/A	N/A
Probation violation response (days)	21	N/A	N/A

Licensing

The Board ensures licensing standards that protect consumers while permitting reasonable access into the professions.

Licensing refers to the initial application submission process for obtaining a license from the Board, as well as the renewal process. Licensing includes processing times, processing backlogs, responsiveness of Board staff to initial and renewal applicant inquires. Inquires may include information from the Board about the licensing process and licensing requirements and eligibility criteria for licensure.

Licensing Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	18%	31%	0%
Effective	63%	69%	94%
Poor	15%	0%	6%
Very poor	4%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Licensing Strengths

1. Licensing was described as thorough and competent.
2. Newly implemented processes and procedures have increased efficiencies and decreased processing times.
3. Staff in enforcement is a strength.
4. The process of administering the Hearing Aid Dispensers exam has improved.
5. Continuing Education requirements are strong and self-study options are being addressed.
6. Standards and requirements for most of the licenses are strong.

Licensing Weaknesses

1. Processing times are too long.
2. Requirements of the Hearing Aid Dispensers exam are too restrictive.
3. There is a lack of staff and resources.
4. There is a significant Audiologist and Speech-Language Pathologist shortage.

For the detailed comments that led to this summary please see the Comments section on page 19.

Legislation and Regulation

Industry legislation and regulations are contemporary with current practices.

Laws and regulations include the federal and/or state laws governing the Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensing professions as well as California's clarifying regulations.

Legislation and Regulation Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	8%	35%	0%
Effective	67%	29%	73%
Poor	22%	36%	27%
Very poor	3%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Legislation and Regulation Strengths

1. The Board stays current on issues affecting the professions.
2. Board members are actively involved in setting legislation and regulation policy.
3. The Board is currently working on updating several regulations.
4. The staff and Executive Officer's relationship with Board members is good.

Legislation and Regulation Weaknesses

1. Stakeholder communication regarding changes to legislation and regulations could be improved.
2. There is a significant backlog of regulation packages.
3. There is a lack of staff to focus on regulation packages and the tracking of legislation.
4. The rulemaking process is lengthy.

For the detailed comments that led to this summary please see the Comments section on page 28.

Outreach

Consumers and other stakeholders are educated and informed about the practices, and laws and regulations governing the professions of Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensing.

Outreach refers to the Board's ability to communicate with consumers, licensees and other stakeholders using various techniques such as: social media, print, television and radio media, and public forums.

Outreach Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	13%	0%	0%
Effective	55%	69%	80%
Poor	28%	31%	20%
Very poor	4%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Outreach Strengths

1. The Web site is informative and more accessible.
2. The relationships the Board has with professional associations and schools are good.

Outreach Weaknesses

1. There is a lack of communication between the Board and licensees.
2. The Board lacks public visibility.
3. There is a lack of staffing in the area of outreach.
4. State imposed travel restrictions hinder the Board's outreach efforts.

For the detailed comments that led to this summary please see the Comments section on page 36.

Program Administration

The Board efficiently utilizes resources and personnel to meet our goals and objectives.

Organizational effectiveness includes the administrative management of the Board, staffing levels, fiscal resources, organizational structure and customer service.

Program Administration			
Rating	External Stakeholders	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	9%	37%	21%
Effective	57%	63%	79%
Poor	30%	0%	0%
Very poor	4%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Program Administration Strengths

1. The staff and the Executive Officer are strengths of the Board.
2. The recently implemented process improvements have strengthened the efficiency of the Board.
3. Due to the recent process improvements there are has been a decrease in processing times.

Program Administration Weaknesses

1. The Board lacks the ability to offer online services.
2. There is a lack of staff.
3. The workload for staff can be overwhelming.

For the detailed comments that led to this summary please see the Comments section on page 41.

Appendix A: Comments

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board strengths and weaknesses collected during the online surveys and interviews.

The comments in this appendix are shown as provided by stakeholders, staff members and Board members. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. The comments have not been edited for grammar or punctuation in order to preserve the accuracy, feeling and/or meaning the participant intended when providing the comment.

Enforcement Strengths – Stakeholder Comments

Consumer Protection

1. The Board strives to be fair and thorough in enforcing the law to protect consumers.
2. Enforcement is one of the Board's strengths to ensure that the public is protected.

Personnel

1. It now has more personnel to complete the tasks.

Board Members

1. Board members are well informed and are invested in the process.

General

1. I believe the Board does an acceptable job in this area.

Enforcement Strengths - Board Staff Comments

Newly Implemented Improvements

1. Staff are now more aware of Performance Measure criteria which should show improvement in the future.
2. There is a newly implemented procedure to track relevant convictions of applicants who are being approved for licensure. This is helpful if they have future criminal convictions resulting in the need for disciplinary action.
3. Recently implemented weekly enforcement meetings have been helpful.
4. Processes are working and backlogs are freed up.
5. The Board is working efficiently.

Fairness and Consumer Protection

1. People are given a fair chance in discipline issues.
2. Complaints are followed up on.
3. The EO is committed to ensuring adequate discipline of licensees/applicants when it is merited.
4. Board members are committed to consumer protection and interested in following protocols and disciplinary guidelines.

Enforcement Staff

1. The three staff members that make up the Enforcement Unit have come to the Board within the past year. These individuals are hardworking, extremely capable, willing to learn and will take on any project.
2. The Board now has an Enforcement Coordinator in addition to two enforcement analysts who investigate the complaints, which should provide consistency and a single point of contact on disciplinary matters in the future.
3. Staff are competent and work well with Board members.

Enforcement Strengths - Board Member Comments

Staff

1. Staff is doing great. They are timely and keep Board members informed.
2. The Enforcement Coordinator is doing a pretty good job, she is more organized and works closely with OAG and OAL.
3. Staff is exceptional at response time via phone and email.
4. The Enforcement Coordinator is great at providing more objective information or "things to consider" to Board members before making decisions. This is nice since we don't have any evidence.
5. We have an Enforcement coordinator that has helped with speeding up the process, rather than being completely dependent on the OAG for enforcement.
6. When we have the personnel working on the complaint we can be timely, but when we don't have the personnel conducting the investigation, it can take a really long time.
7. The Board has a healthy roster of investigations who are tackling more difficult cases.
8. Board staff does the best they can with given resources.

Processes

1. There is an effective voting process by either phone conference or at Board meetings.
2. The EO allowed Board members to visit the office and see the compliant process in house which was very helpful and educational.
3. When Board members review the investigation it appears the investigation is thorough and we have great subject matter experts.
4. Recent enforcement cases have been more cut and dry relating to legal issues rather than scope of practice licensing issues.
5. The Board has closed up the cue and we are keeping up with enforcement cases because the process is more streamlined.
6. My impression is that there are fewer cases happening.

Training

1. The EO had a speaker (a DCA senior legal counsel member) give our Board training on the legal process regarding the adjudication process. This training was very valuable and helpful. It gave us the background we needed and informed Board members of what to look at when reviewing a case.
2. Our Board has done a good job at providing board member training. The Board Member Orientation Training is helpful, but Kurt Heppler really provided much more in depth information.
3. A good board member training is now in place.
4. The training given by the senior legal counsel member for DCA on the process was excellent. Even people who have been on the Board a long time learned a lot.
5. The EO has been with the Board since summer of 2014 and he has been a breath of fresh air. He has taught Board members more about the enforcement process and ensured that

the DCA legal supervisor is more informative, as well as the Board Enforcement Coordinator, who has been more open with BMs.
6. Education has increased a lot since last summer. As new Board members come on board education needs to be continued.

Decision Making and OAG

1. The Board has timely and appropriate dispensation of the cases presented by the OAG.
2. Board members come to decisions quickly once they review the case.
3. Board members work great together to come to a decision.
4. I have come to appreciate the OAG and everyone who works for her and the amount and detail that they all show. Everything comes to us in a timely manner from the OAG.

Consumer Protection

1. Consumer protection has resonated with the Board. That's what we are here for, to protect consumers.
2. Everyone on the Board (members and staff) is dedicated to protecting the public.
3. Hearing Aid Dispensers Bureau was merged with the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board (SLPAB) several years ago and as a result enforcement efforts have improved with more consumer protection.
4. The Board gets quarterly updates on enforcement, which is nice.

Communication

1. Board members are well educated by staff as to the roles of the OAG, Board members and staff regarding cases and decisions.
2. EO and staff work very hard on providing a published, updated handbook on statutes, regulations and disciplinary guidelines so we can refer to it when we review a case.
3. The EO, staff and Board members have very good communication.

Web site Posting of Cases

1. The Board now posts disciplinary cases on the Web site and includes a link to the OAG so the consumer can read the complaint.
2. By linking the accusations of practitioners on the Web site for consumers to see, the consumer can see that while the practitioner hasn't been convicted they can see that the issue was serious enough to be referred.

Enforcement Weaknesses – Stakeholder Comments

Ethics

1. Difficulty in bringing unethical/unlawful practices to enforcement, especially when not consumer initiated
2. It is difficult to figure out how to report a breach of ethics regarding a fellow SLP. It seemed like I needed a consumer (family member) to report.
3. I would appreciate a bi-yearly email reminding license holders of ethics and other types of violations.

Lack of Action Taken in Enforcement

1. I had once reported to the Board what I considered to be egregious errors by an audiologist in San Mateo County. As far as I could tell, no action was taken by the Board against the Audiologist.
2. Too much time to respond to and investigate complaints.
3. No actual consequences for violations of license or advertising.

Complaint Filing, Fairness and Confidentiality of Complaints

1. A complaint can be lodged against a licensee without solid proof. The professional is assumed guilty until he/she can prove otherwise.
2. Complaints against a dispenser should not be "confidential." We have a right to know what we are accused of and to defend ourselves.

Other

1. More funding needed for effective enforcement
2. Drug store over-the-counter sales of hearing aids
3. Lengthy timelines

Enforcement Weaknesses - Board Staff Comments

Staffing Issues and Workload Distribution

1. Enforcement Coordinator and enforcement analysts are all new, still learning, not fully trained.
2. There is no Enforcement Manager to review work and computer entries for accuracy and provide on-the-spot guidance and answers questions.
3. There was a dip in meeting the Performance Measures since onboarding new staff.
4. One enforcement analyst has to concentrate on submitting regulations, which is lengthy and time consuming and takes away time for investigations.
5. Enforcement staff should have an Office Assistant or Office Technician to process subject matter expert contracts and paperwork, photocopying of large volume documents (i.e. for submission to the OAG, reference materials, etc.).
6. The Board lost two longtime members of enforcement in the past year to a new job and retirement. Due to these staff members being with the Board for many years, desk procedures were not kept up-to-date which slows processing as new staff learn the new process.
7. Some processes regarding discipline were not consistent in the past because it was done in house. We are currently reviewing those processes and ensuring consistency.
8. The Board does not audit SLPs or SLPAs in the schools. If we had more staff, we could do that.

Authority of Laws and Regulations

1. Laws and regulations lack clarity which affects the Board's ability to provide maximum consumer protection.
2. Regulations can be limiting in terms of enforcement effectiveness.
3. Speech-Language Pathologists do not necessarily need to be licensed by the Board because they typically work in the public school setting and just need a credential through the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The CTC issues variable term waivers too often because there is a shortage of SLPs. This is a consumer protection issue.
4. The Board does not have authority to license Hearing Aid Dispenser businesses, just the dispensers, so staff can request records from the dispenser (who move locations often) and can't get the records from the business.

Phones and Timeliness

1. Complaints need to be followed up on in a more timely fashion.
2. Enforcement staff need to be more readily available on the phone.

Procedures

1. There is a need for several procedures and policies to be created and/or updated in various aspects of enforcement.

Enforcement Weaknesses - Board Member Comments

Lack of Consumer and Licensee Education on Enforcement Process

1. There is a lot more consumer harm being done than what is being brought to the Board's attention.
2. Maybe consumers are not aware of their right to file a complaint. The Medical Board has a law that states they must post something in their office stating the way in which consumers can file a complaint.
3. We do not do enough education on consumer rights.
4. Many patients don't know what their rights are, especially for hearing aid dispensers. Consumers don't know where to turn if a problem arises because the public doesn't know there's a board.
5. Colleagues fail to report egregious issues because they are afraid of losing a job or contract.

Timeframes

1. The process from making a complaint to the disposition of the case takes too long.
2. The enforcement timelines has been consistently poor for years. I see complacency of Board members regarding cycle times, which are way too long (almost 5 years).
3. We need to explore ways to reduce cycle times.
4. The completion timeframes of cases are too long.
5. The OAG's process is extremely inefficient and ineffective because it takes so long; as much as 2 - 3 years to implement discipline which is at the detriment of the consumer.

Budget and Lack of Staffing

1. There are not adequate funds to increase the number of staff needed to decrease processing times.
2. The Board needs more investigators who can handle the current caseload.
3. Funding and the number of staff are two problems.
4. There is not enough staff to complete work prior to the OAG's process.

Limitations on Board Members

1. Members have a limited role other than receiving decision from the OAG's and have limited access to evidence yet have to make a decision about discipline. This can be challenging.
2. Board members need more access to evidence before making decision on discipline from OAG's.
3. Board members have limited knowledge of the enforcement process and we only have a small portion at the end of the process from the OAG.

Other

1. There was an issue a while ago that sometimes the subject matter experts had bias and lacked objectivity.
2. The EO could be giving us more information on enforcement cases when it happens versus when we have a board meeting.

Licensing Strengths – Stakeholder Comments

Competency and Procedures

1. Able to keep an eye on all licensees.
2. The Board keeps on top of things, i.e. license renewals etc.
3. There is a procedure and it is followed, a bit slowly, but it is improving.

Thoroughness

1. Thorough review
2. The Board's process is thorough.

Testing

1. Tests are regularly reviewed and updated scientifically.
2. The Required Professional Experience (RPE) is a good program to ensure quality.

Continuing Education

1. Requires sufficient total number of CEU's every two-year period

Customer Service

1. I really appreciate the technicians who answer questions. Lisa is always so polite and helpful.

Licensing Strengths – Board Staff Comments

Newly Implemented Processes and Procedures

1. Newly implemented procedures for Speech/Audiology has reduced processing times, and consequently reduced calls and e-mails regarding status update requests.
2. Cut processing times
3. Systems have improved greatly
4. The Board leveraged personnel effectively. We took job tasks off of the licensing analyst's desk that were administrative and hindered the licensing process times, which was very effective.
5. Some desk procedures were updated which will assist new staff in learning the job.
6. Informative requirements given out via telephone and Web site
7. Reviewing for qualifications and requirements upon application has increased efficiency.
8. We have spent the last year streamlining many processes.
9. We have reduced licensing processing times significantly.

Staffing

1. The staff members involved in licensing are hardworking.
2. Staff is knowledgeable on current B&P and CCR codes.
3. The Board has competent staff.

Other

1. The HAD exam is much more consistent and uniformly administered. The process is much more defensible now.

Licensing Strengths - Board Member Comments

Reduction of Processing Times

1. Reduction of application processing time frames from over 9 weeks to 2 weeks
2. Reduction of analysis and review of supporting documents for applications from 8 weeks to 1 week
3. Reduction of analysis and review of supporting documents for temporary licenses that lead to licensure from 4 weeks to 1 days
4. The EO is focused on reducing the timeframe of becoming licensed, which has been well received by applicants and licensees.
5. The EO made a huge effort and implemented improvement to reduce cycle times by revamping the process.
6. Licensing process is going better than in the past.

Standards and Requirements

1. Standards and requirements are clear.
2. Licensing requirements are strict enough and strong.
3. Board members and staff are cognizant of the Board requirements for issuing licenses.
4. Speech-Language Pathology licensing requirements for English as a second language applicants are being addressed.
5. We constantly self-evaluate our practices, review the types of examinations and review the way we pick our subject matter experts.

Hearing Aid Dispensing Exam

1. The Board now has a licensed Hearing Aid Dispenser as one of the examiners during the Hearing Aid Dispensers practical exam.
2. Hearing Aid Dispensers are the only profession on the Board that has a state licensing exam and are involved in the licensing requirements.
3. The EO has improved the testing for practical exam procedures for the Hearing Aid Dispensers exam.

Process Improvements

1. There has been huge improvement over the last year.
2. The Board has made improvements over the last year with new hires (replacing retirees) and the EO has implemented new process improvement for the licensing process and management.
3. New staff and procedures have been established and this has improved licensing times and cleared the backlog.
4. The Operations Manager (Breanne Humphreys) is creative in process changes and the EO supports Breanne in making those changes.

Continuing Education

1. The Board wants to raise the HAD CEU requirement from 9 to 12 units when it used to be 6 units. If the requirement goes up to 12 units, a licensee cannot complete the requirement in one day, which is inconvenient. Therefore, if the requirement goes up, the Board should increase the allowance for more CEUs by self-study.
2. The Board is currently working on increasing the Hearing Aid Dispensers CE requirements for 9 units to 12 units to make them align better with other professions.

Staff

1. Staff is doing a great job given the resources they have.
2. The Board is unique because we license three different professions and the overlap between the professions is very small. Therefore, the staff has done a great job integrating the Hearing Aid Dispenser Bureau without getting additional staff or resources. Their knowledge had to be expanded and they did a great job with the transition.

Other

1. The Web site allows consumers to look-up the licenses of practitioners.
2. Our board meeting agendas reflect our desire to remain on top of issues and maintain integrity.

Licensing Weaknesses – Stakeholder Comments

Lengthy Processing Times

1. The length of processing applications for new residents and new graduates is extraordinarily long. Six plus weeks to start work is truly outrageous, especially with the shortage of practitioners.
2. New graduates should be able to start the licensing application before identifying a job/supervisor.
3. The licensing process is too time consuming with poor customer service from the staff.
4. Takes too long, too many mistakes (i.e. loss of applications)
5. The processing time for licenses is a frustration in private practice where there is no way to onboard a therapist while waiting for license approval.
6. Cumbersome process
7. Web site unclear
8. It takes too long to authorize and approve new and renewal licenses.
9. The process is sometimes unnecessarily burdensome; e.g., application rejection issues are sometimes very petty and could be cleared up with a phone call or email vs. re-submission.
10. It takes too long to license professionals in this state.
11. It is too hard for out-of-state Audiologists to be licensed in California.
12. Streamlining these processes should be a high priority and would benefit both consumers and professionals.
13. Slow response to inquiries - phone call, voicemail, email!
14. Lack of clear information about how to go through the process

Hearing Aid Dispensers Exam Logistics

1. Not enough exam slots
2. Poor communication from the Board
3. No accountability
4. Delay of 2 months to get results
5. Expensive
6. Some of the examiners were so cold and unfeeling.
7. Too few dispensing exams - creates accessibility issues

Continuing Education

1. It is costly for many of us who live in rural areas to travel to obtain the required CEUs. Relaxing that restriction would allow for increase access to the wealth of knowledge online.
2. With so many good courses being offered in self-study online, more online units should be allowed.
3. The Board does not allow sufficient number of CEUs to be online classes, which are frequently much more educational, rigorous and helpful in advanced training than in-person classes. In-person classes are frequently not of the same high quality as online conferences.

Hearing Aid Dispensers Requirements and Exam

1. Audiologists should be able to dispense hearing aids without holding a dispenser's license. The dual licensure denies what is already within my scope of practice.
2. Education minimum requirements for dispensers need to be elevated.
3. Requiring dispensing exam of audiologists creates accessibility issues and is unnecessary.

Supervision

1. Need to have a form to allow Required Professional Experience (RPE) supervisor to increase number of RPEs if he/she is not providing therapy services full time
2. Another area which is too restrictive is the ruling that only an Ear Nose and Throat M.D. may supervise FEES. Other medical professions, such as a surgeon or a Gastroenterologist are just as qualified to use and supervise the use of an endoscope.

General

1. I understand the need to minimize the number of Boards for efficiency and cost-containment and the reasons for the compromise of combining three related professions into one Board, but this has also created inappropriate and unnecessary "turf" debate that slows progress for all.
2. You can only renew within a limited period of time not earlier
3. Fully credentialed public school speech/language specialists should have some sort of equivalent/reciprocal licensing to enable MediCal billing.

Licensing Weaknesses - Board Staff Comments

Lack of Staffing and Allocation of Resources

1. A new Speech analyst was hired this week to work with the remaining licensing analyst. There will be a learning curve before new the hire is up to speed on processing new applications.
2. The Board needs more than two analyst positions, since one position is supposed to also do Continuing Education, but they cannot do it because there not enough time due to licensing demands.
3. The Hearing Aid analyst is responsible for both exams and licensing functions. The Board needs an additional part-time position to assist in hearing aid licensure to reduce backlog.
4. The Board lost two long time staff members to retirement.
5. Licensing staff is overworked. The Board needs more licensing analysts.
6. Not enough staff to streamline or process incoming new applications in a timely manner.
7. The process itself is lengthy and complicated.

HADs

1. The HADs do not have strong educational requirements.
2. Regulations are unique for Hearing Aid Dispensers exam. They could be a lot more consistent.
3. For the HAD practical examination, applicants should be required to become an intern/trainee before being eligible to take the exam.

Regulations

1. Some regulations are vague and hinder the process.
2. HAD trainees, SLPAs and audiology aides have very loose regulations on supervision requirements.

Other

1. Staff could be better about answering their phones.
2. The ATS[1] system is very archaic and is not easy to use or learn.
3. There is a public perception that the Board takes forever, which is not good.
4. There is a significant shortage of SLPs, Audiologists and a potential shortage of Hearing Aid Dispensers.

[1] Applicant Tracking System (ATS) is a DCA software program used to track licensee applications.

Licensing Weaknesses - Board Member Comments

Hearing Aid Dispenser Exam and Requirements

1. The Hearing Aid Dispenser examination is only offered in Sacramento; it is a burden on Southern California applicants to travel for the exam.
2. The Hearing Aid Dispenser exam should accommodate more people at each examination so applicants don't have to wait as long and eliminate an access to care issue.
3. Hearing Aid Dispensers are required to take a practical exam.
4. The exam is offered a limited number of times a year and for a limited number of testers.
5. Procedures for the mandatory practical examination for hearing aid dispensers could be improved. It is expensive and time consuming. Both applicants and staff complain about the exam process.
6. The exam is very time consuming and expensive.

Processing Times and Lack of Staff

1. There is not enough staff.
2. Huge backlog of applications (lag time between when information is received and the notification to applicant that their application has been approved). Applicants cannot work during that period which affects the professional access to care.
3. The licensing process is functional, but lacks efficiency due to lack of staff.
4. There was a 8-12 week backlog at one point, now 2-3 weeks (might have changed because of the summer rush)
5. A lot of improvement could be made.
6. It is a challenge to keep licensees licensed quickly and timely.

Audiology Shortage and Requirements

1. Audiologists have a four year doctorate degree, which has a lot of education regarding hearing aid dispensing, yet they are still required to take the practical exam for hearing aid dispensing.
2. California has 10% of the nationally licensed Audiologists, yet California only has one doctorate program and one in the process of opening. There is an inherent shortage of California grown Audiologists, so California has to import Audiologists from other states.
3. Access to care in the area of pediatric audiology (infant diagnostics) is a challenge.
4. By 2020 California will need 750 new Audiologists. There are only two programs in California (UCSD graduates about seven a year) and the University of the Pacific (UOP). UOP's program is starting in the fall and hopes to have 20 students in their first class, which will graduate in 2018. There is one audiologist for every 22,000 people in California.

SLPs and SLPAs

1. SLPAs (SLP assistants) require an Associates level degree. They have a limited scope of practice. Agencies and schools are using SLPAs as SLPs because of the shortage.
2. SLP program directors need to be reminded that they're not preparing students for ASHA but let them know about the work they have to do for state licensure.

International Applicants

1. There is a concern about equivalent education requirements in other countries for SLPs and Audiologists.

Other

1. BreEZe[2] implementation still has not occurred, yet we have been talking about it for three years.

[2] BreEZe is the Board's new licensing and enforcement software that will replace ATS and CAS, the Board's legacy licensing and enforcement tracking systems.

Legislation and Regulation Strengths - Stakeholder Comments

Remaining Current of Issues

1. To my knowledge, the Board has been great in keeping up with legislation that affects the SLPAHADB professions, licensees and consumers of these professions.
2. The Board keeps up with recent legislation and regulation.

Other

1. I feel comfortable that the Board and our lobbyist are effective.
2. The Board is very active, and seems to try to make all decisions based on evidence. They enter into discussions thoughtfully and professionally. They meet regularly, and often make it possible for interested parties to attend electronically. Weaknesses center more around the rules and regulations themselves rather than on the Board.
3. The Board has a lawyer to keep up with legislation and regulation.

Legislation and Regulation Strengths - Board Staff Comments

Currently Updating Regulations

1. The Board is in the process of updating regulations.
2. The Board has made some updates in laws and regulations.

Staffing

1. The Board has one staff member who is handling the rulemaking packages in conjunction with other tasks at this time. There has been talk of looking into having one staff member dedicated to rulemaking.
2. Staff updated the link on the Web site so that people can click on a link that takes them to the most current regulation.

Legislation and Regulation Strengths - Board Member Comments

Staff and Executive Relationship to Board Members

1. The EO does most of this with the help of the Operations Manager.
2. The EO is cognizant of the areas of where we need to clarify and beef up regulations.
3. Everyone here (staff and Board members) makes a huge effort to navigate the legislation process.
4. The staff engages in this process continuously and reacts to issues immediately by putting them on the agenda.
5. The staff informs Board members quickly on issues.
6. Staff does a good job at updating the Web site with important information and posting notification of Board meetings so that consumers are informed and included.
7. Staff and our EO pay close attention and keep us informed. They give us information, do training for us and educate us.
8. The EO redid the practice manual for Board members. It clearly states our scope of practice which helps us understand what we can and cannot do.

Board Member Involvement

1. Board members are willing to take on relevant issues that need statute or regulatory changes.
2. Board members bring issues to the attention of the staff and the EO.
3. Board members are more cognizant of areas that don't make sense.
4. Board members take on regulation and legislation that they see fit and the Board EO carries out our wishes.
5. Board members follow legislation.
6. The Board approaches new and relevant issues in a timely manner.
7. Board members inform staff regarding relevant issues and do not hold on to "old" issues.
8. There is good accessibility between the Board and staff. We communicate timely and well on relevant and upcoming issues.

Current Legislation in Process

1. The Board is making progress on updating regulations for Speech-Language Pathologists who are trained internationally and apply for California license, because the regulations are outdated and the application is not thorough enough.
2. Regulations state that licensees can only complete 6 out of 24 CE units (every 2 years) by self-study. Board is currently proposing 6 units be increased to 12 units.
3. Speech-Language Pathologist Assistants, who work under the supervision of Speech-Language Pathologists, have a scoop of practice issue. Especially in rural schools, they are practicing out of scope.

4. The Board needs to propose stricter regulations on supervision of assistants by Speech-Language Pathologists. The Board needs to educate schools about the roles.
5. The Board needs to work with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to solve the SLPAs and SLP scoop of practice issue.
6. The Board is working on a new regulation that requires that SLP applicant's degree must be in a field related to SLP and that the applicant must show that they're attempting to enroll in a SLP master's program. The term waivers will also have a limit now.

Legislation and Regulation Weaknesses – Stakeholder Comments

Communication

1. Longer advance notification on Board proposals should be normal. It is not always easy to know when a new regulation will be deliberated upon.
2. Needs more communication on latest court decisions regarding litigious cases in the State, perhaps by email blasts.
3. Ability to communicate
4. While information is great in terms of what is communicated at Board meetings, it could be even more powerful if this information would be emailed automatically to licensees.

Regulatory Change Suggestions

1. Some of the rules and regulations are very convoluted and difficult to understand. They are not at all user-friendly to the professionals intended to follow them.
2. The division of non-dispensing audiologist, dispensing audiologist, and non-audiologist dispenser is very confusing; no other state follows this sort of division.
3. The Board has been slow to complete the process of integrating the Hearing Aid Dispenser Bureau with the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board in terms of some regulations.
4. SLPAs need more fieldwork hours during training to be prepared to fulfill their job responsibilities.

Continuing Education

1. The Board requires too many CEUs be in-person. Online courses are often more educational and provide better training.
2. Restricting independent study for licensure to four hours is not keeping up with the times. It is disregarding the tremendous amount of creditable continuing education which is available online.

Legislation and Regulation Weaknesses - Board Staff Comments

Backlog of Regulation Packages

1. The prior EO handled the rulemaking packages. This caused a backup in handling and submitting rulemaking packages to OAL.
2. The Board has not had a dedicated employee to complete rulemaking packages on the Board's adoptive proposed regulations. We have had a backlog that goes back several years.
3. There are many backlogged regulatory packages which were existent prior to the newer EO.
4. There is a three plus year backlog on regulations.
5. Regulations are outdated, across all three professions.

Suggestions

1. More laws and regulations need to be updated. A layman's manual should be created for the general public to understand laws and regulations instead of them being in legal terms.
2. Consider a statute that would give authority to the Board to conduct inspections of HAD locations.
3. Complete and revise the disciplinary guidelines.

Staff

1. Staff are not knowledgeable on the Practice Act.
2. Not having staff to process regulation packages
3. Not having someone devoted to this area

Legislation and Regulation Weaknesses - Board Member Comments

Board Members Role with Legislation

1. The Board is more reactive when it comes to regulation changes rather than being proactive and it is only done when Board staff bring a concern up.
2. Sometimes the Board is hesitant to change statute because of unintended consequences.
3. The Board does not have adequate relationships with legislators for when we need to utilize them for statue changes.
4. We only meet quarterly, sometimes for only one day, so it is a slow process coming to a consensus between the three different professions on the Board.
5. Sometimes we can micromanage the industries through legislation (i.e. pediatric specialist for audiology would make access to care even more of an issue).
6. Board members try to get legislation updates from state associations but it is irregular and not effective.

Lengthy Process

1. The regulation and legislation process can be overwhelming and takes a long time.
2. The process to complete a regulation or statute change is too long.
3. It is a long process.
4. The process of completing a regulation package is 2-3 years, which is too long. We forget the whole thing by the time it gets through the process, but I understand we don't have any role in making the process faster.
5. It seems to take forever for the legislative process to occur.

Lack of Staff and Tracking of Legislation

1. The EO needs to track legislation that affects the profession and report to Board members at meetings.
2. The Board needs more staff in regulation package development.
3. Legislative reports are given to Board members at every meeting; however it is a broad perspective that impacts DCA, not necessarily the SLPAHAD Board specifically. If there is legislation that is specific to the professions, we don't hear about it. The EO said the Board members need to bring those to the meetings, rather than the other way around.

Potential Areas for Legislation

1. Fiberoptic endoscopitc evaluation of swallowing
2. Esophageal pharyngeal Manometry

Shortage

1. We have a shortage of licensees and programs. Currently there is only one program at UC San Diego with only 7-10 graduates per year. UOP is opening a program but it is very expensive. This is becoming a consumer access to care problem.

Outreach Strengths – Stakeholder Comments

Web site and Email

1. The Web site has a lot of good information, but I feel there has been very little outreach to licensees and other stakeholders.
2. An email program that allows notifications of meetings

Participation

1. The Board invites professional participation.

Outreach Strengths - Board Staff Comments

Relationship with Schools and Associations

1. The Board is capitalizing on partnerships and collaborating with associations, which has been great. For example, the strategic planning survey was sent to the associations for assistance in sending it out to their members.
2. The EO goes to the schools and talks to graduating SLP classes and goes over the licensing process and the importance of being a licensee.
3. SLP associations are more grass root and are very passionate about what they do. This is a huge advantage for the Board because they want to help us.

Web site

1. The Board Web site is loaded with information for consumers, licensees and applicants.
2. Web site

Other

1. Licensees have a positive perception of the Board.

Outreach Strengths - Board Member Comments

Web site

1. The Board Web site was redesigned in the last two years. It is more accessible and user-friendly.
2. The Board Web site is the only form of outreach the Board is doing because of the budgetary constraints against outreach.
3. The Web site licensee look-up function is good.
4. The Web site has improved with more comprehensive information. It is accessible if people know to go there to seek information.
5. The Web site is a great one. It's easy to follow.
6. Web site has been updated in the last few years and it has become more user-friendly and easier to navigate.
7. The Web site has a "What's New" section which is constantly being updated.
8. The Web site is effective. It is much more informative, people are using it more, and the information is timely.
9. Consumers can get to the Board Web site more easily.
10. The Web site has a section called "Practice Issues" that includes hot topics for licensees to be aware of.
11. Online license verification is great. However, consumers do not know about it.

Relationship with Professional Associations and Schools

1. Professional organizations are in touch with the Board. The Board now includes practitioner names with Attorney General referrals.
2. The EO has reached out to the professional associations to gather information about their needs in order to address issues and see how the Board can help them.
3. We are a lot better in this area recently. The EO has done a really good job working on the relationship with the Speech-Language Pathology Association and works well with their Executive Director and maintains open communication.
4. A collection of universities with programs in the professions meet twice a year. The EO attends the annual Sacramento meeting.
5. The EO sent out an email about the strategic planning survey to licensees and associations, which was a great, proactive way to keep people involved.
6. I write a Board report for the Speech-Language Association to keep SLPs current on Board information.
7. Board members conduct a presentation at annual association meetings.

Accessibility

1. Board meetings are offered across the state so stakeholders can attend more easily.

Outreach Weaknesses – Stakeholder Comments

Lack of Communication

1. Lack of regular emailed newsletters giving updates, all licensees should be subscribed
2. I realize it is incumbent upon professionals to be aware of activities of their licensing board and to check the Web site regularly, but I feel outreach would be greatly improved (and licensees better informed) if there were regular email communication with licensees that did not require an opt-in (i.e., it would be automatically sent to all licensees). This could include encouragement to attend Board meetings, links to Board meeting videos, updated or pending legislation, and Board meeting minutes. I know all of this is available if one looks, but there is no real outreach unless a licensee has requested it.
3. I'm not aware of any outreach.

Visibility of the Board with Professional Organizations and the Public

1. I don't believe in 35 plus years of practice, I have ever had a patient refer to the Board. I don't believe that the public is aware of the Board at all.
2. Lack of Board representation at professional meetings/conferences; in the past the EO was allowed to present at state professional conferences. To me, this was of great educational benefit to the professions in understanding Board activity and meeting the EO. In recent years, this was disallowed.

Regulation

1. The field of applied behavior analysis is unregulated; it lacks oversight and often encroaches in the area of Speech-Language Pathology. More education directed toward the vulnerable population needing applied behavior analysis services would be helpful so that parents are aware that applied behavior analysts do not provide Speech-Language therapy.

Outreach Weaknesses - Board Staff Comments

Lack of Staffing

1. No staff positions with time available to conduct outreach
2. The EO has many competing priorities, leaving limited time for outreach.
3. There is a lack of resources, both money and staff.

Lack of Newsletter

1. The Board does not currently have a newsletter that addresses issues within the professions we license.

Suggestions

1. The Board should look into attending events such as Senior Scammers.
2. There is a huge potential for senior citizen outreach for hearing aid education, especially with online, over-the-counter and catalog sales.
3. Conduct more active outreach on unlicensed activity
4. We need to educate people that the Board is here to help them.

Other

1. Most of our outreach is passive, not active.
2. Due to the travel restrictions, the EO and staff can't attend conferences and other association functions, which is the perfect place for outreach.

Outreach Weaknesses - Board Member Comments

Travel and Budgetary Restrictions

1. The EO cannot attend annual meetings because of travel restrictions.
2. The Board needs to travel in order to conduct outreach like presentations at state meetings because it gives a face to the Board for people who might have feared the Board.
3. The Board lacks a budget to communicate with the public in a variety of ways that are efficient and cost effective.
4. The budgetary restraints result in limited outreach opportunities.
5. The EO is not allowed to travel to state association meetings to present materials. As an alternative, the EO sends a PowerPoint and requests other people to present and answer questions. Obviously, this is not ideal.

Lack of Visibility with the Public

1. The public does not know we are available and are a resource for them to go through their journey. Most consumers do not understand the role and responsibility of Board.
2. No one knows we exist. Our patients don't know where to address Hearing Aid Dispenser grievances, yet HADs have the most cases.
3. Every SLP, Audiologist and HAD, needs a sign giving the Board's number to make a complaint, like they have in auto repair shops and medical offices.

Board Member Involvement

1. Board members should do more to inform our colleagues. Board members need to be advocates for what we do.
2. Board members don't do anything specific to reach out to licensees.

Needed Outreach

1. A Consumer Fact Sheet was planned but was never created or implemented.
2. Some bigger Boards, like Board of Behavioral Sciences or Medical Board of California, send quarterly newsletters to their practitioners.

Web site

1. Consumers are not seeking information through the Web site.
2. The Web site is only in English and Spanish.
3. It is difficult to get consumers to be more proactive about utilizing the license look-up function.

Program Administration Strengths – Stakeholder Comments

General

1. In recent years the Board has had top-notch EOs.
2. I feel staff members always conduct themselves in a professional manner when dealing with the public.

Program Administration Strengths - Board Staff Comments

Staff

1. All staff members work very hard and very effectively.
2. Staff members work well together as a team and support one another in the tasks that need to be accomplished.
3. Staff is good about setting and achieving goals.
4. We have knowledgeable staff that can learn quickly and adapt to ever changing priorities.
5. Staff are eager to learn, apply and streamline new techniques and processes to maximize performance output.
6. Development of staff (many staff are promoted within)
7. Everyone knows that it is very important that customer service is key. We develop partnerships with other DCA staff that we will need in the future and remain professional.
8. Staff are very competent.
9. Staff knows the mission and vision of the Board; everyone is on the same page.
10. Breanne Humphreys, the Operations Manager, is a huge strength for the Board, especially her knack for hiring great staff.

Management

1. Front end administration is superb, yet it is still a work in progress to strive for excellence.
2. The manager is willing to take on many tasks.
3. Highly organized and functional

Staffing Solutions

1. We have been creative by hiring seasonal clerks to assist in the office administration so the licensing analysts are able to concentrate on processing applications.

Other

1. The Board members are very supportive.
2. Our partners at DCA (personnel, budgets, June Vargas with Publications, Design and Editing) are great.

Program Administration Strengths - Board Member Comments

Executive Officer and Process Improvements

1. The EO is doing a wonderful job. He has made a lot of personnel, procedural and policy changes in the last year that has shown a huge improvement.
2. The EO walked into processes and a staff that were stagnant and he made some great changes.
3. The current EO has been able to assess the changes from the HAD Bureau and SLPA Board merge and works smarter with the resources they have, rather than just accepting status quo.
4. The EO's willingness and ability to take a 30,000 foot view with the program and staff so that we do things smarter and faster.
5. The EO has reached out to Board members and specifically the Chair, to have really effective meetings and improve communication. As a result of reviewing the agenda, Board meetings are more efficient and timely.
6. The EO is nice and responsive.
7. The EO has done a great job.
8. The EO has implemented process improvements and cross training.
9. The EO reports on budget and it appears to doing well.
10. The EO responds quickly to BM questions.
11. The EO is great at gathering statistics needed to request more staffing resources.
12. The EO is very organized.
13. The EO has made a lot of progress in making the office more efficient, which has been great for licensees and consumers.
14. The EO is capable of addressing Board members who over step their reach, in a professional way.
15. The EO and Board members communication has become more enhanced lately.
16. The EO is straightforward and has a no nonsense mentality.
17. Since the EO took over, there has been much improvement.
18. The EO is doing a good job.
19. The EO is a great leader and his staff appear to be happy working at the Board.
20. I know the EO is only going to make things even better. He is impressive, amazing and such a delight to work with!
21. The EO is an educator, open to suggestions, brings ideas; what a breath a fresh of air.
22. The group is really well-run.
23. The EO is doing a great job.
24. The EO is on things immediately, and he responds quickly.
25. The EO introduced all staff members to the Board.
26. The EO is building a very effective team in such a short time. There are so many changes that are so visible. Kudos.
27. The EO has worked hard to deal with a small team and retirements, which caused a lot of work.

Staff

1. Every staff member I've ever talked to has been very helpful. Especially in helping arrange our trips. Tim Yang fixed my trip and got me there.
2. All staff is good at answering emails and they work very hard.
3. The staff that the EO has hired are great.
4. The EO has amassed a competent group of people who get along and do not complain.
5. Staff moves along the best they can with the resources they have available.
6. The staff keeps Board members informed on staff activities and informs Board members of what staff needs of them.
7. Brianne does a tremendous job.
8. Brianne and the EO do a great job of preparing the staff. It's a very close staff that works well together.
9. Board staff is doing the best they can with given resources.
10. Brianne provides great leadership. She and the EO are both top notch, and he gives her freedom to practice her capabilities.
11. Retired people are being replaced with new staff that are engaged and excited.
12. Turnaround times for questions are much faster.
13. Staff is very informative.
14. Staff is good with new people who work hard.

Decreased Processing Times

1. The licensure timeframe has decreased.
2. We have seen improved timelines for application processing and enforcement action.

Other

1. Very good
2. Accessible
3. The Board is working with CPS HR Consulting on a workload analysis to ensure better assignment allocation and prevent burn-out of staff members.

Program Administration Weaknesses – Stakeholder Comments

Staff

1. Limited Board staff to accomplish the many needed duties
2. Staff turn-over
3. I think the Board needs more employees to process new graduates' paperwork; it takes a long time.

Online Services

1. I think that one area that I find needing improvement is payment options. It is difficult to understand how in these technological times, the only way to pay for your license is by check and mailing it in. Providing a way to quickly pay your fees would be an excellent way to improve services.
2. Online license renewal is needed.

Other

1. It is difficult to reach anyone on the phone and then there is no accountability.
2. Budgetary restraints

Program Administration Weaknesses - Board Staff Comments

Management

1. The Operations Manager is stretched too thin with multiple duties and sometimes needs to entrust the duties over to staff.
2. There should be one manager over licensing and one over enforcement.
3. The manager micro manages some areas of the Board and takes on too many tasks which is detrimental to the Board.

Workload

1. The workload is excessive. Staff members are doing their best but the workload never seems to slow down.
2. A fluctuation in workload impacts the front end tremendously during our Board's peak time for application submission.

Staffing

1. With limited staffing, administration processes can be backlogged.
2. We need additional office support personnel and are currently gathering data to support this.

Other

1. Some of the Board's processes are outdated.
2. Some systems are outdated (CAS, ATS, Excel tracker) and we are forced to create databases to fill in gaps.
3. There was some neglect over the years in terms of legislation, budget, fee increases, regulations, process improvements and training of staff, which has caused a lot of catch up.
4. There was some loss of knowledge when staff members retired or left.

Program Administration Weaknesses - Board Member Comments

Staffing

1. The Board does not have enough staff.
2. Everything is slower because of lack of staff.
3. Staff turnover can be an issue.
4. We do need more people to do the work that needs to be done to protect the public.
5. Lack of staff

Communication

1. We should take minutes of our meetings and send those meeting minutes and list of upcoming deadlines to all Board members after.
2. Communication in general could be improved about what is going on.
3. Board members need to support the team.

Other

1. The new EO had a learning curve, which took time.

Appendix B: Major Trends and Changes

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to trends affecting the Board collected during the surveys and interviews.

There are many factors that may impact the future direction of the Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensing professions. These trends and/or changes could be opportunities the Board may want to capitalize on or threats that the Board may want to try to mitigate.

External stakeholders, Board members and Board staff were asked to list potential changes or trends outside of the Board that they felt could impact the profession and the Board's regulatory role. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. The comments have not been edited for grammar or punctuation in order to preserve the accuracy, feeling and/or meaning the stakeholder intended when providing the comment.

Educational Standards

SLPAs

1. Encouraging the use and training of SLPAs would enhance the work of SLPs but many settings do not allow for their use and do not understand that there will never be enough SLPs to provide direct therapy to every client who needs or qualifies for therapy.
2. SLPAs need more fieldwork hours.
3. Educational requirements for SLPAs should be reviewed. Seventy hours of fieldwork versus 36 weeks of experience does not seem comparable.

Dispensers

1. Elevate dispensers' educational standards
2. For Hearing Aid Dispensing applicants, there should be some way to verify the education level required to apply for licensure. For example, a copy of high school diploma or GED as proof of qualifications.
3. Hearing Aid Dispensers should have additional educational requirements beyond a high school diploma.

Audiologists

1. The Audiology doctorate and the limited number of educational programs to meet the need for Audiologists in California is a problem; we now have two programs in California, which should help, but we may need support for more. Currently, California imports many of its Audiologists from other states, but also loses applicants due to high cost of living in California, as well as impediments to, or delays in, obtaining licensure in California.
2. Audiology education programs need to be promoted because there is going to be a shortage with current licensees retiring over the next several years.
3. There is a lack of dialogistic pediatric Audiologists to handle infants who fail mandatory hearing test. There needs to be more and better pediatric audiology training.

Continuing Education

1. License renewal should allow for a majority of credits to be earned in online study.
2. The Board does not allow credit for many CEUs we take online and instead favors in-person CEUs that are frequently less advanced in training level and less usefulness.
3. Some members would like to increase the number of self-study hours. Our state is more stringent than other states. How do you make sure the self-study is adequate? How do we do this but protect consumer?

National or State Politics

1. Limited Medicare and insurance reimbursement to professionals
2. Even with more and more insurance companies providing at least some audiology services and hearing aid benefits, the practitioner is faced with lower reimbursement and mountains of paperwork in order to comply.

3. Medicare therapy caps frequently prevent senior citizens from receiving the number of speech therapy and physical therapy visits they need in a given year.
4. It would be good to have more training on how the Affordable Care Act might impact licensees.
5. Need to build on current great relationship with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Speech-Language Pathologists have to be credentialed through the Commission as well as with the Board. The Board's relationship is vital and regulations must be parallel with the Commission.

Technology

Hearing Aid Dispensing

1. The Board regulates the sale of hearing aids, yet technology has progressed so far and the Board needs to catch up (i.e. apps on the iPhone that can make your phone a hearing aid). The Board should move towards allowing the purchase of hearing aids over-the-counter.
2. There is an increase in the sale of hearing aids on the internet, catalog and/or over-the-counter.
3. There has been an increase in internet sales of hearing aids without a license.
4. E-commerce and regulating HADs is a potential issue. We need to learn how different states handle this ecommerce issue.

Online Services

1. Being able to pay renewals online
2. The Board lags far behind in modern technology with the outdated data programs.
3. Licensees should be able to handle certain things online such as renewals and address or name changes.

Assistive Technology

1. Looking at the area of Assistive Technology, many SLPs are being asked to program and maintain communicative devices. Many do not have the technical capability to do this. Is there a way the Board can offer an endorsement to separate those who can effectively use and program technology and those who can't?
2. The area of Assistive Technology is growing and many jobs are asking for certification, though no one seems to agree what certification is best. Some people who are not SLPs are earning certification, but their education is woefully lacking in the area of language development.
3. More and more SLPs and SLPAs are using iPad/tablet app technology in their speech/language therapy sessions. My concern is specifically with therapy with preschoolers whose parents either participate in or observe our sessions with their child.
4. We have many tools that are more entry-level, low-cost technology that is not regulated (e.g., PSAPS: Personal Sound Amplifiers), available to us to ensure accurate device fitting, but many of which are not utilized by 75% or so of the professional population (e.g., real-ear, probe-microphone measures to verify hearing aid fittings) and auditory rehabilitation programs to enhance communication success of our patients.

Other

1. Protect California's pediatric hearing impaired. The Department of Health Care Services is not doing enough.
2. Increasing new technologies of ear mold impression can limit the knowledge of competency levels.

Professional Practices or Techniques

Corporations Taking Over Private Practice

1. Private practice audiology clinics, often a good source of local, personalized, and quality professional care, are suffering by the number of "big box" stores able to dispense hearing aids at a sizable discount, with which private practices are unable to compete.
2. Many practices are being bought out by, or essentially owned by, manufacturers in order to stay in the game, but are then beholden to their investors to dispense specific products and, thus, are no longer able to remain truly independent.
3. Small providers will likely have to affiliate with larger organizations to maintain a practice that is reimbursed through the Affordable Healthcare Act.
4. National corporations are coming in and taking over private practices.

HADs

1. Tympanography to confirm if a medical referral is needed would be a helpful tool for dispensers.
2. I do not understand why Hearing Aid Dispensers should be regulated by the same Board as Speech Pathologists and Audiologists.
3. For the HAD practical examination, applicants should be required to become an intern/trainee before being eligible to take the exam. This is to help preserve and ensure the safety of consumers.
4. The hearing aid profession can take and pass both the written and practical examinations by studying training materials and/or taking online courses. There are no formal vocation courses in the state to assist these potential applicants. It is strongly believed by many hearing aid licensees that these applicants should be required to intern under a licensed supervisor prior to being allowed to take the practical examination.

SLPs

1. In the public school setting, there are no caps for the number of students Speech-Language Pathologists serve. ASHA recommendations are 55 for a full caseload. This allows ample time for students to be served well and to do the paperwork required. When our school caseloads become 70 children, no one is served well. The school districts will not hire additional SLPs and they won't even pay for extra aide time, or SLPA time.

Audiologists

1. Licensed Audiologists should automatically become eligible for Hearing Aid Dispenser license without further training.

Economy

1. The reason there is a shortage of Speech Pathologists is because the work is demanding and the salary is not appropriately compensatory. The shortage will increase as the population ages and more therapists are needed for home and hospital services.
2. The high cost of living in California is a barrier to attracting and keeping licensees.
3. Need way more Audiologists and SLP graduates to meet the need
4. There is a significant Audiologist and SLP shortage, mostly because there is a shortage of programs.

Laws and Regulations

Regulations on Hearing Aid Dispensing

1. Stopping drug store over-the-counter sales of hearing aids would be good.
2. Regulate online hearing aid sales because this is a huge consumer protection issue.
3. The Board should allow Audiologists to dispense without having a dispensing license. I understand why it was set up that way, but it denies what is already within the Audiologist's scope of practice.
4. Re-examination attempts should be limited before an applicant must re-apply for licensure again. There should also be a capped number of times any applicant can take each exam before he/she is consider incompetent for the profession as a hearing aid dispenser.

Medicare

1. Medicare requirements that restrict audiology diagnostics for patients who need hearing aids
2. Limited reimbursement to Audiologists despite time-intensive services
3. Better advertising guidance would be helpful.

Tele-health

1. Need for tele-health regulations
2. Tele-practice - we don’t have regulations on it and we need to develop them

Scope of Practice

1. The Board needs to clarify scope of practice regarding, tinnitus management. Are dispensers allowed to advertise tinnitus management and advertise seeking patients with tinnitus?
2. The Board of Behavior Sciences is considering a potential licensure for applied behavior analyst, in the area of autism. The proposed regulation states that this new licensee could provide language pathology to autistic children, which would be an encroachment of Speech-Language Pathologists’ scope of practice.

Other

1. Audiologists need direct access for our consumers in order to efficiently diagnose and treat hearing and balance problems (MD referral currently required).
2. A layman's laws and regulations manual should be created.

Appendix C: Data Collection Method

Information for this survey was gathered by surveying external stakeholders, Board members and Board staff using the following methods:

- Interviews conducted with eight members of the Board, in addition to the Executive Officer, completed during the month of July 2015 to assess the challenges and opportunities the Board is currently facing or will face in the upcoming years.
- An online survey sent to Board staff to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an internal perspective. Seven Board staff participated.
- An online survey sent to several hundred randomly selected external Board stakeholders in June and July 2015 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an external perspective. Sixty-six stakeholders completed the qualitative survey and 302 completed the quantitative survey, for a total of 368 participants. The table below shows how stakeholders identified themselves in the online survey.

Stakeholders Breakdown	Number	% of Total
Professional licensee – Speech-Language Pathology	238	65%
Professional licensee – Audiology	68	18%
Professional licensee – Hearing Aid Dispenser	34	9%
Professional association	13	4%
School or college representation	11	3%
Consumer/member of the public	4	1%
TOTAL:	**368**	100%

Appendix D: Survey Data Reliability

Based on 302 external stakeholders who responded to the electronic survey, we can be 95% confident their opinions represent all California licensed Speech-Language Pathologists, Audiologists and Hearing Aid Dispensers plus or minus seven percent. For example, 81% of stakeholders rated the Board's overall licensing effectiveness as good or excellent. Based on our response rate, we can be 95% confident between 75% and 87% of stakeholders would rate the Board's effectiveness the same way.[3]

To help improve data integrity, the online survey did not provide a neutral option when asking about overall effectiveness. Instead, stakeholders completing the survey chose between a positive choice (excellent or good) and a negative choice (poor or very poor). This allows the Board to better understand whether stakeholders have a positive or negative view of the Board in various areas.

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[3] Source: University of Connecticut sample size calculator www.gifted.uconn.edu/siegle/research/samples/samplecalculator.htm

SOLID Planning Solutions is dedicated to your continual improvement and organization development.
We offer a wide array of services and programs to Boards, Boards and divisions.

Strategic Planning • Process Improvement • Planning Sessions • Meeting Facilitation
Contact us to learn more about how we can help your organization achieve a successful future.
916-574-8316 • SOLID@dca.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY& HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 263-2666 Fax: (916) 263-2668 | www.speechandhearing.ca.gov

Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Sacramento, CA
June 19, 2015

1. Call to Order

Alison Grimes, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensers Board meeting to order at 9:20a.m. Ms. Grimes called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members Present
Alison Grimes, Board Chair
Patti Solomon-Rice, Vice Chair
Jaime Lee, Public Board Member
Deane Manning, Board Member
Marcia Raggio, Board Member
Dee Parker, Board Member
Amnon Shalev, Board Member

Staff Present
Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer
Breanne Humphries, Program Manager
Sabina Knight, Legal Counsel
Anita Joseph, Enforcement Coordinator
Karen Robison, Enforcement Analyst
Marti Shaffer, Enforcement Analyst

Guests Present
Vanessa Cajina, KP Public Affairs for Hearing Healthcare Providers (HHP)
Cynthia Peppers, Hearing Healthcare Providers
Michelle Stout, Department of Consumer Affairs, Executive Office

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

There were no comments from Public/Outside Agencies/Associations.

3. Approval of the March 11, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes

M/S/C Manning/Solomon-Rice

- **Approve the Board meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried 7-0**

4. Consideration of Recommendations of Ad Hoc Committee regarding English-Language Competency and Foreign-Trained Applicants

Ms. Solomon-Rice updated the Board on the English-Language Competency and Foreign-Trained Applicant steps that the SLP Ad Hoc Committee proposed. The Board discussed consumer protection, short and long term goals, recommended academic courses and a combined effort working on guidelines to set intelligibility standards and oral and written English proficiency.

5. Consideration of Recommendations of Ad Hoc Committee regarding Speech-Language Pathology Assistant Supervision Requirements and Audits

The Speech-Language Pathology Assistant Supervision Requirements and Audits is tabled until further notice.

6. Update and Possible Action on Process Issues and Delays with California Children's Services

Ms. Grimes informed the Board that children covered by California Children's Services are struggling with enrollment and reimbursement issues since the service type was changed from medical service provider to a PPO provider and that cases and authorizations are not being reviewed by a licensed audiologist. Ms. Grimes is requesting the Board send a letter to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) requesting a meeting to address these issues. Sending a letter to DHCS addressing these issues was discussed.

M/S/C Shalev/Raggio

- **Ms. Allison Grimes and Ms. Marcia Raggio draft a letter to DHCS. The motion carried 7-0**

7. Update on Status of Request to the FDA for Exemption from Pre-Emption of Requirements - Mail Order and Catalog Hearing Aid Sales

The Exemption from Pre-Emption of Requirements - Mail Order and Catalog Hearing Aid Sales request is still under review by the FDA.

8. Discussion and Possible Recommendation for an Increase in the Number of Self-Study Hours for Continuing Education

The Board discussed increasing the amount of self-study hours allowed per renewal cycle. Included in the discussion was raising the allowed amount of self-study to 50% of the required CE, passing a post course examination and to not allow CE that promotes a specific product.

M/S/C Solomon-Rice/Raggio

- **Direct staff to draft proposed language. The motion carried 7-0**

9. Proposed Regulations – Discussion and Possible Action
   a. Title 16, CCR, Sections 1399.152, 1399.153, 1399.170, 1399.170.4, 1399.170.6, 1399.170.10, 1399.170.11, 1399.170.15 - Speech-Language Pathology Assistant/Supervised Clinical Experience

The Board requested changes to the proposed language to included age ranges and the specific settings the clinical experience needs to be obtained in.

   b. Title 16, CCR, Sections 1399.154.1-1399.154.8 - Speech-Language Pathology or Audiology Aides

M/S/C Raggio/Solomon-Rice

- **Delegate staff and Ms. Raggio to rework language. The motion carries 7-0**

   c. Title 16, CCR, Section 1399.157 - Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Fees

M/S/C Parker/Shalev

- **Delegate to staff to make non-substantive changes and move forward with the Rulemaking package. The motion carries 7-0**

   d. Title 16, CCR, Section 1399.129 - Hearing Aid Dispenser Examination and Licensing Fees

M/S/C Manning/Parker

- **Delegate to staff to make non-substantive changes and move forward with the Rulemaking package. The motion carries 7-0**

   e. Title 16 CCR, Division 13.3 - Hearing Aid Dispensers - Non-substantive, Technical Changes

M/S/C Solomon-Rice/Manning

- **Delegate to staff to make non-substantive changes and move forward with the Rulemaking package. The motion carries 7-0**

   f. Title 16 CCR, Division 13.4 - Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology - Non-substantive, Technical Changes

M/S/C Solomon-Rice/Manning

- **Delegate to staff to make non-substantive changes and move forward with the Rulemaking package. The motion carries 7-0**

10. Executive Officer's Report
    a. Administration Update

Mr. Sanchez introduced all staff to the Board. He informed the Board that the first phase of CPS-HR Consulting has commenced. Mr. Sanchez reminded the Board that Strategic Planning will be held at the August Board meeting.

    b. Budget Report

Mr. Sanchez updated the Board on the budget condition.

    c. Licensing Report
    d. Practical Examination Report
    e. Enforcement Report

11. Review and Approval of Proposed Board Manual

Mr. Sanchez stated that most Boards have a manual which is given out to orient and train new Board members as well as keeping important documents and information at hand for existing Board members to access. The SLPAHAD does not have a Board Manual at this time. A draft of the Proposed Board Manual is expected to be distributed by November.

12. Legislation Update, Review, and Possible Action

Information regarding proposed legislation that may impact the Board can be brought to our attention by anyone and included in the Board materials. Currently, an analyst from DCA's Legislation Office helps locate pending legislation that could potentially impact the Board or DCA. The Board is not required to act on any proposed legislation but may want to take a position if deemed necessary.

    a. AB 12 (Cooley) State Government: Administrative Regulations: Review
       Watch
    b. AB 85 (Wilk) Open Meetings
       Watch
    c. AB 259 (Dababneh) Personal Information: Privacy
    d. AB 333 (Melendez) Healing Arts: Continuing Education
    e. AB 483 (Patterson) Healing Arts: Initial License Fees: Proration
       SLPAHAD is being removed
    f. AB 507 (Olsen) Department of Consumer Affairs: BreEZe System: Annual Report
    g. AB 750 (Low) Business and Professions: Licenses
    h. AB 964 (Chau) Civil Law: Privacy
    i. AB 1060 (Bonilla) Professions and Vocations: Licensure
    j. SB 570 (Jackson) Personal Information: Privacy: Breach
    k. SB 467 (Hill) Professions and Vocations

13. Election of Board Officers

Mr. Sanchez gave an overview of the election process and the rolls of the Chair and Vice-chair of the Board. He noted that elections are required to be held on an annual basis.

Ms. Grimes was nominated to the position of Chair.

M/S/C Solomon-Rice/Shalev

- **The Board voted on the nomination of Ms. Grimes to the position of Chair. The motion carried 7-0**

Ms. Solomon-Rice was nominated to the position of Vice-chair.

M/S/C

- **The Board voted on the nomination of Ms. Solomon-Rice to the position of Vice-chair. The motion carried 7-0**

14. Discussion of Executive Officer Evaluation Process

The annual Executive Officer performance evaluation is due. The evaluation form including instructions and due dates will be distributed to the Board. Ms. Grimes and Mr. Manning will work together on the evaluation.

15. Future Agenda Items and Future Board Meeting Dates
    a. August 20-21, 2015 - San Francisco
    b. November 5-6, 2015 - San Diego
    c. February 4-5, 2016 - Sacramento
    d. May 11-12, 2016 (Location to be determined)

Closed Session

16. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c) (3), the Board will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate on Disciplinary Matters

1C-2010-155
Stipulated Settlement - Adopted

1I-2012-66
Stipulated Settlement - Adopted

Return to Open Session

17. The Board meeting adjourned at 2:40p.m.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY& HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 263-2666 Fax: (916) 263-2668 | www.speechandhearing.ca.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE	August 10, 2015
TO	Speech Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
FROM	Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer
SUBJECT	**Executive Officer Report**

This report and the information provided by staff is an update on the current operations of the Board.

Administration/Personnel/Staffing

Lisa Snelling was recently promoted to a Staff Services Analyst. Ms. Snelling has been a great addition to the Board office recently serving as one of our administrative assistants. In her new role Ms. Snelling will be handling licensing duties. In addition, she will be cross-trained with other licensing and examination staff.

CPS-HR Consulting Workload Assessment – Board office staff have been working with CPS-HR Consulting on workload assessment. The project is still underway with an anticipated September 2015 completion date.

Budget

Included in your Board materials are Revenue and Expenditure Reports which reflect the final month of the 2014-15 budget year. Based on this report, the Board expended $1.89 million (96 percent of our budget), which was on target with the Board's projections. Our revenue report shows a slight increase in most categories with Board revenue for the year totaling $1.87 million.

Proposed Increase in Staffing – The Board submitted a budget change proposal (BCP) to address the Board's lengthy licensing process times and to eliminate the licensing backlog. BCPs are detailed, data-based reports that are used to request establishment of new civil service positions and additional funding to State departments or programs. The submission of a BCP must be approved by DCA and Agency prior to being submitted to the Department of Finance. Our goal is to be adequately staffed to handle the workload in all business areas of the Board. We will continue to work with the DCA Budgets Office to

successfully submit our proposal and ultimately meet the Board's resource and staffing needs.

Licensing/Exams/Enforcement

Included in your Board materials are statistical reports for your review. Management and staff will be present at the Board meeting to answer any questions you have regarding these reports.

Examinations – On July 11, 2015, Board staff administered a Hearing Aid Dispensers Practical Examination in Sacramento. This was the second of four planned examinations for the 2015 calendar year. The next examinations will take place in October and November. We have included a July examination report in your Board materials.

Disciplinary Actions – During the 2014-15 fiscal year, the Board referred 13 cases to the Office of the Attorney General for formal discipline. There are currently 23 formal discipline cases pending with the Attorney General's Office.

The following disciplinary actions were adopted by the Board in fiscal year 2014-15:

Name	License No.	License Type	Effective Date	Action Taken
McPeak, Chelsea	SP 11389	Speech-Language Pathologist	June 18, 2015	Revocation of license.
Crocker, Taran	HA 7542	Hearing Aid Dispenser	June 12, 2015	Revocation stayed, seven years of probation with specified terms and conditions.
Amy x, Jon A.	HA 3433	Hearing Aid Dispenser	May 16, 2015	Revocation of license.
Dizon, Mara	SP 16564	Speech-Language Pathologist	April 16, 2015	Stipulated surrender of license.
Austin, Jennifer	SP 22833	Speech-Language Pathologist	April 12, 2015	Revocation stayed, five years of probation with specified terms and conditions.
Marquis, Aaron	HA 3617	Hearing Aid Dispenser	February 14, 2015	Revocation of license.
Lough, Jinger	SP 17687	Speech-Language Pathologist	March 13, 2015	Revocation stayed, three years of probation with specified terms and conditions.

Name	License No.	License Type	Effective Date	Action Taken
Starch, Sandra	SP 5707	Speech-Language Pathologist	November 9, 2014	Revocation of license.
Gray, Denise	SP 14125	Speech-Language Pathologist	September 15, 2014	Revocation of license.
Watson, Jacqueline	SPA 2783	Speech-Language Pathology Assistant	July 28, 2014	Revocation stayed, two years of probation with specified terms and conditions.

Probation – The Board is currently monitoring 20 active probationers and seven tolled probationers.

Licensing – We are currently at the peak period of our licensing season. At this time, we are taking up to six weeks to license speech-language pathology and audiology applicants. In June, Bonnie McSweeney, on loan from DCA, completed her assignment of assisting the Board with licensing and returned to DCA. Even though it is a decline from our previous report in June, it is a significant improvement from our previous year at this time.

The following table included Board licensing timeframes:

Process	Timeframe 3/1/2015	Timeframe 6/1/2015	Timeframe 8/1/2015
SPL and AU Licensing application	6 weeks	3 weeks	6 weeks
Review and process supporting licensing documents	8 weeks	2 weeks	6 weeks
Review and process RPE applicant's verification forms for full licensure	4 weeks	1 day	6 weeks
HADs	11 weeks	3 weeks	5 weeks

Regulations Update

The Board has three draft regulatory packages for your review and approval. The Board is currently preparing six approved regulatory packages for the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).

The following is a summary of the status of each package along with target completion and submission dates:

1. RPE Clock Hours:
   - Proposed Language, Notice and Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) to EO 8/3/15
   - Returned August 4, 2015
   - Proposed Language to Board at August Board meeting

2. Self-Study Hours:
   - Proposed Language, Notice and ISOR to EO for review August 5, 2015
   - Returned August 4, 2015
   - Proposed Language to Board at August Board meeting

3. HAD Advertising:
   - Submitted Proposed Language, Notice and ISOR to Legal Counsel December 23, 2014
   - Documents return with legal counsel's comments January 8 and 9, 2014.
   - Review legal counsel's comments and make changes by June 2015
   - Reworked language to make non-substantive changes to language
   - Working on Notice and ISOR
   - Target submission with OAL September 2015

4. HAD CE:
   - Submitted to OAL on November 25, 2014
   - Published on January 5, 2015
   - 45 day comment period over on January 19, 2015
   - Review 2 comments received during the 45 day comment period
   - Will need to go out for 15 day comment period for CE application addition
   - (Form #, rev date)
   - Target 15 day comment period start date August 31, 2015
   - Final Filing Date is November 25, 2015

5. SLPA:
   - Proposed Language to Board for approval June 19, 2015
   - Proposed Language, Notice and ISOR to EO for Review 7/30/15
   - Returned August 4, 2015
   - Final Review to EO 8/10/15
   - Target submission with OAL August 18, 2015

6. HAD Fees:
   - Proposed Language to Board for approval June 19, 2015
   - Approved by Board at June Board meeting
   - Final Review to EO 8/11/15
   - Target to submission with OAL August 18, 2015

7. HAD Non-Substantive Changes:
   - Proposed Language to Board for approval June 19, 2015
   - Approved by Board at June meeting
   - Target submission with OAL August 18, 2015

8. SLP & AU Non-Substantive Changes:
   - Proposed Language to Board for Approval June 19, 2015
   - Approved by Board at June meeting
   - Target submission with OAL August 18, 2015

9. SLP & AU Fees:
   - Proposed Language to Board for approval June 19, 2015
   - Approved by Board at June meeting
   - Working on Notice and ISOR
   - Target submission with OAL September 2015

10. Uniform Standards/Disciplinary Guidelines:
    - Disciplinary Guidelines last published in 1997 for Hearing Aid Dispensers and 2004 for Speech Language Pathologists and Audiologists
    - Working on Notice and Initial Statement of Reasons
    - Updated effective date on Guidelines from 2012 to 2016 and need to move rationale from language to Notice and ISOR.
    - Working with Enforcement staff and DCA Legal Counsel to revise language for Board approval (*DCA Legal requested that we hold off on this proposal for further direction until further notice.)
    - Target submission date with OAL will be late 2015

Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board - 0376
BUDGET REPORT
FY 2014-15 EXPENDITURE PROJECTION

FISCAL MONTH 13

OBJECT DESCRIPTION	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL EXPENDITURES (MONTH 13)	FY 2013-14 PRIOR YEAR EXPENDITURES 6/30/2014	FY 2014-15 BUDGET STONE 2014-15	FY 2014-15 CURRENT YEAR EXPENDITURES 6/30/2015	FY 2014-15 PERCENT SPENT	FY 2014-15 PROJECTIONS TO YEAR END	FY 2014-15 UNENCUMBERED BALANCE
PERSONNEL SERVICES							
Salary & Wages (Staff)	350,858	350,858	**444,656**	391,673	88%	**391,673**	52,983
Statutory Exempt (EO)	79,405	79,405	**79,524**	82,680	104%	**82,680**	(3,156)
Temp Help Reg (Seasonals)	3,316	3,316	**876**	54,350	6204%	**54,350**	(53,474)
Temp Help (Exam Proctors)	475	475		4,592		**4,592**	(4,592)
Board Member Per Diem			**5,854**		0%		5,854
Committee Members (DEC)	5,100	5,100		4,100		**4,100**	(4,100)
Overtime	12,235	12,235		18,128		**18,128**	(18,128)
Staff Benefits	182,185	182,185	**243,165**	228,845	94%	**228,845**	14,320
TOTALS, PERSONNEL SVC	**633,574**	**633,574**	**774,075**	**784,368**	**101%**	**784,368**	(10,293)
OPERATING EXPENSE AND EQUIPMENT							
General Expense	11,356	11,356	**47,627**	19,009	40%	**19,009**	28,618
Fingerprint Reports	13,696	13,696	**28,439**	20,635	73%	**20,635**	7,804
Minor Equipment	8,234	8,234	**3,050**	3,406	112%	**3,406**	(356)
Printing	8,653	8,653	**24,393**	3,667	15%	**3,667**	20,726
Communication	5,043	5,043	**17,027**	3,097	18%	**3,097**	13,930
Postage	24,062	24,062	**23,340**	26,374	113%	**26,374**	(3,034)
Insurance			**144**	0	0%	**0**	144
Travel In State	16,196	16,196	**34,162**	31,425	92%	**31,425**	2,737
Travel, Out-of-State			**0**	0		**0**	0
Training			**5,802**	465	8%	**465**	5,337
Facilities Operations	60,083	60,083	**112,569**	65,835	58%	**65,835**	46,734
Utilities			**0**	0		**0**	0
C & P Services - Interdept.			**23,890**	5,377	23%	**5,377**	18,513
C & P Services - External	363	363	**0**	1,325		**1,325**	(1,325)
DEPARTMENTAL SERVICES:							
Departmental Pro Rata	171,051	171,051	**160,036**	159,192	99%	**159,192**	844
Admin/Exec	87,432	87,432	**98,058**	98,480	100%	**98,480**	(422)
Interagency Services			**29,093**	0	0%	**0**	29,093
IA w/ OPES	67,996	67,996	**0**	62,976		**62,976**	(62,976)
DOI-ProRata Internal	2,780	2,780	**3,066**	2,679	87%	**2,679**	387
Public Affairs Office	3,241	3,241	**2,997**	3,109	104%	**3,109**	(112)
CCED	35,893	35,893	**3,259**	3,004	92%	**3,004**	255
INTERAGENCY SERVICES:							
Consolidated Data Center	193	193	**8,932**	224	3%	**224**	8,708
DP Maintenance & Supply	3,902	3,902	**17,077**	2,901	17%	**2,901**	14,176
Central Admin Svc-ProRata	59,269	59,269	**79,026**	79,026	100%	**79,026**	0
EXAM EXPENSES:							0
Exam Supplies			**0**	0		**0**	0
Exam Freight			**0**	0		**0**	0
Exam Site Rental	2,232	2,232	**7,663**	4,149	54%	**4,149**	3,514
C/P Svcs-External Expert Administrative	9,995	9,995	**25,542**	10,445	41%	**10,445**	15,097
C/P Svcs-External Expert Examiners			**37,913**	0	0%	**0**	37,913
C/P Svcs-External Subject Matter	40,079	40,079	**0**	68,725		**68,725**	(68,725)
ENFORCEMENT:							
Attorney General	84,005	84,005	**90,567**	152,182	168%	**152,182**	(61,615)
Office Admin. Hearings	16,021	16,021	**21,749**	14,423	66%	**14,423**	7,326
Court Reporters	1,202	1,202	**0**	1,258		**1,258**	(1,258)
Evidence/Witness Fees	19,153	19,153	**7,428**	7,050	95%	**7,050**	378
DOI - Investigations	214,031	214,031	**291,649**	283,575	97%	**283,575**	8,074
Major Equipment			**0**	3,860		**3,860**	(3,860)
Other - Clothing & Pers Supp			**0**	0		**0**	0
Special Items of Expense			**0**	0		**0**	0
Other (Vehicle Operations)			**15,000**	0		**0**	15,000
TOTALS, OE&E	966,161	966,161	**1,219,498**	1,137,873	93%	**1,137,873**	81,625
TOTAL EXPENSE	1,599,735	1,599,735	**1,993,573**	1,922,241	96%	**1,922,241**	71,332
Sched. Reimb. - Fingerprints	(16,635)	(16,635)	**(31,000)**	(18,326)	59%	**(29,802)**	(1,198)
Sched. Reimb. - Other	(5,415)	(5,415)	**(2,000)**	(4,465)	223%	**(2,000)**	0
Distributed							0
Unsched. Reimb. - Other	(32,613)	(32,613)		(9,011)			0
NET APPROPRIATION	1,545,072	1,545,072	**1,960,573**	1,890,439	96%	**1,890,439**	**70,134**
						SURPLUS/(DEFICIT):	**3.6%**

Speech

Revenue Projection

2014-15

Input in Blue Shaded Cells Only

Month: Jun

Month Number: 13

Mos. Remaining: -1

DO NOT INPUT DATA ON THIS SPREADSHEET!

		FY 12-13		FY 13-14		FY 14-15			Projection Formulas		Comments
		6/30/13 YTD	Month 13	6/30/14 YTD	Month 13	Budgeted	6/30/15 YTD	Projection	PY Ratio	SL Projection	
Speech Reimbursements:											
991937		$ 21,335	$ 24,245	$ 21,585	$ 21,585	$ 33,000	$ 22,350	$ 22,350	$ 22,350	$ 20,631	
991937 01	Scheduled Reimbursements/Fingerprints	$ 15,920	$ 15,920	$ 16,170	$ 16,170		$ 17,885	$ 17,885	$ 17,885	$ 16,509	PY Ratio
991937 02	Scheduled Reimbursements/External	$ 5,415	$ 8,325	$ 5,415	$ 5,415		$ 4,465	$ 4,465	$ 4,465	$ 4,122	PY Ratio
995988		$ 11,474	$ 11,474	$ 32,613	$ 32,613	$ -	$ 6,986	$ 6,986	$ 6,986	$ 6,449	
995988 00	Unsch - External/Other	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
995988 01	Unsch - Investigative Cost Recovery	$ 11,474	$ 11,474	$ 32,613	$ 32,613		$ 6,986	$ 6,986	$ 6,986	$ 6,449	Estimate
Total Reimbursements:		$ 32,809	$ 35,719	$ 54,198	$ 54,198	$ 33,000	$ 29,336	$ 29,336	$ 29,336	$ 27,079	
Speech Revenue:											
125600		$ 19,714	$ 19,714	$ 13,665	$ 13,665	$ 25,000	$ 16,905	$ 16,905	$ 14,905	$ 15,605	
125600 SD	*Letter of Good Standing	$ 5,389	$ 5,389	$ 5,440	$ 5,440	$ -	$ 5,880	$ 5,880	$ 5,880	$ 5,428	PY Ratio
125600 5H	Citation and Fine	$ 7,000	$ 7,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ -	$ 1,846	Estimate
125600 5T	Duplicate Renewal License	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125600 5W	Duplicate License	$ 7,325	$ 7,325	$ 8,225	$ 8,225	$ -	$ 9,025	$ 9,025	$ 9,025	$ 8,331	PY Ratio
125700		$ 94,286	$ 94,286	$ 97,219	$ 97,219	$ 291,000	$ 115,667	$ 115,667	$ 115,332	$ 106,770	
125700 D8	Cont. Prof. Develop Provider	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ 4,400	$ 4,400		$ 4,600	$ 4,600	$ 4,600	$ 4,246	PY Ratio
125700 H2	Temporary License- SP	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 H3	Temporary License- AU	$ 120	$ 120	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 N1	**Speech Assistant App. Fee	$ 20,600	$ 20,600	$ 19,500	$ 19,500		$ 28,600	$ 28,600	$ 28,600	$ 26,400	PY Ratio
125700 01	Refunded Reimbursements	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 5S	Application Fee - Speech	$ 38,605	$ 38,605	$ 39,585	$ 39,585		$ 45,500	$ 45,500	$ 45,500	$ 42,000	PY Ratio
125700 5T	Initial License Fee - Speech	$ 28,510	$ 28,510	$ 27,725	$ 27,725		$ 31,900	$ 31,900	$ 31,900	$ 29,446	PY Ratio
125700 5U	Aide Registration	$ 630	$ 630	$ 510	$ 510		$ 530	$ 530	$ 530	$ 489	PY Ratio
125700 5V	Application Fee - Audiology	$ 2,590	$ 2,590	$ 3,325	$ 3,325		$ 2,520	$ 2,520	$ 2,520	$ 2,326	PY Ratio
125700 5W	Initial License Fee - Audiology	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ 2,375	$ 2,375		$ 1,800	$ 1,800	$ 1,800	$ 1,662	PY Ratio
125700 8V	App Fee - Dispensing Audiologist $2	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 90	Over/Short Fees	$ 61	$ 61	$ 17	$ 17		$ 52	$ 52	$ 52	$ 48	PY Ratio
125700 91	Suspended Revenue	$ 75	$ 75	$ -	$ -		$ 335	$ 335	$ -	$ 309	Estimate
125700 92	Prior Year Revenue Adjustment	$ (905)	$ (905)	$ (218)	$ (218)		$ (170)	$ (170)	$ (170)	$ (157)	PY Ratio
125800		$ 750,612	$ 750,072	$ 780,788	$ 780,195	$ 1,332,000	$ 803,707	$ 803,462	$ 734,692	$ 678,403	
125800 A2	Temp Lic Renewal - SP	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 A3	Revewal-Temporary License AU	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 A6	SPA Assistant Renewal	$ 54,300	$ 54,300	$ 56,025	$ 56,025		$ 68,770	$ 68,770	$ 68,770	$ 63,480	PY Ratio
125800 BJ	Biennial Renewal Fee - SP	$ 616,610	$ 616,610	$ 681,795	$ 681,795		$ 663,071	$ 663,071	$ 663,071	$ 612,066	PY Ratio
125800 BK	Biennial Renewal Fee - AU	$ 67,550	$ 67,550	$ 29,370	$ 29,370		$ 60,610	$ 60,610	$ 60,610	$ 55,948	PY Ratio
125800 RM	Continuing Prof. Devel. Renew	$ 11,600	$ 11,600	$ 13,000	$ 13,000		$ 11,000	$ 11,000	$ 11,000	$ 10,154	PY Ratio
125800 8V	Biennial Renewal - DAU	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 8W	Ann Ren-Dispensing Audiologist	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 90	Over/Short Fees	$ 12	$ 12	$ 5	$ 5		$ 11	$ 11	$ 11	$ 10	PY Ratio
125800 C1	Automated Revenue Refund Claim	$ 540	$ -	$ 593	$ -		$ 245	$ -	$ -	$ 226	
125900		$ 15,250	$ 15,250	$ 14,325	$ 14,325	$ 18,000	$ 16,875	$ 16,875	$ 16,875	$ 15,577	
125900 DE	Delinq. Renewal - SPA	$ 2,725	$ 2,725	$ 1,675	$ 1,675		$ 2,925	$ 2,925	$ 2,925	$ 2,700	PY Ratio
125900 5U	Delinq. Renewal - SP	$ 11,875	$ 11,875	$ 12,100	$ 12,100		$ 13,300	$ 13,300	$ 13,300	$ 12,277	PY Ratio
125900 5V	Delinq. Renewal - AU	$ 650	$ 650	$ 550	$ 550		$ 650	$ 650	$ 650	$ 600	PY Ratio
125900 8V	Delinq. Renewal - DAU	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
142500		$ 15	$ 15	$ 626	$ 626	$ 1,000	$ 445	$ 445	$ 445	$ 411	
142500	Misc. Services to the Public	$ 15	$ 15	$ 626	$ 626		$ 445	$ 445	$ 445	$ 411	Estimate
150300		$ 2,231	$ 2,823	$ 1,719	$ 2,374	$ 5,000	$ 2,409	$ 3,409	$ 3,327	$ 2,224	
150300 00	Income from Surplus Money Invest.	$ 2,231	$ 2,823	$ 1,719	$ 2,374		$ 2,409	$ 3,409	$ 3,327	$ 2,224	Estimate

161000		**$ 1,230**	**$ 1,230**	**$ 704**	**$ 704**	**$ 1,000**	**$ 604**	**$ 604**	**$ 604**	**$ 558**	
161000 02	Revenue Cancelled Warrants	$ 1,230	$ 1,230	$ 704	$ 704		$ 604	$ 604	$ 604	$ 558	PY Ratio
161400		**$ 525**	**$ 525**	**$ 682**	**$ 682**	**$ 1,000**	**$ 575**	**$ 575**	**$ 575**	**$ 531**	
161400 91	Dishonored Check Fee	$ 525	$ 525	$ 547	$ 547		$ 400	$ 400	$ 400	$ 369	PY Ratio
161400 FT	Misc Revenue FTB Collection	$ -	$ -	$ 135	$ 135		$ 175	$ 175	$ 175	$ 162	PY Ratio
Total Revenue:		**$ 883,863**	**$ 883,915**	**$ 909,728**	**$ 909,790**	**$ 1,674,000**	**$ 957,187**	**$ 957,942**	**$ 886,755**	**$ 820,077**	

Total:	**$ 916,672**	**$ 919,634**	**$ 963,926**	**$ 963,989**	**$ 1,707,000**	**$ 986,523**	**$ 987,278**	**$ 916,091**	**$ 847,157**	

*SB 2021, Statutes of 2002, Effective January 1, 2003 provided the Board the authority to collect fees for issuing Letters of Good Standing. The fee was established by regulation CCR Section 1399.157(e) in the amount of $10.00

**Significant spike in speech assistant applications in 02/03 due to expiraton of grandfathering clause as of June 1, 2003. Number of applications drastically decreased in FY 03/04 and will level off in future years.

HADB

Month: Jun

Month Number: 13

Revenue Projection

Mos. Remaining: -1

2014-15

DO NOT INPUT DATA ON THIS SPREADSHEET!

		FY 12/13		FY 13/14		FY 14/15			Projection Formulas		Comments
Revenue Code:		**6/30/13 YTD**	**Month 13**	**6/30/14 YTD**	**Month 13**	**Budgeted**	**6/30/15 YTD**	**Projection**	**PY Ratio**	**SL Projection**	
HADB Reimbursements:											
991913		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
991913 00	Scheduled Interdepartmental	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -		$ -	$ -	
991937		**$ 147**	**$ 147**	**$ 465**	**$ 465**	**$ -**	**$ 441**	**$ 441**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
991937 01	Fingerprint Reports	$ 147	$ 147	$ 465	$ 465		$ 441	$ 441	$ 441	$ 407	PY Ratio
991937 02	Scheduled Reimbursements/External	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
995988		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 2,025**	**$ 2,025**	**$ -**	**$ 1,869**	
995988 01	Unsch - Investigative Cost Recovery	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ 2,025	$ 2,025	$ -	$ 1,869	Estimate
Total Reimbursements:		**$ 147**	**$ 147**	**$ 465**	**$ 465**	**$ -**	**$ 2,466**	**$ 2,466**	**$ -**	**$ 1,869**	
HADB Revenue:											
125600		**$ 10,887**	**$ 10,887**	**$ 10,470**	**$ 10,470**	**$ -**	**$ 11,405**	**$ 11,405**	**$ 11,405**	**$ 10,528**	
125600 00	Other Regulatory Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125600 3M	Replacement Lic $25	$ 575	$ 575	$ 850	$ 850		$ 1,075	$ 1,075	$ 1,075	$ 992	PY Ratio
125600 3N	Official Lic cert $15	$ 465	$ 465	$ 675	$ 675		$ 2,430	$ 2,430	$ 2,430	$ 2,243	PY Ratio
125600 3R	License Confirmation Letter $10	$ 10	$ 10	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125600 5X	Cite and Fine	$ 9,837	$ 9,837	$ 8,945	$ 8,945		$ 7,900	$ 7,900	$ 7,900	$ 7,292	Estimate
125600 92	Prior Year Adj	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700		**$ 202,815**	**$ 202,815**	**$ 194,060**	**$ 194,060**	**$ -**	**$ 303,418**	**$ 303,418**	**$ 304,093**	**$ 280,078**	
125700 00	Other Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 F2	HAD Acct-Written Exam Fee $225	$ 65,300	$ 65,300	$ 79,650	$ 79,650		$ 81,000	$ 81,000	$ 81,000	$ 74,769	PY Ratio
125700 F3	HAD Acct-Practical Exam Fee $500	$ 60,275	$ 60,275	$ 36,000	$ 36,000		$ 115,000	$ 115,000	$ 115,000	$ 106,154	PY Ratio
125700 3N	Initial App Fee - $75	$ 11,250	$ 11,250	$ 17,700	$ 17,700		$ 19,575	$ 19,575	$ 19,575	$ 18,069	PY Ratio
125700 3P	Initial License - $280	$ 23,520	$ 23,520	$ 6,440	$ 6,440		$ 31,135	$ 31,135	$ 31,135	$ 28,740	PY Ratio
125700 3S	CE Provider App - $50	$ 27,340	$ 27,340	$ 25,500	$ 25,500		$ 25,750	$ 25,750	$ 25,750	$ 23,769	PY Ratio
125700 38	Initial Temp Lic $100	$ 1,000	$ 1,000	$ 900	$ 900		$ 1,600	$ 1,600	$ 1,600	$ 1,477	PY Ratio
125700 39	Initial Branch Lic $25	$ 4,375	$ 4,375	$ 7,100	$ 7,100		$ 11,000	$ 11,000	$ 11,000	$ 10,154	PY Ratio
125700 42	Initial TraineeLicense - Hearing Aid Disp	$ 10,100	$ 10,100	$ 15,700	$ 15,700		$ 17,400	$ 17,400	$ 17,400	$ 16,062	PY Ratio
125700 56	Practical Exam - HAD $285	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 59	Written Exam - HAD $100	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125700 8V	App Fee-Dispensing Augiologist $2	$ -	$ -	$ 4,760	$ 4,760		$ 560	$ 560	$ 560	$ 517	PY Ratio
125700 90	Over/Short Fees	$ 5	$ 5	$ 5	$ 5		$ 8	$ 8	$ 8	$ 7	PY Ratio
125700 91	Suspended Revenue	$ -	$ -	$ 305	$ 305		$ 1,065	$ 1,065	$ 1,065	$ 983	PY Ratio
125700 92	Prior Year Adj	$ (350)	$ (350)	$ -	$ -		$ (675)	$ (675)	$ -	$ (623)	Estimate
125800		**$ 488,039**	**$ 487,989**	**$ 551,838**	**$ 551,788**	**$ -**	**$ 558,132**	**$ 558,107**	**$ 558,107**	**$ 515,199**	
125800 00	Renewal Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 3M	Temp Lic Renewal - $100	$ 10,425	$ 10,425	$ 12,200	$ 12,200		$ 18,600	$ 18,600	$ 18,600	$ 17,169	PY Ratio
125800 3P	Annual Renewal - HAD $280	$ 245,255	$ 245,255	$ 254,040	$ 254,040		$ 246,682	$ 246,682	$ 246,682	$ 227,706	PY Ratio
125800 3T	Branch Lic Renewal - $25	$ 12,875	$ 12,875	$ 12,950	$ 12,950		$ 14,675	$ 14,675	$ 14,675	$ 13,546	PY Ratio
125800 3Y	Bien Ren - P&S - One Time Credit	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 8V	Bien Ren - Dispensing Audiologist	$ 36,314	$ 36,314	$ 50,800	$ 50,800		$ 54,150	$ 54,150	$ 54,150	$ 49,985	PY Ratio
125800 8W	Ann Ren-Dispensing Audiologist	$ 183,120	$ 183,120	$ 221,798	$ 221,798		$ 224,000	$ 224,000	$ 224,000	$ 206,769	PY Ratio
125800 90	Over/Short Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125800 C1	Automated Revenue Refund Claim	$ 50	$ -	$ 50	$ -		$ 25	$ -	$ -	$ 23	
125900		**$ 4,125**	**$ 4,125**	**$ 3,725**	**$ 3,725**	**$ -**	**$ 4,625**	**$ 4,625**	**$ 4,625**	**$ 4,269**	
125900 00	Delq. Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
125900 3J	Delq. Ren - HAD $25	$ 2,175	$ 2,175	$ 1,775	$ 1,775		$ 1,825	$ 1,825	$ 1,825	$ 1,685	PY Ratio
125900 3K	Delq. Ren - Temp Lic HAD $25	$ 350	$ 350	$ 350	$ 350		$ 350	$ 350	$ 350	$ 323	PY Ratio
125900 3L	Delq. Ren - Branch Lic $25	$ 575	$ 575	$ 625	$ 625		$ 1,400	$ 1,400	$ 1,400	$ 1,292	PY Ratio

		FY 12/13		FY 13/14		FY 14/15			Projection Formulas		Comments
125900 8V	Delq. Ren - Dispensing Audiologist	$ 1,025	$ 1,025	$ 975	$ 975		$ 1,050	$ 1,050	$ 1,050	$ 969	PY Ratio
142500		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
142500 90	Misc Services to the Public	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
150300		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
150300 00	Income from Surplus Invest.	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
160400		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
160400 00	Sale of Fixed Assets	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
161000		**$ 125**	**$ 125**	**$ 610**	**$ 610**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
161000 02	Revenue Cancled Warrants	$ 125	$ 125	$ 610	$ 610		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
161400		**$ 187**	**$ 187**	**$ 110**	**$ 110**	**$ -**	**$ 130**	**$ 130**	**$ 130**	**$ 120**	
161400 FT	Misc Revenue FTB Collection	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
161400 TB	Misc Revenue FTB	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
161400 00	Misc Revenue	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
161400 90	Misc Income	$ 27	$ 27	$ 10	$ 10		$ 80	$ 80	$ 80	$ 74	PY Ratio
161400 91	Dishonored Check Fee	$ 160	$ 160	$ 100	$ 100		$ 50	$ 50	$ 50	$ 46	PY Ratio
302080		**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	
302080 00	Tr From Hearing Aid Dispensers'	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
Totals Revenue:		**$ 706,178**	**$ 706,128**	**$ 760,813**	**$ 760,763**	**$ -**	**$ 877,710**	**$ 877,685**	**$ 878,360**	**$ 810,194**	

Total:		**$ 706,325**	**$ 706,275**	**$ 761,278**	**$ 761,228**	**$ -**	**$ 880,176**	**$ 880,151**	**$ 878,360**	**$ 812,063**	

Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensers Board

As of June 30, 2015

Licenses Issued

LICENSES ISSUED	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15
AU	57	55	76	57	89
AUT	2	1	1	0	0
DAU	78	20	19	UA	UA
SLP	734	911	1056	974	1143
SPT	1	0	0	0	0
SLPA	312	346	407	325	550
RPE'S	513	667	727	702	836
AIDES	52	44	51	40	48
CPD PROVIDERS	15	16	9	15	17
HAD Permanent	50	91	84	49	92
HAD Trainees	77	94	95	139	145
HAD Licensed in Another State	12	6	7	5	9
HAD Branch Office	205	192	132	282	426
TOTAL LICENSES ISSUED	**2108**	**2443**	**2664**	**2588**	**3355**

Licensing Population

POPULATION	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15
AU	622	595	609	UA	612
DAU	911	930	942	UA	988
Both License Types	1,533	1,525	1,551	1,555	1600
AUT	0	0	0	0	0
SLP	11,349	12,020	12,696	13,285	13,967
SPT	0	0	0	0	0
SLPA	1,304	1,529	1,771	1,969	2343
RPE'S	608	665	682	768	802
AIDES	215	181	120	119	124
HAD	932	938	946	913	948
HAD Trainees	83	97	95	145	160
HAD Licensed in Another State	12	6	9	8	7
HAD Branch Office	601	627	653	710	821
TOTAL LICENSEES	**18,170**	**19,113**	**20,074**	**19,472**	**22,372**

Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology & Hearing Aid Dispensers Board

Hearing Aid Dispensers Practical Examination

Sacramento - July 11, 2015

Candidate Type	# of Canididates	Passed	Percentages	Failed	Percentages
Applicants without Supervision					
HA	5	1	20%	4	80%
AU	6	4	67%	2	33%
RPE	1	1	100%	0	0%
Applicants with Supervision					
HA	16	8	50%	8	50%
AU	6	5	83%	1	17%
RPE	1	0	0%	1	100%
Aide	1	0	0%	1	100%
	# of Canididates	**Passed**	**Percentages**	**Failed**	**Percentages**
TOTAL:	36	19	52.8%	17	47.2%

Speech-Language Pathology Audiology Hearing Aid Dispensers Board

ENFORCEMENT STATISTICS

	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
COMPLAINTS AND CONVICTIONS	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**
Complaints Received	71	28	86	41	56	41
Convictions Received	7	41	6	29	4	27
Average Days to Intake	1	2	2	2	31	31
Closed	103	87	104	69	107	46
Pending	111	29	100	30	55	56

Average cycle time from complaint receipt, to the date the complaint was assigned to an investigator. DCA Performance Measure: Target 5 Days.

	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
INVESTIGATIONS Desk	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**
Assigned	98	69	91	68	59	64
Closed	91	80	84	63	89	41
Average Days to Complete	360	220	458	128	339	250
Pending	84	27	80	28	46	48

	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
INVESTIGATONS DOI	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**
Assigned	25	0	12	5	2	3
Closed	6	6	20	5	15	2
Average Days to Complete	758	697	451	503	722	527
Pending	27	1	19	2	6	3

	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
ALL TYPES OF INVESTIGATGIONS	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**
Closed Without Discipline	94	77	93	60	83	37
Cycle Time - No Discipline	383	243	470	152	347	234

Average cycle time from complaint receipt to closure of the investigation process. Does not include cases sent to the AG or other forms of formal discipline. DCA Performance Measure: Target 90 Days.

	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
CITATIONS/Cease&Desist	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**	**HAD**	**SP/AU**
Issued	6	3	7	3	3	8
Avg Days to Complete Cite	654	794	358	453	292	188
Cease & Desist Letter	26	0	9	0	5	1

Speech-Language Pathology Audiology Hearing Aid Dispensers Board

ENFORCEMENT STATISTICS

ATTORNEY GENERAL CASES	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
	HAD	SP/AU	HAD	SP/AU	HAD	SP/AU
Pending at the AG	12	12	9	13	14	9
Accusations Filed	1	3	3	6	5	6
SOI Withdrawn, Dismissed, Declined	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acc Withdrawn, Dismissed, Declined	0	4	2	1	1	1
Average Days to Discipline	606	1013	703	617	1336	234

Average number of days to complete the entire enforcement process for cases resulting in formal discipline. (Includes intake and investigation by the Board and prosecution by the AG.) DCA Performance Measure: Target 540 Days

ATTORNEY GENERAL TYPE OF PENALTIES	FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013		FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014		FISCAL YEAR 2014 - 2015	
	HAD	SP/AU	HAD	SP/AU	HAD	SP/AU
Probation		4	4		1	1
Surrender of License		1	1	1		1
Conditional License			1	3		
License Denied (SOI)	1					
Revocation-No Stay of Order				1	1	3
Petition for Modification of Probation				1		
Petition for Reinstatement Denied			1			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY& HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 263-2666 Fax: (916) 263-2668 | www.speechandhearing.ca.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE	August 10, 2015
TO	Speech Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
FROM	Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer
SUBJECT	**Supervised Clinical Experience/RPE Clock Hours**

BACKGROUND

In January 2015, SB 1466 became effective which gave the Board authority to raise the minimum number of clinical clock hours required from 300 clock hours to 375 clock hours.

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends that we review and approve the amended language and for submission to the Office of Administrative Law.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD

Title 16, Chapter 13.4
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY
Article 3. Qualifications for Licensure – Education and Clinical Experience
Proposed Language

Amend Section 1399.152.2 of Article 3 of Division 13.4 of Title 16 as follows:

§ 1399.152.2. Supervised Clinical Experience.

(a) …

~~(b) Two hundred seventy-five (275) clock hours of clinical experience shall be required for licensure as a speech-language pathologist or audiologist for applicants who completed their graduate program on or before December 31, 1992.~~

(~~c~~ b) Three hundred seventy-five (~~300~~375) clock hours of clinical experience in three (3) different clinical settings shall be required for licensure as a speech-language pathologist or audiologist. ~~for applicants who completed their graduate program after December 31, 1992.~~

(~~d~~ c) Twenty-five (25) hours of the required clinical experience may be in the field other than that for which the applicant is seeking licensure (speech-language pathology for an audiologist or audiology for a speech-language pathologist) if such clinical experience is under a supervisor who is qualified in the minor field as provided in subsection (a).

Note: Authority cited: Section 2531.95, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2532.2, Business and Professions Code.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY • GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY& HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 263-2666 Fax: (916) 263-2668 | www.speechandhearing.ca.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE	August 10, 2015
TO	Speech Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
FROM	Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer
SUBJECT	**Increase in the Number of Self-Study Hours for Continued Professional Development (CPD)**

BACKGROUND

On June 19, 2015, the Board decided to increase the number of self-study hours that can be applied toward meeting the CPD requirements for license renewal for the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology professions.

There is currently no self-study limit for Hearing Aid Dispensers toward meeting renewal requirements; however, the Board previously approved a regulatory proposal that to limit the number of self-study continuing education hours that can be applied toward meeting renewal requirements. This regulatory proposal can be amended prior to the filing deadline of November 25, 2015.

Committee Chair, Deane Manning has requested that the Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee discuss this issue at the next committee meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends that we review and approve the amended language and for submission to the Office of Administrative Law.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD

Title 16, Chapter 13.4
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY
Article 11. Continuing Professional Development
Proposed Language

Amend Sections 1399.160, 1399.160.1, 1399.160.2, 1399.160.3, and 1399.160.7 of Article 3 of Division 13.4 of Title 16 as follows:

§ 1399.160. Definitions.
As used in this article:
(a) A "self-study course" means a form of systematic learning performed at a licensee's residence, office, or other private location including, but not limited to, ~~viewing or listening to recorded courses, or participating in "self-assessment testing"~~ print, recorded audio-visual and internet or computer-based enduring educational material that requires completing and passing an assessment or test~~, (open-book tests that are completed by the licensee, submitted to the provider, graded, and returned to the licensee with correct answers and an explanation of why the answer chosen by the provider was the correct answer)~~. A self-study course does not mean a course taken at an accredited university towards a degree, nor does it include any interactive courses offered via electronic media where the course offering affords participants the opportunity to interact with an instructor and/or other course participants.
(b) A "self-study course" means a form of systematic learning performed at a licensee's residence, office, or other private location including, but not limited to, viewing or listening to recorded courses, or participating in "self-assessment testing" (open-book tests that are completed by the licensee, submitted to the provider, graded, and returned to the licensee with correct answers and an explanation of why the answer chosen by the provider was the correct answer). A self-study course does not mean a course taken at an accredited university towards a degree, nor does it include any interactive courses offered via electronic media where the course offering affords participants the opportunity to interact with an instructor and/or other course participants.
(c) A continuing professional development "provider" means an accredited institution of higher learning, a nonprofit education association, a nonprofit professional association, an individual, or other organization that offers continuing professional development courses and meets the requirements contained in this article.
(d) A "renewal period" means the two-year period that spans from a license's expiration date to the licensee's next expiration date.
(e) An "operational plan" means a detailed, written description which contains information that explains how the provider intends to conduct business, advertise its courses, provide educational services, and meet the minimum standards established in this article.
(f) "Professional development" shall have the same meaning and effect as the term "continuing education" when interpreting the provisions in this Article.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2531.95 and 2532.6(a), Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2532.6(b), (c)(1), (e) and (f), Business and Professions Code.

§ 1399.160.1. License Renewal Requirements.

(a) Except as provided in Section 1399.160.2, a licensee ~~whose license expires in the year 2001,~~ shall certify in writing, when applying to renew their license for the first time, ~~license renewal,~~ by signing a statement under penalty of perjury that during the preceding renewal period the licensee ~~has~~ completed twelve (12) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~.

(b) Except as provided in Section 1399.160.2, a licensee who holds both a speech-language pathology license and an audiology license ~~that expire in the year 2001~~, shall certify in writing, when applying to renew both licenses for the first time, by signing a statement under penalty of perjury that during the preceding renewal period the licensee ~~has~~ completed eight (8) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ for each license for a total of sixteen (16) hours.

(c) Except as provided in Section 1399.160.2, a licensee shall certify in writing, when applying for license renewal, by signing a statement under penalty of perjury that during the preceding renewal period the licensee ~~has~~ completed twenty-four (24) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~.

(d) Except as provided in Section 1399.160.2, a licensee who holds both a speech-language pathology license and an audiology license, shall certify in writing, when applying to renew their licenses ~~for license renewal~~, by signing a statement under penalty of perjury that during the preceding renewal period the licensee ~~has~~ completed sixteen (16) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ for each license for a total of thirty-two hours.

(e) A licensee who falsifies or makes a material misrepresentation of fact when applying for license renewal or who cannot verify the completion of the continuing professional development requirement by producing a record of course completion, upon request by the ~~b~~Board, is subject the disciplinary action under Section 2533(e) of the Code.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2531.95 and 2532.6(a), Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 2532.6(b), (c) (d) and 2533(e), Business and Professions Code.

§ 1399.160.2. Exemptions from Continuing Professional Development.

~~(a) An initial licensee shall complete at least twelve (12) hours of continuing professional development, of which no more than four (4) hours may be earned through the following activities prior to his or her first license renewal:~~

~~(1) No more than (2)~~ six (6) ~~of the required~~ hours ~~by way of self-study activities,~~

~~(2) No more than (2) hours from courses related to the discipline of speech-language pathology or audiology as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4), or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).~~

(~~b~~a) A licensee is exempt from the continuing professional development requirement if his or her license is inactive pursuant to Sections 703 and 704 of the Code.

(~~c~~b) A licensee may submit a written request for exemption from the continuing professional development requirement for any of the reasons listed below. The ~~b~~Board will notify the licensee, within thirty (30) working days after receipt of the request for exemption, whether the exemption was granted. If the request for exemption is denied, the licensee is responsible for completing the full amount of continuing professional development required for license renewal. The ~~b~~Board shall grant the exemption if the licensee can provide evidence, satisfactory to the ~~b~~Board, that:

(1) For at least one year during the licensee's previous license renewal period the licensee was absent from California due to military service;

(2) For at least one year during the licensee's previous license renewal period the licensee resided in another country; or

(3) During the licensee's previous renewal period, the licensee or an immediate family member, where the licensee has primary responsibility for the care of that family member, was suffering from or suffered a disability. A disability is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or

more of the major life activities of an individual. The disability shall be verified by a licensed physician or psychologist with special expertise in the area of disability. Verification of the disability shall include:
(A) the nature and extent of the disability;
(B) an explanation of how the disability hinders the licensee from completing the continuing professional development requirement; and
(C) the name, title, address, telephone number, professional license or certification number, and original signature of the licensed physician or psychologist verifying the disability.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2531.95 and 2532.6(a), Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2532.6(d), Business and Professions Code.

§ 1399.160.3. Continuing Professional Development Requirements.
(a) A licensee, ~~whose license expires in the year 2001~~ applying to renew their license for the first time, shall accrue at least twelve (12) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ as defined in Section 1399.160.4. A licensee may accrue no more than ~~four (4) hours~~ six (6) of the required hours of continuing professional development ~~courses through~~ by way of self-study ~~courses~~ activities during this renewal period.
(b) A licensee who holds both a speech-language pathology license and an audiology license, applying to renew both licenses for the first time, ~~that expire in the year 2001,~~ shall accrue at least eight (8) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ as defined in Section 1399.160.4 for each license. A licensee may accrue no more than ~~two (2)~~ four (4) of the required hours of continuing professional development ~~courses through~~ by way of self-study ~~courses~~ activities for each license.
(c) A licensee shall accrue at least twenty-four (24) hours ~~during a single renewal period~~ of continuing professional development per renewal period ~~courses~~ as defined in Section 1399.160.4. A licensee may accrue ~~no more than eight (8) hours of~~ continuing professional development ~~courses~~ through the following activities during ~~a single~~ each renewal period:
(1) No more than ~~six (6)~~ twelve (12) of the required hours by way of self-study activities,
(2) No more than four (4) hours from courses related to the discipline of speech-language pathology or audiology, as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4) or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).
(3) Not more than 50% of the continuing professional development hours required of a licensed non-dispensing audiologist, may be in hearing aid courses, but shall not be obtained from courses where the content focuses on equipment, devices, or other products of a particular publisher, company or corporation.
(d) A licensee who holds both a speech-language pathology license and an audiology license shall accrue at least sixteen (16) hours of continuing professional development per renewal period ~~courses~~ as defined in Section 1399.160.4 for each license. A licensee may accrue ~~no more than five (5) hours of~~ continuing professional development through the following activities for each license:
(1) No more than eight (8) of the required hours by way of self-study activities,
(2) No more than two and one-half (2.5) hours from courses related to the discipline of speech-language pathology or audiology, as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4) or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).
(e) A licensed audiologist authorized to dispense hearing aids as provided by Section 2539.1 of the code shall accrue at least twelve (12) hours of continuing professional development per renewal period as defined in Section 1399.160.4 annually. A licensed audiologist authorized to dispense hearing aids may accrue ~~no more than (3) hours of~~ continuing professional development ~~courses~~ through the following activities during ~~a single~~ each renewal period:
(1) No more than six (6) of the required hours by way of self-study activities,

(2) No more than one and ~~a~~ one-half (1.5) hours from courses related to the discipline of audiology, as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4) or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).
(3) Exactly 50% of the continuing professional development hours required of a licensed audiologist authorized to dispense hearing aids, shall be obtained from courses related to hearing aid dispensing but shall not be obtained from courses where the content focuses on the equipment, devices, or other products of a particular manufacturer or company. The remaining 50% of the continuing professional development hours required of a dispensing audiologist shall be relevant to the practice of audiology as defined in Section 2530.2(k) and shall not be obtained from hearing aid dispensing courses as provided for in this section.
(f) A licensee who holds both a speech-language pathology license and a dispensing audiology license shall accrue:
(1) At least sixteen (16) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ in speech-language pathology biennially, ~~of which no more than four (4) hours of the continuing professional development~~ may be accrued through the following activities during ~~a single~~ each renewal period:
(A) No more than eight (8) of the required hours by way of self-study activities,
(B) No more than two and one-half (2.5) hours from courses related to the discipline of speech-language pathology as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4) or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).
(2) At least eight (8) hours of continuing professional development ~~courses~~ in dispensing audiology as defined in Section 1399.160.4 and 1399.160.3(e)(3) annually~~, of which no more than two (2) hours of continuing professional development courses~~ may be accrued through the following activities during ~~a single~~ each renewal period:
(A) No more than four (4) of the required hours by way of self-study activities,
(B) No more than one (1) hour from courses related to the discipline of speech-language pathology as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(4) or in indirect client care courses as defined in Section 1399.160.4(c)(3).
(g) If a licensee teaches a course offered by a provider registered with the ~~b~~Board or an entity listed in Section 2532.6 of the Code, the licensee may claim credit for the same course ~~only~~ once per renewal period, receiving the same amount of hours of continuing professional development credit as a licensee who attended the course.
(h) A licensee may not claim credit for the same course more than once per renewal period for hours of continuing professional development.
(i) A licensee who takes a continuing professional development course as a condition of probation resulting from disciplinary action by the ~~b~~Board may not apply the course as credit towards the continuing professional development requirement.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2531.95 and 2532.6(a), Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2532.6(b), (c) and (e), Business and Professions Code.

§ 1399.160.7. Board-Approved Providers.
(a) A continuing professional development provider shall meet the ~~b~~Board's course content and instructor qualifications criteria, as provided under this article, to qualify to become a ~~b~~Board -approved provider.
(b) ~~An applicant for~~ A continuing professional development provider applicant shall submit a completed Continuing Professional Development Provider Application (form no. ~~77A-50, new 1/99~~ CEP 200/REV 7/15), hereby incorporated by reference, remit the appropriate fees, submit a complete operational plan, and obtain a continuing professional provider number from the ~~b~~Board to become a ~~b~~Board -approved provider.

(c) A provider approval issued under this section shall expire twenty-four months after the ~~approval~~ issue date. To renew an unexpired provider approval, the provider shall, on or before the expiration date of the approval, pay the biennial renewal fee set forth in Section 1399.157 of these regulations.
(d) A provider approval that is not renewed by the expiration date may not be renewed, restored, reinstated, or reissued thereafter, but the provider may apply for a new approval.
(e) Board-approved provider status is not transferable.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2531.95 and 2532.6(a), Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2532.6(e)(1) and (e)(2), Business and Professions Code.