



BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Norwalk, CA
Thursday, December 4, 2025

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

Gilda Dominguez, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order on December 4, 2025, at 1:01 p.m. and 3:49 p.m. Ms. Dominguez called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members Present

Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist, Board Chair

Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist, Board Vice Chair

Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser

Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member

Karen Chang, Public Member

Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist

Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer

Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst

Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel

2. Welcome and Thank You to Cerritos Community College and their Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA) Associate Degree Program Staff and Students

Ms. Dominguez invited Susan McDonald, Cerritos College SLPA Program Director, to welcome the Board to Cerritos College whereupon a presentation was presented to the Board.

Ms. Dominguez, Cherise Burns, and Dr. Amy White expressed gratitude to Cerritos College and their SLPA Program for welcoming the Board.

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

3. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

Ms. Burns read a comment from the California Speech and Hearing Association regarding practices by Kaiser Permanente that limit access to speech services through use of an episodic care methodology that include breaks in care provisions.

4. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1) the Board will conduct the annual performance evaluation and consider the salary of its Executive Officer.

The Board met in closed session to conduct the annual performance evaluation and consider the salary of its Executive Officer.

SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE
Norwalk, CA
Thursday, December 4, 2025

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

Gilda Dominguez, Committee Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order on December 4, 2025, at 1:22 p.m. Ms. Dominguez called roll; three members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

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

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding Scope of Responsibility, Duties, and Functions of Speech-Language Pathology Assistants Related to Swallow Therapy as Stated in Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 1399.170.1, 1399.170.2, and 1399.170.3

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

Ms. Liranzo asked if the speech-language pathologist (SLP), who signed the verification of competency, is the same SLP who provides immediate supervision for all 100 hours of feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus material. Cherise Burns said that for SLPs to perform Fiberoptic Endoscopic Evaluation of Swallowing (FEES), they are required to complete 25 supervised FEES procedure and some SLPs are supervised by someone different than the one who signs the verification of competency.

Francis David asked if each feeding and swallowing therapy under immediate supervision would be signed by the attending SLP. Ms. Burns said that is how some SLPs are doing it for their

supervised FEES procedures.

Mr. David asked if it's possible to require the SLP signing the verification of competency to confer with the other SLPs. Ms. Burns said that it is possible. Ms. Liranzo said that it should be specified in regulations to ensure that it does happen.

Mr. David asked if it would be possible to require the SLP with the most supervision to sign the verification of competency. Ms. Burns said that it could be restrictive due to the number of hours required. Ms. Dominguez said that it could be possible that the SLP with the most supervision may no longer be working at the location when the SLPA completes their hours and needs their written verification and recommendation from the supervising SLP to sign their verification. Ms. Liranzo noted that the written verification is a one-time documentation and that it will have to be available for Board inspection whether that is a copy in the SLPA's employee records or retained by the SLPA and/or their supervising SLP.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the intent of the 100 hours of supervised feeding and swallowing therapy will be that it is performed in the workplace and said that if requiring the supervising SLP to sign the verification is a reasonable requirement. Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with the proposed changes. Dr. Tamara Chambers expressed agreement with the proposed changes and said that this will give SLPAs the opportunity to have different experiences with different SLPs while ensuring that there is oversight from one SLP.

Ms. Liranzo asked if "unwillingness to cooperate with the examination" should be added as a contraindication or is it sufficiently covered by "inability to cooperate." Ms. Dominguez said that it would be common among children to be unwilling to cooperate. Mr. David said that unwillingness and refusal are two different things and said that a procedure cannot be performed if the patient refuses. Dr. Chambers said that "inability to cooperate" is different from unwillingness as inability could be a physical limitation whereas unwillingness can be something that is coachable. Ms. Dominguez said that SLPAs may be in a situation where they are already coaching an unwilling patient and it could be dangerous with bolus material to continue with the therapy. Ms. Liranzo noted that "unwillingness to cooperate with the examination" will be added as a contraindication.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the proposed regulations create barriers to SLPAs to obtain the education and experience needed to perform feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus material, such as only requiring an approved continuing education (CE) provider to provide the education, a California licensed SLP can supervise the 100 hours of feeding and swallowing therapy, and direct client care can count toward the 100 hours of supervised feeding and swallowing therapy.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the approved CE provider is in regard to the 45 hours of required education. Ms. Liranzo said that it is and commented that employers may offer education on the topics required but may not be an approved CE provider. Ms. Burns commented on the courses being reviewed during audits and who is providing them.

Ms. Dominguez asked how feasible it is to approve courses from hospitals or clinic. Ms. Burns said that the Board doesn't approve CE courses for SLP and audiology and they are required to become an approved provider, whether that is applying with the board to become an approved provider or through an exemption as stated in the Board's Practice Act. Ms. Dominguez said that the education should be from an approved provider or through an exempt organization. Mr. David

expressed agreement that it should be from an approved provider or through an exempt organization.

Dr. Chambers asked how SLPAs could get CE credit for education from a research or teaching hospital. Ms. Liranzo asked Ms. Burns if hospitals would be part of the exempt organizations. Ms. Burns said that providers approved by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, American Academy of Audiology, or California Medical Association are exempt from Board approval process. Ms. Liranzo asked Dr. Chambers if her hospital is a CE provider through the California Medical Association. Dr. Chambers asked if the education for CE credit would be tied to the work setting or the person providing the course. Ms. Dominguez said that education should be from an approved provider or through an exempted organization to ensure the quality of education is consistent. Ms. Dominguez asked Dr. Chambers if the courses are open to the community or just employees. Dr. Chambers said that they are only open to employees.

Ms. Dominguez continued with the discussion questions regarding whether the 100 hours of supervised feeding and swallowing therapy should only be from a California licensed SLP or if it could be from a SLP licensed in another state. Ms. Burns said that a SLP licensed in another state could come to California to provide training and supervision for the FEES procedures to a group of SLPs and this could be something that could happen for SLPA. Ms. Liranzo clarified that this question and the next question may no longer be applicable as it was clarified earlier that the intent of the 100 hours of supervised feeding and swallowing therapy is that they happen in the workplace where the opportunities will be available. The Committee expressed agreement that this was the intent of the requirement.

Ms. Liranzo asked if there should be restrictions and/or specified requirements to feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus material for specific age groups or conditions such as newborns or infants or patients with artificial airways. Ms. Dominguez said that SLPs are required to obtain additional training to provide feeding and swallowing to neonates and does not recommend that SLPAs be allowed to work with these populations. Mr. David recommended that there should be restrictions to some medically fragile patients such as those on advanced airways or with certain comorbidities.

Ms. Liranzo asked what those comorbidities would be and noted the contraindications currently specified. Mr. David recommended adding restrictions related to cognitive functioning. Ms. Liranzo asked if that would be similar to “inability to cooperate with the examination.” Mr. David said that it would be different, such as a patient may not be able to follow instruction or provide feedback during the therapy. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes to add neonate/infants, cognitive impairment, and patient with advanced airways as contraindications.

Mr. David asked if medically fragile patients should be excluded. Ms. Liranzo said that a higher level of supervision is required when SLPAs are working with medically fragile patients and that these regulations should specify which of the medically fragile patients a SLPA cannot work on at all, if any. Dr. Chambers read the definition of medically fragile to mean a client that is acutely ill and in an unstable condition and said that being “acutely ill” is different from “cognitive impairment.”

Ms. Liranzo said that education in swallowing/dysphagia may lack clarity for the rulemaking process and asked what exactly about swallowing/dysphagia should a SLPA know that would provide them with the knowledge they need to perform feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus

material such as causes of dysphagia, signs and symptoms of dysphagia, and screening, assessments, and treatment for of dysphagia. Ms. Dominguez and Mr. David recommended adding anatomy and physiology of swallowing. Ms. Dominguez recommended adding etiology or causes of dysphagia; signs and symptoms of swallowing disorders; aspiration; knowledge of screening and assessments including clinical bedside and instrumental assessment such as FEES, modified barium swallow, and video fluoroscopies; and the International Dysphagia Diet Standardisation Initiative's framework for diet textures and liquid. Dr. Chambers asked if maneuvers should be added. Ms. Dominguez and Mr. David said it would fall under treatment. Ms. Dominguez recommended the word "maneuvers" should be used. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Dr. Chambers asked if the education should cover pediatrics. Ms. Dominguez and Mr. David said that it should, and recommended the regulations should specify that the required education should cover a wide range of ages. Ms. Dominguez and Mr. David also recommended that the required education should also cover documentation such as writing notes. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Ms. Burns commented on the rulemaking process and recommended that the Board can hold an Ad Hoc meeting with SLPA programs to continue discussion on how this task can be part of future SLPA program curriculum.

Ms. Dominguez said the proposed regulations will permit SLPAs to provide feeding and swallowing therapy, but SLPs need to consider other requirements when determining if their SLPA is allowed to provide feeding and swallowing therapy such as facility requirements, coverage, and reimbursement requirements established by health care insurance and managed care providers like Medicare.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comment.

Susan McDonald, SLPA Program Director at Cerritos College, commented on future discussions with SLPA programs to provide training on feeding and swallowing and said that she looks forward to seeing the invitation.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

**HEARING AID DISPENSING COMMITTEE
Norwalk, CA
Thursday, December 4, 2025**

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

Tod Borges, Committee Chair, called the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee (Committee) meeting to order on December 4, 2025, at 2:50 p.m. Mr. Borges called roll; four members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser, Committee Chair

Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Add and Amend Regulations Regarding Postfitting Counseling and Foreign Body In The Ear Canal Related to Hearing Aid Dome Removal at Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.125 and 1399.126, as used in BPC Sections 2538.11, 2538.36, and 2539.6

Mr. Borges invited Maria Liranzo to provide an update on discussion and possible action regarding hearing aid dome removal. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to the proposed regulatory text.

Mr. Borges asked what the meaning of higher air conduction and lower bone conduction is in the definition of significant air-bone gap in Section 1399.126(a). Ms. Liranzo said that this text already existed and may be outdated and recommended the Committee make changes to the definition if they find it confusing as currently written.

Dr. Amy White said that it may be trying to omit hearing tests where the bone conduction is worse than the air conduction because this, in theory, is not possible and may be a placement issue with the oscillator. Dr. White said that it should read as bone conduction is better than air conduction and recommended to replace the word “succeeding” with the word “successive.” Mr. Borges asked if it could be revised to say that bone conduction is fifteen (15) decibels or more better than air conduction. Cherise Burns said that it can be revised so that it is clearer. Ms. Liranzo asked Dr. Tamara Chambers if that is her understanding of significant air-bone gap. Dr. Chambers said that it is and she understands it both ways. Ms. Burns asked for clarification on how it should be read. Dr. White said that it should read as “a significant air-bone gap means a difference of fifteen (15) decibels or more where bone conduction is better than air conduction at two (2) or more successive octave frequencies...” Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Dr. Charles Sanders said that it should be consecutive or adjacent octave frequencies. Dr. White said the word “successive” is similar to the words like “continuous” and “adjacent.” Ms. Liranzo said that there are different definitions that Board staff can provide when it presents this text to the Board, if the Committee recommended the text to the Board as amended. Dr. White and Mr. Borges said that the FDA’s definition will be the most appropriate definition for hearing aid dispensers.

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

Amy White moved to recommend the regulatory text for Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.125 and 1399.126 to the Board to initiate the rulemaking process, as amended, and direct Board staff to prepare the regulatory text for Board review and approval.

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

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

**AUDIOLOGY PRACTICE COMMITTEE
Norwalk, CA
Thursday, December 4, 2025**

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

Dr. Amy White, Committee Chair, called the Audiology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order on December 4, 2025, at 3:07 p.m. Dr. White called roll; four members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

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

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

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

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

Dr. White and Dr. Charles Sanders said that screenings are not the same as evaluations. Dr. Sanders said that it wouldn't be within an audiology aide's scope because school audiometrist who conduct screenings in schools must complete some level of education to conduct those screenings. Dr. Sanders also said that the Board does not have a mechanism to require and verify such training. Dr. White said that she disagrees because an audiology aide would have an audiologist present at the time, whereas an audiometrist doesn't have an audiologist who can review their work, which is why there is additional education and training. Dr. Sanders said that it could be possible for an audiology aide to perform screenings without their supervisor being present. Dr. White said that the audiology aide cannot work without an audiologist. Cherise Burns said that the regulations are being amended to not permit an audiology aide to work on their own while performing certain tasks. Ms. Liranzo said that indirect client care is the only task where an audiologist would not be required to be onsite with the audiology aide.

Dr. Sanders asked if immediate supervision would be required when the audiology aide is performing screening. Dr. White said initially or if the supervisor is training them until they are competent, at which point direct supervision can be provided to the audiology aide. Ms. Liranzo said that the question came up in reviewing speech-language pathology assistant laws and regulations which permit them to conduct screenings and wanted to know if this would be prohibited for audiology aides. Dr. White said the audiometrist work independently by conducting the screening and reviewing results on their own, whereas an audiology aide would conduct the screening but the results would be provided to their supervisor for review. Ms. Liranzo noted that the meeting material included examples of screenings as defined by Medicare and asked which ones an audiology aide would be able to do and which ones they would not be able to do. Ms. Burns said that the screening should be appropriate for someone who doesn't have any education or experience. Dr. White said that newborn hearing screeners do not have education. Ms. Liranzo said that is why she wanted the Committee to discuss this item because screening was not identified as being out of an audiology aide scope. Dr. White said that the use of audiology aide is very narrow and that they are not used for that reason.

Dr. White also said that she hopes that audiology aides will be more used if they are better defined and asked if the Board would be able to come back if it needs to narrow down the use of audiology aides if an audiologist assistant license was created. Ms. Burns said that the scope of an audiology aide should be developed so that it is for someone who has no education or experience. Dr. White said that audiology aide will be trained by their supervisor. Ms. Burns said that it is training directed by the supervisor after they are registered. Dr. White recommended that the only hearing screening an audiology aide could perform is the one defined in the Practice Act. Dr. Sander expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Dr. White continued with the discussion questions regarding the fitting, selling, or independently adjusting a hearing aid as used in Section 1399.154.11(j) having the same meaning as the practice of fitting or selling hearing as defined in BPC section 2538.11. Dr. White said that they do not have the same meaning because there are some aspects of postfitting counseling an audiology aide can do, such as help patients use and care for their hearing aids, which is information typically found in a user manual.

Ms. Liranzo asked what the word "adjust" means in the profession. Dr. White and Dr. Sanders said that it would be adjusting the programming or making gain change on a hearing aid. Ms. Liranzo said that it could also imply physical adjustments and recommended revising or removing

the words “independently adjust” if it could restrict audiology aide from physically adjusting a hearing aid on a patient. Dr. White said that helping the patient practice putting on their hearing aid would be acceptable for an audiology aide to perform. Ms. Burns said that altering hearing aid programming or settings is already listed under Section 1399.154.11(c) and recommended removing the words “independently adjust.” Ms. Liranzo noted the change.

Karen Chang asked if the word “fit” also implies physical adjustments. Dr. White said that the word “fit” has a unique meaning in hearing aid dispensing that covers the initial fitting of the hearing aid on the patient to meet their hearing needs as well as any adjustments to hearing aid domes or earmolds. Dr. White asked if the word “fit” has to be defined. Ms. Liranzo said that her explanation is very clear and it will be used when preparing regulatory documents.

Dr. White asked what further clarifications are needed. Ms. Liranzo said that we will have to determine the language regarding hearing screenings and where in the text it should be added.

Dr. White asked if it could say that an audiology aide can perform hearing screenings as defined in the Practice Act. Ms. Liranzo said it could be written that way and it could cite the definition in the Practice Act. Ms. Burns recommended that it should be added to a section that would say hearing screening is permitted such as a section on supervision requirements, responsibility of a supervisor, or training requirements. Ms. Burns said that it would normally be added to the section on duties and function of an audiology aide, but the regulations are written to specify prohibited activities and not activities permitted. Dr. White said that it might have to be added as prohibition in Section 1399.154.11. Ms. Burns said that it could be written both ways and recommended adding it to Section 1399.154.10 as item (e) regarding training. Ms. Liranzo said that she would need to consult with their Regulatory Counsel to determine if a prohibition should be added.

Dr. Sander asked why the meeting materials included material regarding audiology assistant. Ms. Liranzo said they are included as a means of comparison. Ms. Liranzo also said that American Speech–Language–Hearing Association identifies screening as an audiology assistant’s role and responsibility and wanted to give the Committee an opportunity to discuss if it would also be within the role and responsibility of an audiology aide.

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

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Norwalk, CA
Friday, December 5, 2025**

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

Gilda Dominguez, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order on December 5, 2025, at 9:05 a.m.

Ms. Dominguez called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members Present

Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist, Board Chair

Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist, Board Vice Chair

Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser

Tamara Chambers, Otolaryngologist, Public Member

Karen Chang, Public Member

Francis David, Speech-Language Pathologist

Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Cherise Burns, Executive Officer

Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst

Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

3. Review and Possible Approval of the August 21 - 22, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes

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

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of the minutes.

Tod Borges said there were some typos. Mr. Borges asked to replace the title “Ms.” with the title “Mr.” to his last name toward the end of the third paragraph after item 3 on page 11 of 28 and in the middle of the second to last paragraph on page 23 of 28; and replace the word “curios” with word “curious” and remove “not” in the middle of the second to last paragraph on of page 23 of 28. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Dr. Charles Sanders asked to replace the title “Mr.” with the title “Ms.” to Burns in the third to last paragraph on of page 23 of 28. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Francis David asked to replace the letter “s” with the letter “d” to his last name in the motion on page 10 of 28. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Ms. Dominguez said that her intent in the third paragraph after item 3 on page 4 of 28 is that speech language pathology assistants (SLPAs) are not able to care for Medicare population due to the Medicare regulations not considering them as providers and asked if it could be reworded to clarify that.

Ms. Dominguez said that it would be feasible or practical for SLPAs to provide feeding and swallowing therapy with bolus material to adult population once the parameters are in place, but the limitation is the payer. Cherise Burns recommended replacing the word “adult” with “Medicare.” Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with the recommendation and recommended adding “at this time” at the end of the sentence. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

Mr. David asked to replace the word “it is” with “both stages are” in the last paragraph of page 7 of 28. Ms. Liranzo noted the changes.

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

Tod Borges moved to approve the August 21 - 22, 2025 Meeting minutes as amended.

Karen Chang seconded the motion.

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

4. DCA Update – DCA Board and Bureau Relations

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

Ms. Burns provided an update on new Board and Bureau Relations staff, the retirement of DCA's Director Kimberly Kirchmeyer, and Board member training.

Karen Chang asked if the Unconscious Bias Training is required and when it will be due. Ms. Burns said that she would have to ask Board and Bureau Relations about it.

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

5. Board Chair's Report

Ms. Dominguez reported on the Board meeting calendar and said that dates for the upcoming year will be discussed at this meeting later today.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Borges asked why audiometry was not listed as a diagnostic evaluation. Dr. White said that it is not an exclusive list. Mr. Borges asked if it could be added. Ms. Liranzo asked if audiogram is part of an impedance test battery. Dr. White said that it is not and recommended that it be added. Ms. Liranzo noted the change.

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

6. Executive Officer's Report

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

Ms. Burns provided an administration update and said that there are no vacant positions except for a position that is unfunded.

Ms. Burns reported on outreach efforts including meetings with the California Speech Language Hearing Association (CSHA), California Academy of Audiology (CCA), and Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences; and a presentation by board members at CAA Conference in September 2025.

Ms. Burns reported on the budget including enforcement cost, an augmentation for Attorney General (AG) and Office of Administrative Hearing (OAH) costs, setting aside some procurements and overtime for additional savings, and savings as a result of the budget reduction such as transitioning renewal notices to postcard reminders.

Mr. Borges asked how the budget is determined for AG and OAH. Ms. Burns said that it is a three-year average but it has been high in the last two years and the budget may need to be increased if it continues to remain high. Ms. Burns also said that the enforcement cost has been high due to some of the cases with longer hearings, which are rare for this board.

Mr. Borges asked if the Board had to do an augmentation last year. Ms. Burns said that it did for a smaller amount.

Ms. Burns reported on the fund condition, including the increase in delinquent fees collected and said that issue would be something to look into in the future. Ms. Burns also said that other boards have much higher delinquent fees to deter late renewals. Ms. Burns commented on the revenue and when a fee increase would be required. Ms. Burns said the Board does not need a fee increase during this Sunset because of its increasing licensee population, especially in speech-language pathologist and speech language pathology assistant licenses.

Dr. White asked if the increase in delinquent fees related to full renewal form being mailed out and not the postcard reminders. Ms. Burns said that it has been increasing in the past few years.

Dr. Sanders asked if the Board would have to go to the legislature to increase its delinquency fee. Ms. Burns said that the Board would have to go to the legislature to increase its delinquency fees.

Dr. Tamara Chambers asked if the Board recovers costs from cases that go to hearing. Ms. Burns said that not in all cases, such as citation and fine appeals or when a license is revoked. Ms. Burns also said that cost recovery becomes part of probation and includes recovery of cost up to the point of the administrative hearing.

Dr. Chambers asked if there are fees associated with citations and fines for continuing education (CE) audits. Ms. Burns said that there are fees associated with citations and fines for CE audits and they can range from \$100 to \$2,500. Ms. Burns also said that there will be an increase in revenues in citation and fine as a result of CE audits. Ms. Burns commented on the CE audit process and said that Board staff will work with licensees who are being audited to ensure they don't qualify for any exemption.

Ms. Dominguez asked what the number of months means for the funds in reserve. Ms. Burns said that the Board has 5 months of funds available to cover operating expenses if it were to stop generating revenue and the goal is to keep it at 3 to 6 months. Ms. Burns also said that, if the amount of funds in reserve is high, the board would have to consider lowering fees or increasing services it provides.

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

Ms. Burns reported on licensing including processing times.

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

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

Ms. Burns said that while the passage rate of the CE and CPD audits is not high but there has been a large increase in licensees contacting the Board to verify the CE and CPD requirements. Ms. Burns also said that the passage rate of the CE and CPD audits should increase in the next couple of years. Dr. White said that these audit numbers justify having the CE auditor position and its importance. Ms. Burns said that there have been benefits for both licensees and providers and commented on licensees understanding the Board's requirements for renewal and Board staff seeing where licensees are obtaining their hours. Ms. Dominguez said that the Board's outreach effort to inform licensees of their CE/CPD requirements at conventions and organizations has been helpful and beneficial. Dr. White expressed agreement and said that this is an area where repeating the information multiple times is helpful.

Ms. Burns commented on the licenses issued and licensee population statistics and said there has been a steady increase overall with most of the increase in the practice of speech-language pathology.

Ms. Burns commented on enforcement statistics and said that complaints and convictions returned to pre-pandemic levels last year and citation and fines issued due to failing CE/CPD audits have increased the number of complaints opened.

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

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

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

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

8. Discussion and Possible Action on the Board's 2026 Sunset Review Report

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to present the Board's 2026 Sunset Review Report. Ms. Burns provided a background on the Sunset review process. Dr. White and Ms. Dominguez reported on discussions from the Sunset Review Ad Hoc Committee (Ad Hoc Committee).

Ms. Burns provided a background on discussions and possible action to amend BPC section 2538.33 regarding branch office license. Ms. Burns said that the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee (Committee) met in May 2025 and determined that allowing a hearing aid trainee to maintain a branch office license pursuant to BPC section 2538.34 would be inconsistent with BPC section 2538.30, which prohibits them from managing or independently operating a business that engages in the fitting or sale of hearing aids. Ms. Burns also said that the Committee approved language to address the issue and replace outdated language. Ms. Burns directed the Board to turn to page 118 of the report for the language. Ms. Burns said that the Board should discuss the item to determine if it should be included as part of the Board's Sunset Review.

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

Tamara Chambers moved to adopt the legislative proposal as part of the Board's Sunset Review as noticed.

Amy White seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Burns directed the Board through the report section by section. Ms. Burns asked for Board discussion and revisions to the report.

Ms. Burns said that the fund condition on page 30 could be updated to reflect the current months in reserve for fiscal year 25/26 and 26/27. Ms. Chang recommended that it should be updated because the current months in reserve are much lower than what is in the report. Mr. Borges expressed agreement to the recommendation. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Ms. Chang recommended breaking up the large paragraph on page 35 to smaller paragraphs starting at "Since the last Sunset Review,". Ms. Burns noted the change.

Ms. Burns commented on the processing timeframes on page 38 for aides, audiologists, audiologists-temporary, hearing aid trainee, and speech-language pathology assistant, and noted the changes to each are 12, 11, 18, 13, and 16 days respectively.

Ms. Burns commented on the pass and fail rate from Educational Testing Service (ETS) on page 49 and said that she will make changes using the data provided by ETS. Ms. Burns also said the data is nationwide and not just California applicants because the Board only receives passing rate data.

Ms. Chang recommended that the eight SLPA programs be listed on page 51 along with what city they are in. Ms. Burns noted the changes. Ms. Dominguez recommended that the SLPA programs should also be listed geographically by Northern and Southern California. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Ms. Domingez recommended that the rephrased “in alignment with the drop in complaints” so that it say, “decrease in volume in complaints” on page 33. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Ms. Chang recommended highlighting the questions of the report in bold. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Dr. Sanders asked if the Board still believes there isn't enough doctoral audiology programs in California as stated in question 60 on page 77 and said that some programs may not be at their enrollment capacity. Ms. Burns said that she was not aware that doctoral programs are not at their enrollment capacity and recommended removing audiology from the response to question 60.

Dr. White said that there are still access issues to see audiologists, but programs are not filling their enrollment capacity. Dr. Sanders said that one of the issues is that there are not enough qualified applicants to participate in audiology programs. Dr. White said there are also other reasons such as the need for different pathways to enter into the program. Ms. Burns asked if that should be added to the report. Dr. White recommended that it should not be added to the report until the Board can get data on all the programs. Ms. Burns noted the change to remove audiology from the response to question 60.

Dr. Chambers asked what the timeframe is for the table on page 78. Ms. Burns said that it would be the most recent data. Dr. Chambers recommended that the year be added. Ms. Burns noted the change.

Mr. Borges said that the words “to be” in the questions of Issue #4 on page 87 is missing a space in between the words. Ms. Burns said that there may be a space in between the words, but Microsoft Word can't make it appear bigger and recommended adding extra space.

Ms. Dominguez said the Ad Hoc Committee found this issue throughout the document. Ms. Burns noted the changes to add extra space when necessary.

Dr. Sanders recommended replacing the words “as well as” with the word “or” in the first sentence of the Board's 2025 response on page 95. Ms. Burns noted the change.

Mr. David asked if there was a way to quantify the statement regarding the “significant growth in the number of Audiologists applying” through the new certification pathways on page 95 or if the percentage stated in the report represents this growth. Ms. Burns said that 51 percent or 86 annually refers to the number of applicants through RPE and the Board issues, on average, 36 licenses per year through the new certification pathways. Ms. Burns recommended that a percentage could be added to the number of licenses issued through the new certification pathways. Mr. David expressed agreement with the recommended changes

Ms. Dominguez asked if the last paragraph on page 104 could be broken down into three smaller paragraphs with the second paragraph starting with the words “another factor” and the third paragraph starting with the word “lastly.” Ms. Dominguez said that this would align with the writing style in another part of the report. Ms. Burns noted the changes.

Ms. Burns noted the changes to page 119 regarding hearing aid dispensing branch office requirements as it was discussed and approved to be included in the Sunset Report. Ms. Burns said that she will remove the highlights and include the Board's approval date.

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

Tamara Chambers moved to approve the Sunset Review Report, as amended, and delegated to the Executive Officer to make technical or editorial changes necessary for submission by the January 5, 2026 deadline.

Tod Borges seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Liranzo to provide the legislative report. Ms. Liranzo reported on the legislative calendar and deadlines and changes to bills being monitored by the Board, including bills that were chaptered and bills that were vetoed by the Governor. Ms. Liranzo said that an advisory will be sent to licensees regarding chaptered bills and their impact at the end of the year or the beginning the next year. Ms. Liranzo also said that the Governor's vetoed message can be found in the meeting material.

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

10. Legislative Items for Future Meeting

Ms. Dominguez asked for legislative items for future meeting.

Ms. Liranzo said AB 82 regarding gender-affirming health care provider, employee, or volunteer and AB 144 regarding 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in LA were chaptered with impact to the Board and/or its licensees. Ms. Liranzo also said that, in addition to including them in the next legislative report for Board discussion, they will be added to the advisory that will be sent to licensees

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

11. Election of Board Officers for 2026

Ms. Dominguez invited nominations for Board Chair and Vice Chair for 2026.

Dr. White nominated Ms. Dominguez for Board Chair. Ms. Dominguez accepted the nomination.

Mr. Borges nominated Dr. White for Board Vice Chair. Dr. White accepted the nomination.

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

Tod Borges moved to approve Gilda Dominguez as Board Chair and Amy White as Board Vice Chair for 2026.

Karen Chang seconded the motion.

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

12. Discussion of Potential Dates for Board Meetings in 2026

Ms. Dominguez invited Ms. Burns to provide potential dates for Board Meetings in 2026.

Ms. Burns said that, because of the Board's Sunset Review, its first meeting should be after its hearing, which is usually in March, and proposed the first meeting be on March 26 and 27. Ms. Burns also said that this meeting could be remote with publicly disclosed locations. Ms. Burns proposed April 2 and 3 and April 16 and 17 as other dates to consider. The Board expressed agreement with a remote meeting on April 2 and 3.

Ms. Burns proposed June 4 and 5 or July 16 and 17 for the second meeting date. Ms. Dominguez asked if this would be in-person. Ms. Burns said that it will be in-person most likely in Northern California but it could be remote. Ms. Burns said that if one person can't make it, that person may be able to use the newer provisions of the Bagley Keene Act to attend the meeting provided that they are not needed to establish a quorum. The Board expressed agreement with a remote meeting on July 16 and 17.

Ms. Burns proposed September 10 and 11, October 1 and 2, or October 8 and 9, for the third meeting date. The Board expressed agreement with a meeting on October 1 and 2. Ms. Burns said that this will be an in-person meeting and recommended the location to be in Northern California.

Ms. Burns proposed December 3 and 4 or December 10 or 11 for the fourth meeting date and recommended that this meeting is in-person in Southern California. Ms. Burns said that Board staff can see if another SLPA program could offer to host the Board at their college. The Board expressed agreement with a remote meeting on December 3 and 4.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the location could be switched. Ms. Burns noted the changes to location of the third and fourth meetings.

Ms. Dominguez asked for public comments.

Susan McDonald, Cerritos College Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA) Program Director, said that the Board is always welcome to return to Cerritos College as a location for their meeting.

Marta Delgado, SLPA student from Cerritos College, expressed gratitude for the Board having their meeting at Cerritos College and said that the information was very informative as a student and a future SLPA.

Ms. Dominguez expressed gratitude for Cerritos Colleges and its SLPA program for hosting the Board and allowing it to conduct its meeting at its college.

Charles Sanders moved to approve the dates for Board Meetings in 2026.

Francis David seconded the motion.

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

13. Solicitation of Future Agenda Items

Ms. Dominguez asked for future agenda items.

Ms. Liranzo said that an item for future agenda would be possible statutory changes similar to Senate Bill 160 regarding background checks for the Medical Board, Osteopathic Medical Board, Board of Psychology, and Board of Behavioral Sciences.

Ms. Liranzo also said that another item for future agenda would be a discussion on the Board's 2026 rulemaking calendar.

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

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m.