



**Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee
Telephonic Meeting Minutes
APRIL 22, 2008**

**Department of Consumer Affairs
Speech-Language Pathology &
Audiology Board**
2100 Evergreen Street, Suite 2100,
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 263-2909

6061 Shelter Bay Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 94941
(415) 383-7029

Green Valley Christina Center,
376 South Green Valley Road,
Watsonville, CA
(831) 724-0847.

UC Davis Medical Center
2521 Stockton Blvd,
Sacramento, CA 95817
(916) 734-2832

Committee Members Present

Lisa O'Connor, M.A., Chairperson
Paul Donald, M.D.
Carol Murphy, M.A.
Jennifer Hancock, M.A.

Staff Present

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

Guests Present

Jan Pryor, SLP, Representing the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association

I. Call to Order

Chairperson O'Connor called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

II. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves

III. Consider Procedural Changes for Evaluating the Academic and Clinical Training of Foreign Educated Applicants

The Committee discussed whether devising a curriculum guideline to be used by the approved transcript evaluation services would be helpful in obtaining more consistent and relevant evaluations from the evaluation services which are reviewing foreign transcripts to determine whether a candidate for licensure has obtained equivalent training to that offered in the United States.

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided a recent example in which two separate board-approved evaluations services rendered distinctly different decisions regarding the equivalency of foreign applicant's education, wherein one service deemed the education equivalent to that of a master's degree in

speech-language pathology, while the other determined that only the equivalence of a bachelor's degree was earned.

The Committee determined that reviewing the curriculum of a sample of California speech-language pathology training programs would be helpful to determine the congruence in requisite coursework and clinical training and to discern whether a curriculum guideline could be developed as a tool for foreign transcript evaluation services. The curriculum of the following universities were to be divided amongst the members and researched: San Diego State, California State Los Angeles, San Francisco State, Sacramento State, California State Northridge, and California State East Bay.

The Committee members agreed to compile the information and report their independent findings at the May 22, 2008 Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee meeting.

IV. Review English Language Competency Examination and Consider Appropriate Regulatory Action Regarding Examination Requirements of Foreign Applicants

The Committee agreed that each member would review the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) examination via a web-based tutorial and provide input as to whether the examination may be appropriate as a licensing requirement for those who are foreign educated, and whose native language is not English. The Committee members will report on their individual assessments of the examination at the May 22, 2008 Committee meeting.

Ms. Murphy stated that she learned through ETS, that a new language based examination has been developed specifically for the healthcare workforce, referred to as the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) which may be a more relevant examination for demonstrating English-language competency of health care providers. She stated that the new TOEIC examination is not currently being administered as a workgroup comprised of subject matter experts is in the process of establishing the new examination passing score.

The Committee also discussed whether developing new required professional experience (RPE) ratings forms or clinical performance evaluation forms would be helpful for RPE supervisors to use when evaluating and documenting competency that may be noted throughout the experience.

Ms. Del Mugnaio suggested that the use of such forms submitted to the Board on a monthly or quarterly basis may helpful for the Board in terms of being able to monitor and communicate with RPE supervisors about competency issues as they arise as opposed to waiting until the RPE experience has concluded (which may be nine-months or more) for the assessment to be submitted and evaluated by the Board. She also stated that by supervisors completing the evaluation forms more consistently, the supervisor has an opportunity to either communicate an improvement plan with the RPE and/or secure the necessary documentation to support the reasons for terminating the experience due to a clear lack of entry-level preparation or other significant performance issues. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that some supervisors have reported a reluctance to deny an RPE their experience for fear of legal ramifications, even though, the supervisor believes the RPE has notable performance issues.

The Committee agreed to research existing samples of clinical experience ratings forms and skills inventory forms that are currently being used in certain work settings and provide such documentation for the Committee review and consideration at the May 22, 2008 Committee meeting.

V. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Jan Pryor, representing the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA), expressed concerns regarding the proposed changes to the RPE supervisor qualifications. Specifically, Ms. Pryor stated that several professionals were concerned over the new requirements for supervisors to obtain continuing education in supervision training prior to being approved to serve in a supervisory capacity. She stated that with the lack of individuals already willing to serve as supervisors, there is a concern that additional requirements such as the proposed regulations may discourage those currently supervising from continuing. Ms. Pryor commented that she supports the concept of the supervision training but is concerned about its impact on the profession in terms of the availability of the training.

Ms. O'Connor explained that the Board's decision to amend existing regulations to require the new supervision qualifications has been discussed at several board meetings over the past year and that CSHA representatives were aware of the proposal during the public comment period. She also stated that the Board will be discussing the new provisions and the implementation thereof at the May 22-23, 2008 meeting and will take into consideration some of the expressed concerns.

VI. Adjournment

Ms. O'Connor adjourned the meeting at 2:12 p.m.