



## **FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

### **January 27, 2011**

Kensington Park Hotel  
450 Post Street  
"Sherwood Room"  
San Francisco, CA  
(415) 351-4148

#### **Board Members Present**

Lisa O'Connor, M.A., Chairperson  
Alison Grimes, Au.D., Vice Chairperson  
Sandra Danz, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Deane Manning, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Carol Murphy, M.A.,  
Robert Green, Au.D.  
Monty Martin, M.A.

#### **Staff Present**

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer  
LaVonne Powell, Legal Counsel  
Cynthia Alameda, Staff  
Yvonne Crawford, Staff  
Debbie Newcomer, Staff

#### **Board Members Absent**

Rodney Diaz, M.D.

#### **Guests Present**

Cynthia Peffers, HHP CA  
Jody Winzelberg, Director of Rehabilitative Services, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital at Stanford  
Marcia Raggio, California Academy of Audiology (CAA)  
Rebecca Binge, University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)  
Robert Powell, California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA)  
Kimberly Kirchmeyer, Executive Staff, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)  
Cindy Kanemoto, DCA  
Randy Sager, HHP CA  
Chelsea Diles, InSound Medical  
Hallie Morrow, California Department of Health Care Services  
Jennifer Sherwood, California Department of Health Care Services

#### **I. Call to Order**

Chairperson O'Connor called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

#### **II. Introductions**

Those in attendance introduced themselves.

#### **III. Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

**A. July 26, 2010 Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee Meeting & Full Board Meeting Minutes**

The Board discussed minor edits to the meeting minutes of the July 26, 2010 Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee and full Board meeting minutes.

**M/S/C: Grimes/Murphy**

The Board voted to approve the meeting minutes as amended.

**B. September 14, 2010 Teleconference Board Meeting Minutes**

The Board reviewed the telephonic meeting minutes of September 14, 2010.

**M/S/C: Grimes/Green**

The Board voted to approve the meeting minutes.

**C. November 29, 2010 Teleconference Board Meeting Minutes**

The Board reviewed the telephonic meeting minutes of November 29, 2010.

**M/S/C: Grimes/Danz**

The Board voted to approve the meeting minutes.

**IV. Budget Review and Proposal for a Fee Increase for the Hearing Aid Dispensers Written and Practical Examinations.**

Ms. Del Mugnaio referenced the budget projection reports based on operational expenditures through November 30, 2010, as included in the meeting packets for both the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology budget and the Hearing Aid Dispensers budget. She also referenced a historical budget expenditure and revenue report for the Hearing Aid Dispensers program, which included a five-year history of program expenditures and revenues. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that, as mentioned in prior meetings, the Hearing Aid Dispensers fund will be insolvent within the next two years if the Board does not increase fees to generate additional revenue, as the program is projected to under-collect revenue by approximately 40% in fiscal year 2010/2011 and thereafter. She explained that many program areas have become more costly (e.g., examination administration and enforcement costs), and these increased costs have resulted in a fund imbalance. Ms. Del Mugnaio referenced a proposal included in the meeting packets that documented a need for an increase in the hearing aid dispensers examination fees for both the written and practical examinations. She reported that, after conducting an analysis of actual examination costs (including staff time and respective salaries, examination development, occupational analysis, and actual costs to administer the examinations), the Board's existing fees of one-hundred dollars (\$100) for the written examination and two-hundred and eighty-five dollars (\$285) for the practical examination were not adequate to fund the Board's examination program. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that in order to fund the examination program sufficiently, the Board would need to increase the examination fees to two-hundred and twenty-five dollars (\$225) for the written examination and five hundred dollars (\$500) for the practical examination. She indicated that such fees are not established by statute or regulation, but may be set by resolution of the Board, and she requested the Board's consideration of the proposed fee increase.

Mr. Manning inquired about the actual examination costs and how the costs were identified. He inquired which costs are set costs versus costs that may fluctuate or may be reduced by forced savings. He also inquired about the dollar amount noted for “examination expenditures” and asked about the breakdown of expenditures included under this heading.

Ms. Del Mugnaio responded and referenced the cost analysis document included in the Board packets, which provided estimates of staff resources and actual contractual expenses for the examination vendor to administer the written hearing aid dispensers examination, as well as costs associated with the inter-agency agreement with the Department of Consumer Affairs Office of Examination Resources to provide examination development and validation services.

Ms. Grimes inquired about the number of times the Board must offer the hearing aid dispensers practical examination annually.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the statute requires the Board to administer the examination at least twice annually; however, the Board has historically offered the practical examination three or four times per year, as there is typically a number of candidates waiting to take the examination in order to begin practicing hearing aid dispensing.

Mr. Sager stated that the Hearing Health Care Providers of CA (HHP) does not have an issue with increasing the examination fees.

Ms. Del Mugnaio indicated that the increase in examination costs would be noticed to the public before the next hearing aid dispensers practical examination, which is scheduled for early April 2011.

The Board discussed the proposed examination fee(s) increase and the additional revenue stream the new fees will provide to off-set the cost of administering the hearing aid dispensers written and practical examinations.

**M/S/C: Grimes/Green  
Unanimous**

**The Board resolved that the fees for the hearing aid dispensers examination shall be increased effectively immediately, raising the written examination fee from \$100 to \$225 and the practical examination fee from \$285 to \$500.**

**V. Report from the Department of Health Care Services Newborn Hearing Screening Program- Provider and Facility Standards, Screening Statistics, and Future Goals- (Program Representatives: Hallie Morrow, M.D., Jennifer Sherwood, Au.D.)**

Vice Chairperson Grimes introduced the discussion item regarding the status of the Newborn Hearing Screening Program’s (NHSP) standards, policies, and future goals. She identified herself as a longstanding California Childrens Services (CCS) provider and outlined four (4) general issues with the NHSP program for which she would like input from the NHSP representatives:

1. *Availability of uniform or standardized parent resource materials for deaf or hard of hearing children:* Ms. Grimes stated that she does not believe the state has met its mandate of publishing appropriate resource materials and, thus, was the impetus of Assembly Bill 2072, which was heard during the 2010 Legislative session.
2. *California lost-to-follow-up statistics:* Currently, the California statistics are not published on the Center for Disease Control’s website; however, most all other states’ statistics do appear. Statistics provided by the Department of Health Care

Services (DHCS), as published on the DHCS website, indicate a 3.6% lost-to-follow-up average, which is drastically below the national average of 46%, as reported on the CDC website.

3. *Eligibility standards for CCS paneled providers:* Provider retention, removal of incompetent providers, and methods for educating paneled providers regarding standard of care issues.
4. *Referral patterns and practices:* Time frames for referrals from failed hospital screenings, to diagnostic evaluations, to intervention.

Hallie Morrow and Jennifer Sherwood addressed the Board and provided a response or information regarding the four (4) items outlined by Chairperson Grimes:

1. Hallie Morrow reported that the NHSP has been unsuccessful in developing wording for “uniform” parent resource materials, as not all interested parties can agree upon the information that should be included in a universal pamphlet. There is debate surrounding the methodology that should be recommended for children born deaf or hard of hearing. However, the NHSP does provide resource materials published by other governmental organizations upon request of a family. NACHAM materials are available to families through the various Hearing Coordination Centers (HHCs) throughout the state.
2. Hallie Morrow also explained that the national statistics for lost-to-follow-up represent the number of children that are not tracked by a state agency after an infant fails the initial hospital screening. California has a much lower rate of lost-to-follow-up because it employs the HHCs to track every infant who is recorded as failing a hospital screening. There are approximately 550,000 babies born in California hospitals each year. Approximately, 10,000 babies are referred for diagnostic evaluations at the time of hospital discharge. An estimated 1,000 babies that should be referred at the time of hospital discharge are not recorded. An estimated 12,000 babies are tracked by the HHCs at any given time; only 3.6% of babies are identified as lost-to-follow-up. If a family moves out of state after an infant fails a hospital re-screen or does not respond to the HHC, the case for that infant is closed and is not reported as a lost-to-follow-up case. The CDC’s statistics track only infants that require diagnostic testing or who were never provided out-patient screening, and their statistics do not capture data on out-patient re-screens, while California’s statistics include these data. Using the CDC’s formula, comparative data for California would reflect a 14.5% lost-to-follow-up rate.
3. Jennifer Sherwood provided information on provider qualifications. Individuals qualify as paneled providers under CCS by holding a valid, clear license and two-years of experience working with the pediatric population. Paneled providers work and provide services within approved facilities that are classified as level A, B, and C facilities based on available equipment and the experience of the providers employed at the facility. CCS is not an enforcement agency, but rather provides support and education to its providers. Any issues regarding competency should be reported to the Board for further investigation or disciplinary action. In 2009, the NHSP held a pediatric symposium as an educational outreach effort for its providers and is also considering holding webinars to provide further education and guidance in terms of program expectation.

Chairperson Grimes inquired about whether the NHSP is considering requiring some form of a prerequisite examination as a provider standard for pediatric audiologists, and suggested that the NHSP research the American Board of Audiology Pediatric Specialty Certification examination.

Jennifer Sherwood stated that a specialty certification should be a licensing standard and not mandated through the NHSP.

Chairperson Grimes recommended that a joint letter of the Board and the NHSP be sent to the American Board of Audiology to inquire about the prerequisites to take the pediatric specialty examination and whether the examination would be available to any licensed audiologist.

4. Jennifer Sherwood outlined referral patterns and backlogs. Delays in referrals to available clinics may be anywhere from three to four months, as there are a limited number of facilities and providers available to provide pediatric diagnostic services. HHCs will call large facilities to determine appointment availability and communicate wait times to families so that infants may be seen by the facility with the earliest appointment available.

Jody Winzelberg commented on the provider access issues and stated that inadequate reimbursement to providers within the CCS system is a major contributing factor to the low number of providers. She indicated that a few years ago, the California Academy of Audiology, the DHCS-CCS, and the EDS, met with Assembly Member Dave Jones to try to flush out some of the reimbursement issues, error detection procedures, and general policies that made it difficult for providers to obtain authorizations and reimbursement for services provided under CCS. Ms. Winzelberg stated that she would be interested in the Board re-energizing these conversations, as she believes little has been done to address untimely and low reimbursement to providers. Ms. Winzelberg commented that she has heard discussions regarding Assembly Bill 2072 being reintroduced this year and stated that much of the dissention regarding the bill last year surrounded disagreement between providing services to hard of hearing children versus deaf children. She stated that she would like to appeal to the Department of Education to request the Department develop an unbiased informational pamphlet to provide to families with hard of hearing children, which would outline appropriate communication options.

Chairperson Grimes thanked the representatives from the DHCS for attending the meeting of the Board and for their concerted efforts managing the NHSP given the tremendous resource challenges.

## **VI. Executive Officer's Report**

### **A. Status of Proposed Regulations**

#### **1. Dispensing Audiologists Renewal Fee/Continuing Professional Development Amendments (California Code of Regulations Sections -1399.157, 1399.160.3-1399.160.6)**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reported that the regulations have been approved by State and Consumer Services Agency and that the emergency proposal will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law within the next few weeks. She stated that the emergency regulations should take effect within approximately six (6) weeks.

#### **2. Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative (California Code of Regulations 1399.150.3, 1399.151, 1399.156, & 1399.156.5)**

Ms. Del Mugnaio referenced the proposed regulations in the meeting packets and stated that while the Board had approved the language at a previous meeting, she had been advised by interested parties of changes to the language that should be presented to the Board for consideration. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that CCR Sections 1399.130 and 1399.156 regarding unprofessional conduct have been amended to state that a licensee shall not be held responsible for civil settlements where a "gag clause" is enforced unless the licensee has some independent control over the terms of the settlement. She

explained that in many instances, the licensee is not consulted or included in the negotiating of a civil settlement, yet is named as a party to the settlement.

Ms. Powell agreed that licensees should not be held accountable for settlements that they are not involved with in the terms of the settlement.

Ms. Kirchmeyer suggested that the Board consider striking the language “including, but not limited to” in CCR Section 1399.150.3 (a) regarding the delegation to the Executive Officer to accept default decisions, approve settlement agreements for revocation, and the surrender or interim suspension of the license, as the language may suggest the Executive Officer’s authority extends beyond the decisions and agreements included in the section.

**M/S/C: Grimes/Danz  
Unanimous**

The Board voted to approve the proposed regulations as amended and delegated to Ms. Del Mugnaio to notice the regulatory proposal.

#### **B. Administration Transition Issues- Hiring Freeze/ Staff Recruitment/ Personnel Issues**

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the Department and all boards and bureaus are still subject to the state hiring freeze, although there is some flexibility for employees of the Department, and the boards and bureaus within the Department, to transfer to other programs if the employee is transferring to a position within the same civil service classification.

Ms. Del Mugnaio reported that she is currently recruiting for a Staff Services Manager position and the Non-Sworn Investigator position and is considering applications from employees within the Department.

#### **VII. Chairperson’s Report**

##### **Report from the National Council of State Boards of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology (NCSB) Meeting 2010**

Chairperson O’Connor provided a written report, which included topics from the NCSB meeting and the Department’s Director Board Chair and Vice Chair Conference Call.

NCSB Conference issues included:

1. Regulations pertaining to telepractice
2. CE regulations pertaining to self study
3. Supervision of assistants/aides when providing services through telepractice

January 11<sup>th</sup> Director’s Conference Call with Board Chairs items discussed were:

1. Transition to new Governor
  - The hiring freeze is still in place until Gov. Brown says otherwise.
  - The state budget released in January does not adversely impact the Department
  - Departments are asked to reduce cell phones by 50% and re-justify the use of state-issued credit cards.
  - Reorganization and consolidation of state agencies is being considered.
2. Continuing Competency
  - Podiatric Medicine has instituted a new model of continuing competency: CE plus a continuing competency exam or other options. There are multiple pathways to show continuing competency (e.g., peer review, Board certification exam, hospital privileges, etc.). Business and

Professions Code 2496 (applicable to Podiatric Medicine) states that proof of competency must be demonstrated every two years.

- The Department recommends that all boards research different models of continued competency.
3. BREEZE
    - Should be up and running by December 2012.
    - There is an interim solution to provide on-line license renewal payment until Breeze is available. There is a 2% fee charged to each Board for each renewal and the licensee pays \$1.00. Ms. Del Mugnaio indicated that the Board has made a request to be included in the interim program.
  4. Performance Measure Regarding Enforcement. Department web site has data on each board.
  5. Expert Consultants. New Guidelines for employing experts to serve in examination, licensing and enforcement capacities.

#### **VIII. Practice Committee Reports**

##### **A. Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee Report and Recommendations for Proposed Regulatory Amendments Continuing Professional Development Provisions, Proposed Regulations to Implement the Song Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, and Scope of Practice Limitations on Deep Insertion Hearing Aid Devices**

Mr. Manning provided an overview of the matters discussed at the Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee Meeting and outlined the recommendations of the Committee before the Board (included under the Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee Meeting Minutes).

##### **M/S/C: Grimes/Murphy**

The Board voted to adopt the recommendation of the Committee and approve the filing of the regulation amendments (California Code of Regulations Sections 1399.140 – 1399.143) regarding continuing education (CE) for hearing aid dispensers

##### **M/S/C: Manning/Diaz**

The Board voted to adopt the recommendation of the Committee to approve the draft regulation document as a discussion document for the legislative proposal to amend the Song Beverly Consumer Warranty Act.

Chairperson O'Connor requested that the matter regarding the hearing aid dispenser CE regulations be re-opened, as she was unclear as to the changes to the provisions of Section 1399.140(e) regarding CE waivers and grace periods.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that subsection (e) does not address waiver exemptions; instead it provides a one-year grace period for licensed hearing aid dispensers to make up deficient CE from the previous license renewal period. She explained that waiver exemptions are covered in a separate CCR Section, 1399.144.

##### **M/S/C: Grimes/Green**

The Board voted to re-open the Committee action and Board discussion regarding the proposed CE changes for hearing aid dispensers.

The Board discussed the difference between the grace period currently in regulation for hearing aid dispensers and waiver exemptions for substantiated hardships, which are also available to licensees.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that she is unaware of other healing arts boards that allow grace periods for deficiencies in CE.

Mr. Manning suggested that the issue regarding subsection (e) be addressed in a Committee meeting, thus respecting the process for discussions surrounding hearing aid dispensers license authorization.

Ms. Powell stated that the proposed regulations may be noticed and a hearing scheduled. The Committee will have another opportunity to revisit the policy issues surrounding the grace period prior to any final action.

**M/S/C: Danz/Grimes**  
**Oppose: Manning**

The Board voted to approve the recommendation of the Committee to notice the proposed CE regulations for hearing aid dispensers, but voted to strike Section 1399.140(e) and eliminate a grace period for licensees to make-up deficient CE hours.

**B. Speech-Language Pathology Committee Report and Recommendations Regarding Telepractice, Proposed Regulatory Amendments for Speech-Language Pathology Assistant Field Work Requirement, and Status of the Proposal to Conduct a Standard Setting Study for the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) Examination**

Chairperson O'Connor summarized the discussion from the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee Meeting (included under the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee Meeting Minutes).

**M/S/C: Danz/Grimes**

The Board voted to approve the recommendation of the Committee to notice the proposed regulations for speech-language pathology assistant field work hours and supervision (CCR Section 1399.170.1399.170.10, 1399.170.11, & 1399.170.15)

**IX. Department of Consumer Affairs Director's Report**

Kimberly Kirchmeyer addressed the Board on behalf of Director Brian Stiger:

- *Emergency regulations:* Reported that she was informed that the Board's emergency regulations for dispensing audiologists were approved by the State and Consumer Services Agency.
- *CPEI regulations:* The Board's Consumer Protection and Enforcement Initiative (CPEI) regulations were reviewed by the Department and are ready to file.
- *Hiring freeze:* The Administration indicated that the Department should continue to operate under the hiring freeze conditions. However, critical positions including CPEI positions will be forwarded to State and Consumer Services Agency for hiring freeze exemption consideration.
- *Cell phone reduction:* All agencies were required to reduce the number of cell phones allotted to their organization by fifty-percent (50%). The Board has met its reduction.



- *Transition issues:* Currently, there is not an Agency Secretary appointed to State and Consumer Services Agency. Mr. Brian Stiger has been asked by the Governor's Office to remain in his Director capacity until further notice.
- *Performance Measures:* These are posted on the Department's website for all boards/bureaus. Board members should review the measures.
- *Breeze Project:* Department is pursuing an integrated data system for licensing, enforcement, examinations, legislative reports, continuing education, etc. Several workshops are being held to prepare for the data conversion.
- *Senate Bill 1441-Uniform Standards for Substance Abusing Licensees:* All Boards are encouraged to incorporate the provisions of SB 1441 into their respective diversion programs or disciplinary guidelines.
- *Board meeting materials posted on the website:* Thanked the Board for making its materials available to the public on its website and for webcasting its meetings, as it provides greater public access to Board deliberations.
- *Expert Consultants:* Must be paid through personnel services contracts.
- *Continued Competency:* The Department will be holding a telephonic meeting to discuss the pathways for continued competency.

## X. Legislation

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided the following written legislative report:

### A. Amendments to 1793.02 Civil Code Regarding Warranty Provisions for Assistive Devices-Hearing Aids

The legislative proposal amending Civil Code Section 1793.02 was submitted to the Department early November 2010. The Department's Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Unit is assisting the Board with finding an author for the bill. However, the Board may need to work with the professional organizations to secure an author, as the proposal is not considered omnibus.

Ms. Peffers stated that the HHP is pursuing an author for the legislative proposal and will work with the Board and the California Academy of Audiology on the measure.

### B. Merger of the Speech-Language Pathologist and Audiologist/Hearing Aid Dispensers Practice Act(s)

The Board is pursuing a legislative proposal to merge its Practice Acts for the Speech-Language Pathologist and Audiologist B&P Chapter 5.3 (Sections 2530 et.seq.) and the Hearing Aid Dispensers Chapter 7.5 (Sections 3300 et.seq.) pursuant to the merger of the two oversight bodies under AB 1535. Since dispensing audiologists are subject to many of the provisions of both Acts, and the authority to carry out the mandates of the professions is under one Board, it makes sense to merge the statutes for clarity in administering and enforcing the provisions. The Department is assisting the Board with this endeavor and submitting the measure as an omnibus proposal that may be carried by either the Senate Business Professions and Economic Development Committee or an independent author. Ms. Del Mugnaio is currently working with Legislative Counsel on the consolidation of some of the statutory provisions and the inclusion of others under one Article within the Business and Professions Code.

### C. Entry Level Licensing Standards for Audiologists and 4<sup>th</sup> year Audiology Doctoral Students Completing the Required Professional Experience (Business and Professions Code Section 2532.25)

At its July 26, 2010 meeting, the Board discussed the issue of amending the entry-level licensure requirements for AuD students, as law currently requires a 12-month externship. This is problematic

as some programs calculate completion of the 4<sup>th</sup> year in hours, not months, and the hours do not always total a full 12-month time period. If a student completes the externship early, the student is often forced to find other employment and supervision in order to complete the 12-month experience. Ms. Grimes had offered to work with the American Academy of Audiology to identify some standard in the number of hours required by university programs that would be accepted as a minimum standard for program accreditation. Chairperson Grimes indicated that, to date, the information is not available from the Academy, as a separate task force has been assigned to define the standards for the 4<sup>th</sup> year externship.

#### **D. Other Legislation of Interest to the Board**

No other legislation was discussed by the Board.

#### **XI. Corporate and Employment Practices for Licensees**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed the existing provisions regarding the Knox Keene Act and the Business and Professions Code provisions regarding professional corporations and general law corporations. She stated that there are a number of challenges in interpreting existing statutes, as the issues of corporate practice versus employment relationships of various health care providers are complex. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the Department's Legal Office is in the process of preparing a legal opinion regarding the corporate practice and employment arrangements for Physical Therapists. She indicated that the legal opinion may assist the Board in determining whether statutory changes to its corporate practice provisions should be pursued.

Ms. Powell stated that many of the existing laws governing corporate structure may need to be revisited, as the provisions have not kept pace with the changes in the health care delivery system.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the Board has a unique challenge in navigating unlawful employment arrangements, as speech-language pathologists and audiologists must practice under professional corporations, while hearing aid dispensers may be employed under general law corporations. She stated this is problematic, as there are a number of employment relationships between audiologists, hearing aid dispensers, and physicians where the "corporation" is employing the health care providers, but not all the providers are licensed to dispense hearing aids, which is a violation of Business and Professions Code Section 655.2.

Ms. Powell suggested the Board review the legal opinion developed for the Physical Therapy Board once it's released and then revisit the discussion of amending its corporate practice provisions and employment arrangement restrictions.

#### **XII. Licensing / Enforcement/Examination Statistical Data**

The Board reviewed the statistical data as provided by staff and requested information regarding the gathering of statistical information.

Each program area was presented independently, and a thorough review of the data was facilitated by Board staff.

#### **XIII. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda/ Future Agenda Items**

A member of the public inquired about the enforcement process for subject matter experts to issue opinions regarding scope of practice issues and whether such opinions are public information.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that if the subject matter opinion were to be adopted by the Board and incorporated as a policy decision to be codified in regulation, the policy decision would be public information.

Ms. Winzelberg addressed the Board and stated that she is aware of a Medi-Cal trailer bill that will increase the hearing aid benefit to \$1,510 per year per device. She stated that the standard for replacing a hearing aid device is approximately every three (3) years and that the new language is incredibly costly to the state. Ms. Winzelberg commented that last year, audiology services were removed as a covered benefit under Medi-Cal and was presented as a necessary cost reduction for the state. She stated that removing audiology services as a covered benefit presents a serious consumer protection issue for elderly patients who desperately need such services, and that increasing the hearing aid benefit to an annual benefit is unnecessary and is cost prohibitive to the state.

A member of the public commented that in the past, courses on pediatric hearing loss or intervention have not been approved by the Hearing Aid Dispensers Bureau for CE credit and was curious as to why such courses would be denied.

Ms. Del Mugnaio indicated that she would need to research the specific courses in question to be able to provide an appropriate response.

**XIV. Announcements- Future 2011 Board Meetings- July 14-15, 2011 Sacramento/ October 20-21, San Francisco  
Next Scheduled Board Meeting April 13-14, 2011 San Diego**

Ms. O'Connor stated that the next scheduled Board meeting would be held in San Diego. The Board discussed the option of holding the Board meeting on a Thursday and Friday since furloughs were no longer an issue.

The Board confirmed the dates of the July and October meetings as noticed.

The April meeting was rescheduled to April 14-15, 2011 in San Diego.

**VII. Adjournment**

Chairperson O'Connor adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.