



**Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Sacramento, CA 95834  
May 31, 2018**

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

Patti Solomon-Rice called the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. Ms. Solomon-Rice called roll; three members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Patti Solomon-Rice, Committee Chair  
Dee Parker, Committee Member  
Debbie Snow, Committee Member

Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Breanne Humphreys, Operations Manager  
Carla Newman, Enforcement Coordinator  
Kelsey Pruden, Legal Counsel  
Katrina Martinez, Analyst

Guests Present

Marcia Raggio, AuD, Board Member  
Amnon Shalev, HAD, Board Member  
Karen Chang, Board Member  
Jacque Georgeson, University of the Pacific  
Patrick Le, Assistant Deputy Director, Office of Board and Bureau Services

2. Approval of the February 8, 2018 Committee Meeting Minutes

**M/S/C Snow/Parker**

- **Motion to approve the February 8, 2018 Committee Meeting Minutes as written. Motion carried 3-0**

3. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

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

4. Discussion and Possible Action regarding RPE Direct Monitoring Requirements (As Stated in California Code of Regulations 1399.153.3) and Remote or Tele Supervision

Ms. Solomon-Rice summarized various letters the Board recently received in support for tele-supervision for RPE temporary license holders. CCR 1399.153.3 requires 8 hours per month of direct monitoring for full time RPE licensees (4 hours per month for part-time licensees) by the supervisor. Direct monitoring has been determined to mean in-person, on-site observation of the RPE licensee. Ms. Solomon-Rice explained that there is a lack of clarity in current regulation because there is no definition outlined by regulation. Mr. Sanchez described the differences between the supervision requirements for SLPAs and RPEs as outlined by current regulation and questioned whether we want to apply SLPA definitions of supervision to RPE licensees. Ms. Parker advocated that the more consistency there is between the requirements and definitions of supervision the better it would be for supervisors, for RPE and SLPA licensees, and for consumers. The differences between supervision requirements as defined by current regulation and by ASHA guidelines were discussed.

The issue of whether the tasks outlined in CCR 1399.153.3(d)(1-4) can be done via tele-supervision or other electronic means of supervision was brought up for discussion. Ms. Solomon-Rice opined that the level of skill of the RPE licensee needs to be taken into consideration and tele-supervision should not be used out of convenience for the supervisor. The limited scope of practice for a SLPA allows for tele-supervision to be considered more easily. Mr. Sanchez added that the Board needs to consider whether its limitations are barriers to licensure especially in comparison to other states and the national standard; however, the highest priority of the Board is consumer protection.

**M/S/C Solomon-Rice/Parker**

- **Motion to recommend to full Board to direct Board staff to work with legal counsel to develop proposed regulations with language that supports the use of tele-supervision based on the skill level of the RPE licensee. The motion carried 3-0.**

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.