



**BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**Sacramento, Glendora, and Teleconference Meeting**  
**May 12-13, 2022**

For the sake of clarity, the meeting minutes are organized in numerical order to reflect their original order on the agenda; however, issues were taken out of order during the meeting.

**Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee**

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

Tod Borges, Committee Chair, called the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 1:00 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  
Marcia Raggio, Dispensing Audiologist  
Karen Chang, Public Member  
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Heather Olivares, Legislation/Regulation Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
David Bouilly, DCA SOLID  
Bryce Penney, DCA Web Cast

Guests Present

April Dolan, AuD

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Patrick, a member of the public, inquired about remote supervision for Required Professional Experience (RPE).

3. Discussion and possible action to Amend or Adopt regulations regarding Continuing Education Requirements and Continuing Education Course Content Requirements

for Hearing Aid Dispensers and Dispensing Audiologists as stated in Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) sections 1399.140, 1399.140.1 and 1399.144

Cherise Burns provided a summary of changes to the regulations regarding continuing education (CE) requirements.

Mr. Borges opened the discussion on the changes to regulations regarding CE requirements. Mr. Borges commented that section 1399.140(h) once existed and suggested no more than four hours for examination related duties. Dr. Amy White expressed agreement with a specified number of hours per day and suggested limiting the number of hours per renewal period. Karen Chang expressed agreement with the suggested four hours. Mr. Borges commented that this may encourage licensees to help with developing or administering the examination.

Dr. White inquired if the four hours would be per day. Mr. Borges replied the examination are one day and workshops are two days. Ms. Burns clarified that examinations now run for two days in a row. Mr. Borges commented to break down the hours further. Dr. White expressed agreement that it should be two hours per day.

Paul Sanchez inquired if Ms. Burns can read the suggested changes and if there was a maximum number of hours. Ms. Burns replied that a maximum number of four hours was suggested. Mr. Borges inquired if this limitation applied to both the workshops and examinations. Dr. White replied limiting it four hours total. Dr. Marcia Raggio expressed agreement to limit it to four hours for both workshops and examinations. Mr. Borges expressed agreement to limit it to four hours for both workshops and examinations and suggested it to be for each renewal.

Ms. Burns noted the suggested changes are: "If a licensee serves the Board as a selected participant in Board sponsored examination development or examination administration related functions, the licensee may receive up to two (2) hours of continuing education credit for each day of service with a maximum of four (4) hours per renewal period."

Ms. Burns suggested removing the last sentence in subsection (h). Mr. Borges expressed agreement that this information is redundant and can be omitted. Karen Halbo, the Board's regulation counsel, expressed agreement that this sentence is not necessary and can be omitted.

Mr. Borges opened the discussion on the changes to allow hearing aid device courses. Mr. Borges commented on the benefits to consumers if their dispenser can complete courses on the programming, troubleshooting, and functionality of hearing aid devices. Dr. Raggio commented on why these types of course were removed in the past. Mr. Borges commented that courses offered today are different from courses provided in the past. Ms. Burns commented on the course approval process. Dr. Raggio commented on marketing materials provided during the course and marketing emails following the course. Mr. Borges shared his experience of marketing materials in

courses he attended. Mr. Sanchez commented on the ability to regulate marketing materials to those enrolled in Board approved courses. Ms. Burns suggested regulatory language can be added regarding the distribution of marketing materials as an unacceptable course content. Dr. White commented on the difficulty of drafting clear regulatory language on courses related to hearing aid devices. Ms. Burns commented on how CE course approval and audit process would look for these types of courses. Mr. Borges commented on course content that help consumers being valuable for hearing aid dispensers.

Dr. White inquired about a maximum number of hours for courses on hearing aid devices. Mr. Borges replied that it could be considered. Ms. Burns commented that it could be added to section 1399.140. Mr. Borges expressed agreement with limiting the number of hours. Ms. Burns commented on the use of subject matter experts for complex requests during the course approval process. Mr. Sanchez commented on the regulatory language being clear for licensees to understand.

Ms. Chang inquired if there are other providers who provide courses on hearing aid devices. Mr. Borges replied that courses will come from the manufacturer of the device. Dr. White commented on why these types of course were removed in the past.

Dr. Raggio inquired if courses provided on AudiologyOnline are provided by manufacturer. Mr. Borges replied that there are a wide variety of providers for various topics and courses on hearing aid devices and that they are primarily provided by the manufacturer of the device.

Ms. Burns provided a summary of changes to the regulations regarding CE requirements exemptions in section 1399.144.

Ms. Burns provided a summary of the attachments included for discussion which includes other states CE requirements and denied courses. Ms. Chang commented on Arizona's limitations on hours sponsored by a single manufacturer and inquired how it compared to current regulations and the proposed changes. Ms. Burns and Mr. Borges replied that current regulations do not permit courses sponsored by a manufacturer and limiting the number of manufacturers could be a restriction to consider. Ms. Chang inquired how many brands do dispensers carry. Mr. Borges replied that most dispenser carry two or three and commented that consumers may come with a different brand. Dr. White commented on the importance of limiting the number of hours on courses that are sponsored by a manufacturer. Mr. Borges commented on Arizona's course approval process. Mr. Borges further commented on continuing education being on the scope of practice to dispense hearing aids. Dr. White commented on the scope of practice and other tasks involved to fitting hearing aids. Dr. Raggio commented that technological advancements to hearing aid devices make courses on them appropriate and beneficial to dispensers.

Dr. April Dolan, Continuing Education Administrator from Audiology Online, commented on being available to answer any questions.

Ms. Burns inquired about the limitation to the number of hours for hearing aid device courses. Ms. Chang replied that no limitation was established. Mr. Borges commented that this can be discussed at the Board meeting when it's ready for their vote.

Ms. Halbo inquired about the language for unacceptable course content for marketing materials. Ms. Burns replied that the Committee was suggesting adding it to section 1399.141(b)(2) as: "This shall include the distribution of any materials during or after the course." Mr. Borges expressed agreement with the proposed language.

Ms. Chang inquired about materials provided during the courses. Mr. Borges replied that PowerPoint slides are generally provided. Ms. Chang commented on the proposed language being clear so that it doesn't prevent this type of material from being distributed.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the proposed language and issues with restraint of trade. Michael Kanotz replied that it would be a case-by-case basis in terms of commercial speech and for regulatory purpose the basis or necessity for the requirement will be needed to promulgate the requirement.

Dr. April Dolan, Continuing Education Administrator from Audiology Online, inquired if there will be a period prior to promulgating the requirement. Ms. Burns replied that course providers can work with Board staff to correct any deficiencies and noted that this expands acceptable courses making it easier to allow for these types of courses.

**Karen Chang made a motion to recommend to the Board the propose regulatory language as amended.**

**Dr. Marcia Raggio seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.** (Ayes: Borges, Raggio, Chang, White)

4. Discussion and possible action regarding Examination Requirements for Hearing Aid Dispensers and Dispensing Audiologists as stated in Title 16, CCR sections 1399.120, 1399.121, and 1399.122

Maria Liranzo provided a background on the changes to the regulations regarding examination requirements for Hearing Aid Dispensers and Dispensing Audiologists.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the payment status for applicants who are not accepted to the practical examination. Ms. Burns replied that payments are processed when the number of applicants is finalized for each examination. Ms. Burns provided a background of the current practical examination process and what it would look like under the proposed changes. Mr. Sanchez commented on the proposed changes providing more flexibility to Board staff in providing the practical examination.

Mr. Kanotz inquired about the number of allowable applicants and how they are determined. Ms. Liranzo replied that applicants are accepted in the order received and the Board determines the number of applicants accepted based on the number of examiners, location, and health and safety considerations. Mr. Sanchez commented on the limitations of the current process. Ms. Burns provided a background on Board staff process during the application filing period.

Ms. Chang inquired about applicants who reside outside of Sacramento. Ms. Burns replied that applications are sent to the Board through a postal service for early morning drop off. Mr. Sanchez commented on the proposed changes increasing the opportunities to complete the practical examination. Ms. Chang expressed agreement with the proposed changes.

Dr. Raggio inquired about retaking a failed portion of the examination. Ms. Burns replied that this was a change that occurred after DCA's Office of Professional Examination Services conducted an evaluation. Dr. Raggio inquired about halting the examination for failing a portion. Ms. Burns replied that there are different processes for scoring and halting the examination depending safety risks in a particular section.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of changes to sections 1399.120. Ms. Burns clarified that the information being added to regulations is a process that already exists and are not new requirements.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of changes to section 1399.121. Ms. Chang suggested if the provision regarding removal for cheating could be numbered the same on 1399.120 and 1399.121. Ms. Liranzo noted the suggested change.

Ms. Chang inquired about the total cost for completing both the practical and written examination. Ms. Burns replied to confirm that the total cost would be \$725. Ms. Chang inquired if the cost would be the same for retaking it. Ms. Burns replied that it would. Mr. Borges noted that it wouldn't if an appeal is granted. Ms. Burns confirmed and commented on the practical examination appeal process.

Mr. Borges inquired about the regulatory text and the phrase "including but not limited to." Ms. Halbo replied that "shall include" is an expansive term and the phrase "including but not limited to" is no longer necessary.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of changes to sections 1399.122 and 1399.152.4.

Mr. Borges inquired about having more emphasis on laws and regulations in the written examination. Mr. Sanchez replied that the proposed language in section 1399.120(b)(6) will aid discussion regarding the written examination development with DCA.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of the attachments included for discussion which includes the last approved version of the regulatory text and the most recent examinations outlines.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Dr. Marcia Raggio made a motion to recommend to the Board the propose regulatory language.**

**Karen Chang seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 4-0.** (Ayes: Borges, Raggio, Chang, White)

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

### **Audiology Practice Committee**

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

Dr. Marcia Raggio, Committee Chair, called the Audiology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. Dr. Raggio called roll; three members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### Committee Members Present

Marcia Raggio, Dispensing Audiologist, Committee Chair

Karen Chang, Public Member

Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

#### Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer

Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer

Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel

Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel

Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst

Heather Olivares, Legislation/Regulation Analyst

Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator

David Bouilly, DCA SOLID

Bryce Penney, DCA Web Cast

#### Guests Present

Debbie Clark, AuD

Christy Kirsch, AuD

#### 2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 3. Discussion and possible action regarding Statutory and/or Regulatory Requirements Related to Audiology Aide Scope of Practice and Supervision Requirements as

stated in BPC section 2530.2 and Title 16, CCR section 1399.154 through 1399.154.7

Dr. Raggio opened the discussion regarding the scope of practice and supervision requirements for audiology aides. Dr. Raggio commented on the issues and concerns regarding the role and tasks of audiology aides. Dr. Amy White commented on defining the tasks by listing prohibited tasks and defining audiology aide supervision similar to speech-language pathology assistant (SLPA) supervision. Dr. Raggio expressed agreement in defining audiology aide supervision similar to SLPA supervision.

Dr. Raggio suggested that any task that requires a license cannot be performed by an audiology aide and commented on the advantage and disadvantage of this type of language.

Karen Chang inquired about activities an audiology aide can or cannot perform. Dr. Raggio replied that some tasks listed on page 4 of the memo are appropriate and others are not as they require a license to perform. Paul Sanchez commented that various attachments are included for discussion which includes examples of tasks. Ms. Chang inquired if Attachment H would be an appropriate list to adopt. Dr. Raggio replied that examples listed uses broad language that can be open to different interpretation and the suggested supervision may be too restrictive. Dr. White commented on defining direct and indirect supervision similar to Attachment F.

Dr. White inquired if the intent for clarifying the audiology aide is for the creation of an audiology assistant license. Cherise Burns replied that this is separate from creating an audiology assistant which requires a statutory authority similar to SLPAs.

Dr. Raggio inquired about continuing education requirements for aides. Ms. Burns replied that renewal and continuing education requirements for aides are recommendations as part of the Board's Sunset Review. Mr. Sanchez commented on the need to clarify current aide requirements for consumer protection and the Board may consider the creation of an audiology assistant license type in the future.

Dr. White inquired about implementing changes to current aide requirements and the impact on those that currently perform tasks that would be considered outside their scope of practice. Mr. Sanchez replied that the Board requires an examination to properly make ear mold impressions to dispense hearing aids and it would be necessary to inform individuals performing this task that they would need to be licensed.

Dr. White inquired if tasks like ear impressions are currently not allowed to be performed by aides. Mr. Sanchez replied that they should not be allowed and the purpose of making changes is to make this clear. Ms. Burns commented that Board staff approve task according to their level of evasiveness and noted that without a renewal requirement the Board is not aware of the type of tasks aides are currently doing after they have been trained. Dr. Raggio commented on the Board receiving aide registration forms with tasks listed that are outside their scope of practice. Ms. Burns

commented on current aide applicants being more educated and experienced and the Board not having a structure for oversight and supervision when they are trained in tasks considered outside the scope

Dr. Raggio commented on the tasks listed in Attachment H as being appropriate for an aide to perform and others that would require some level of supervision and training due to their complexity. Dr. Raggio inquired who determines if an aide is not qualified or not adequately trained. Ms. Burns replied that there would have to be some sort of measure as Board staff are not trained in knowing what “qualified” or “adequately trained” means. Mr. Sanchez commented to clarify the attachments are examples to aid the discussion and not recommendations.

Dr. Raggio inquired if the Board would need regulations to make these changes. Ms. Burns replied there are no list of tasks in regulations. Michael Kanotz replied that to adopt standards and tasks that aides can perform would require regulations. Ms. Burns commented that the Board is authorized to designate standards and requirements related to the extent, kind, and quality of services performed by the aide, which can be defined in regulations. Ms. Burns commented on using this authority as an opportunity to clarify training requirements in section 1399.154.4.

Dr. White inquired if current training plans can be audited to see the current task being performed by aides. Ms. Burns replied that current plans can be reviewed to see the type of task listed. Dr. White commented on the negative impact changes to aide requirements may have to current business operation.

Dr. Raggio inquired about listing tasks that an aide can perform. Ms. Burns replied this is one method but may be problematic if a task is not listed. Dr. Raggio inquired if the list should contain categories of task and not specific tasks. Ms. Burns replied that this is another option and suggested listing tasks aides cannot perform as the current statutory language is broad.

Dr. White inquired about specifying education or training requirements. Ms. Burns replied that the statutory language for aides is an experience and training requirement rather than an education requirement. Ms. Burns commented that explicit statutory authority is generally given to implement education requirements such as those that exist for SLPAs. Mr. Kanotz commented on aides as used under the Business and Professions Code are generally unlicensed person with some training and registered with a board. Dr. White commented on the confusion with the use of aides under other healing arts boards. Dr. Raggio commented on the use of aides under other boards. Dr. Raggio commented on audiology assistant programs in California and inquired what happens to those individuals after the program. Ms. Burns replied that they could only be registered as an aide.

Dr. Raggio inquired if this Committee should develop categories of tasks and supervision requirements for aides. Ms. Burns replied that this would make specific the board’s designated standards and requirements as stated in Business and Professions



Code 2530.6. Ms. Burns commented on various ways to define the extent, kind, and quality of services performed by the aide.

Dr. Raggio inquired if aides would continue to exist if an assistant license type was created. Ms. Burns replied that the Board continues to receive registration applications for speech-language pathology aides even with a SLPA license type.

Ms. Burns read a written comment from Debbie Clark with Pacific Hearing Services in Los Altos regarding audiology assistants' ability to perform otoscopy and clarity on what they can do independently.

Dr. Debbie Clark from Pacific Hearing Services in Los Altos commented on providing input at future committee meetings regarding audiology aides.

Dr. Christy Kirsch, Clinical Director from San Diego State University, commented on the need for clearer guidelines in order to train audiology students on the proper use of aides or assistants in the clinic.

Dr. Raggio commented on the concept of triage by aides and inquired if it would require some type of interpretation. Ms. Burns replied that licensed professionals like registered nurses that perform triage have a certain amount of training to implement certain criteria on patients.

**Dr. Amy White made a motion to have no more than two committee members to work with Board staff to draft language regarding audiology aides.**

**Karen Chang seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 3-0. (Ayes: Raggio, Chang, White)**

4. Update, discussion, and possible action regarding Audiology Licensing Requirements Related to Supervised Clinical and Professional Experience as stated in Business and Professions Code Sections 2532.2 and 2532.25 and Title 16, CCR sections 1399.152.2

Ms. Burns provided an update on statutory changes to supervised clinical and professional experience for audiology license and noted that Board staff recommend further discussion to be held at a future meeting after statutory amendments are more certain.

Dr. Raggio inquired about amendments to the statutory language. Ms. Burns replied that the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee have inquires on the Board's suggested changes that Board staff are resolving. Mr. Sanchez commented on the discussion Board staff are having with the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the survey for the audiology programs in California. Ms. Burns replied that questions are being prepared and will be sent to programs in the summer.

Dr. Christy Kirsch, Clinical Director from San Diego State University, inquired on what pre-didactic means to the Board. Ms. Burns replied that these are clinical rotations or experiences completed before the completion of the didactic program.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

### **Board Meeting**

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

Dr. Marcia Raggio, Board Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2022 and 9:03 a.m. on Friday, May 13, 2022. Dr. Raggio called roll; eight members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### Board Members Present

Marcia Raggio, Dispensing Audiologist, Board Chair  
Holly Kaiser, Speech-Language Pathologist, Vice Chair  
Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Karen Chang, Public Member  
Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist  
Debbie Snow, Public Member  
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

#### Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Heather Olivares, Legislation/Regulation Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
David Bouilly, DCA SOLID  
Bryce Penney, DCA Web Cast

#### Guests Present

Matt Shafer  
Carl Sims  
Laura Wasco  
Jennifer Kizner  
Kenya Gomez

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

Cherise Burns read a written comment from Jill Axtell regarding in-person continuing education requirements.

3. Review and Possible Approval of the January 13, 2022, Board Teleconference Meeting Minutes

Maria Liranzo provided a summary of the January 13, 2022, Board Teleconference Meeting Minutes.

There was no Board discussion nor comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Gilda Dominguez moved to approve the January 13, 2022 Board meeting minutes.**

**Dr. Amy White seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

4. Review and Possible Approval of the February 25, 2022, Board Teleconference Meeting Minutes

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of the February 25, 2022, Board Teleconference Meeting Minutes.

Holly Kaiser requested amendments on page 6 under Agenda Item 13c to replace "CASHA" with "CSHA."

Gilda Dominguez requested amendments on page 4 under the fifth paragraph to remove the second "a" from Pasadena.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Karen Chang moved to approve the February 25, 2022 Board meeting minutes, as amended.**

**Tod Borges seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

5. Board Chair's Report

Dr. Raggio opened the discussion on the 2022 Board and Committee Meeting Calendar and noted that the next meeting will be in-person unless stated otherwise. Cherise Burns commented on requesting bids to help determine a viable location in southern California for August's meeting and suggested Sacramento or teleconference for October's meeting.

Debbie Snow and Ms. Kaiser reported on the discussion from the Enforcement Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Paul Sanchez commented on the overview provided on the enforcement process.

Tod Borges reported on the discussion and actions from the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee meeting held on May 12, 2022. Dr. Amy White inquired about the four hours limitation. Mr. Borges replied that it was suggested for courses on hearing aid devices but not decided. Mr. Borges noted that it was decided to limit the hours in helping to develop and administer the examination to four hours. Ms. Burns commented that another change discussed was the four hours for in direct or related care.

Dr. Raggio reported on the discussion and actions from the Audiology Practice Committee meeting held on May 12, 2022.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

## 6. Executive Officer's Report

Mr. Sanchez reported on the Business Modernization Project including filling a vacant position created by the project and progress made since the last Board meeting.

Mr. Sanchez reported on outreach efforts including the Board presenting at the California Speech-Language Hearing Association Convention in Pasadena. Ms. Kaiser and Ms. Dominguez commented on their experience.

Mr. Sanchez reported on the Board's budget and fund condition including the current surplus(deficit) percentage and months in reserve. Karen Chang inquired if DCA Pro Rata includes the Business Modernization Project. Ms. Burns replied that DCA Pro Rata is calculated to include some of the project cost but mostly includes services provided by Legal, Human Resources, printing, budgets, and other services not provided by Board staff. Ms. Chang inquired about pro rata encumbrance status. Ms. Burns replied that it is unencumbered until the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Chang inquired if the current surplus(deficit) percentage includes unencumbered funds. Ms. Burns replied it includes all encumbered funds.

Mr. Sanchez provided a brief report on the Board's regulation and deferred to the regulation report.

Mr. Sanchez noted a report on the licensing processing time, practical examination, licenses issued, and licensee population.

Mr. Sanchez noted a report on enforcement and disciplinary actions.

Dr. Raggio inquired if any audiologists took the practical examination. Mr. Sanchez replied that there are some listed under “Applicants without Supervision.”

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 7. DCA Update – DCA Board and Bureau Relations

Brianna Miller with DCA Executive Office provided an update on in-person meetings, Board and Bureau Relations newsletter, DCA’s open meeting survey, positions filled in DCA’s executive team, Board member orientation training, and leadership change to Board and Bureau Relations.

Dr. Raggio complimented the leadership meetings provided by the Board and Bureau Relations.

Ms. Kaiser inquired about the open meeting survey. Ms. Miller replied that DCA is providing this to staff to complete after each meeting starting April 1, 2022.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 8. Update and Discussion Regarding the Board’s 2022 Sunset Review, Board Testimony at the Joint Sunset Review Oversight Committee (Committee) Hearing on March 10, 2022, and the Board’s Response to the Issues Identified in the Committee’s Sunset Background Paper

Mr. Sanchez provided an update on the Board’s Sunset Review and noted that Assembly Bill 2686 will establish a new sunset date and make changes to the Board’s Practice Act.

Dr. Raggio inquired about future discussions regarding Business and Profession Code 2532.25 related to the audiology supervised clinical and professional experience licensing requirement. Ms. Burns replied that discussions are ongoing as the bill goes through the legislature.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 9. Update and Discussion on the Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact

Dr. Raggio opened the discussion with a background on the Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology Interstate Compact (ASLP-IC) and invited Matt Shafer, Deputy Director with the National Center for Interstate Compacts, the Council of State

Governments, to present to the Board on the ASLP-IC.

Mr. Shafer provided a presentation on the ASLP-IC and covered what an interstate compact is and its uses, common misconceptions, data on various compacts enacted or under development, the development process of the ASLP-IC, the benefits of the ASLP-IC, state participation requirements, how the compact works, how it affects licensees with license/credential such as working in a school setting or authorized to dispense hearing aid, state sovereignty and jurisdiction in regards to adverse actions, and the compact commission.

Mr. Borges inquired about the meaning of “buying compact privileges.” Mr. Shafer replied that there is a fee paid for every state in which a licensee would want a compact privilege in and the state has the ability to set that fee.

Mr. Borges inquired about fees to the compact itself. Mr. Shafer replied there is a fee that goes to the compact commission and a fee to the member state.

Dr. Raggio inquired about additional cost for the state to belong to the compact. Mr. Shafer replied ASLP-IC currently does not charge states to maintain their membership and noted the other compacts that do.

Dr. Raggio inquired which doctoral degree an audiologists need. Mr. Shafer replied that he will need to confirm if it’s a clinical degree, and not a PhD.

Dr. Raggio inquired what they mean by supervised clinical practicum. Mr. Shafer replied that he will need to confirm and report back to the Board.

Dr. Raggio inquired about how a state would conduct a license verification through the compact. Mr. Shafer replied that this is all done through the compact’s data system.

Dr. Raggio inquired about interstate compact privilege for hearing aid dispensers. Mr. Shafer replied that it is intended for licensed audiologists and speech-language pathologists.

Ms. Kaiser inquired about continuing education requirements under the interstate compact. Mr. Shafer replied that additional requirement can be imposed in order to perform a certain function within the state.

Dr. Raggio inquired about current laws for California licensees providing services in other states through telehealth. Mr. Sanchez and Ms. Burn replied that a California licensee may need to be licensed in another state in order to provide services to a patient located in another state.

Mr. Sanchez inquired about the required participation in enforcement cases. Mr. Shafer replied that it would be sharing information with the state that is conducting an investigation on a licensee.

Dr. Raggio inquired about licensee participation with criminal record. Mr. Shafer replied that applicants can't have a criminal record where they were found guilty of a felony related to the practice, they are licensed in.

Mr. Sanchez inquired about the Board's ability to act against a licensee who poses an immediate danger to the public. Mr. Shafer replied that this type of information can be shared through the compact's data system to notify other states of a licensee who poses an immediate danger to the public.

Dr. White inquired if licensees have to change their state when they move to another state. Mr. Shafer replied that licensee would need to be licensed in the state they primarily reside.

Dr. White inquired about audiologists who wish to sell hearing aids under this compact. Mr. Shafer replied that secondary license requirements are not covered under the compact and will need to confirm if California requirements would be considered a secondary license.

Ms. Burns inquired about a renewal fee for compact privileges. Mr. Shafer replied there is a renewal fee similar to the initial fee.

Dr. Raggio inquired about personnel for the operation of the compact and commission. Mr. Shafer replied that the compact is still being implemented and no states are issuing privileges at the moment.

Ms. Dominguez inquired about how a licensee initiates a compact privilege. Mr. Shafer replied that they would contact the commission who will issue them the privileges once the requirements are verified.

Ms. Burns inquired how the compact verifies the licensee's information. Mr. Shafer replied the commission contacts the state the licensee is licensed in to obtain documents to verify the requirements.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 10. Discussion on the Board's Communication Methods with Licensees

Ms. Burns provide a summary of the Board's communication methods with its licensees.

Karen Chang inquired about the number of licenses who opt out of the email list. Ms. Burns replied that there may be a way to obtain this information but will require working with DCA.

Ms. Chang inquired if the Board needs permission from DCA to use social media. Ms. Burns replied with information on what other boards are doing and commented on the

resources needed to manage social media and other public communications activities. Ms. Chang commented on a method to create a social page to provide information without receiving comments from the public. Mr. Sanchez commented on the importance of strategic communication.

Ms. Kaiser inquired if this information can be provided to California Speech Language Hearing Association (CSHA) to highlight in their magazine or newsletter. Ms. Burns replied that a summary can be provide to them and other professional organizations. Ms. Burns commented on the email list for legislative advisories when there are statutory or regulatory changes.

Ms. Chang suggested a QR code that sends individuals directly to the Board's website on flyers handed out at schools or events. Ms. Burns commented that Board staff can work with DCA to create one.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the purchase of addresses and if this applies to email addresses. Ms. Burns replied that email addresses are only for the purpose of the Board. Ms. Burns stated that any organization can request a list of addresses that is publicly available as this is public information and does not include phone number or email address.

Brianna Miller with DCA Executive Office commented on communication services DCA can provide to the Board.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 11. Update and Discussion on Board's Filing of Public Comment Regarding U.S. Food and Drug Administration Proposed Rule on Medical Devices; Ear, Nose and Throat Devices; Establishing Over-the-Counter Hearing Aids

Mr. Sanchez provided an update on the Board's public comment to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regarding the proposed rule on Over-the-Counter (OTC) hearing aids. Ms. Burns, Dr. Raggio, and Michael Kanotz commented on the federal regulatory process.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 12. Regulatory Report: Update, review, and possible action on Board regulation packages

Ms. Liranzo provided an update on Board regulations and noted four items for discussion and possible action.

Heather Olivares provided an update on proposed regulations regarding board location and processing times and noted that changes to the processing times does not qualify for the Section 100 process because of the authority used that is still in place and will



need to go through the formal regulatory process. Ms. Burns provided a background on the regulations regarding processing time.

Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of changes to the proposed regulations regarding Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA) requirements.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the changes to the supervision requirements after initial licensure. Ms. Liranzo replied that the number of hours remains the same and a recordkeeping requirement is added for the purpose of compliance verification.

Ms. Kaiser inquired if the word “initial” was being added for clarity. Ms. Liranzo replied that this text was approved by the Board at the August 2021 Board meeting.

Mr. Sanchez and Ms. Burns commented on the changes to the proposed regulations and how it will help move the package forward and noted that Board staff will have further discussion with DCA Legal on the items removed from this package regarding SLPA program and academic requirements.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Karen Chang moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for Sections 1399.170, 1399.170.2, and 1399.170.15 through 1399.170.18 direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at Sections 1399.170, 1399.170.2, and 1399.170.15 through 1399.170.18 as noticed.**

**Holly Kaiser seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Liranzo provided a background to the proposed regulations regarding examination requirements for hearing aid dispensers and dispensing audiologists and a summary of changes to regulations. Ms. Liranzo noted that the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee review the language and no substantive changes were made.

There was no Board discussion nor comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Tod Borges moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for Sections 1399.120, 1399.121, 1399.122, and 1399.152.4 direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at Sections 1399.120, 1399.121, 1399.122, and 1399.152.4 as noticed.**

**Dr. Amy White seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Liranzo provided a background to the proposed regulations regarding Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements for speech-language pathologists and audiologists and a summary of changes to regulations.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the number of dual license holders in the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology. Ms. Burns replied that the Board staff will need to research and report back to the Board.

Ms. Kaiser inquired for a breakdown on the different type of hours limitations. Ms. Liranzo replied that self-study is half of the required hours and courses on related or indirect client care is one-third of the self study hours.

Ms. Burns suggested to amend sections 1399.160.3(c)(3) and 1399.160.3(e)(3) using the proposed language the Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee recommended on May 12, 2022: "shall not be obtained from courses where the content focuses on marketing, launching, or demonstrating the marketability of equipment, devices, or other products regardless of whether it focuses on a particular manufacturer's or company's equipment, devices or products. This shall include the distribution of any materials during or after the course." Ms. Burns noted that this can be amended again during the regulatory process if changes are made to the proposed changes to the Hearing Aid Dispensers regulations.

Mr. Sanchez inquired about the area of the language regarding course content for hearing aid devices that needed further discussion. Ms. Burns replied that further discussion is needed in regard to limiting the number of hours and if the language causes commercial speech restriction. Michael Kanotz and Karen Halbo commented on DCA Legal needing to do further research on the language and commercial speech. Ms. Burns noted that this can be amended again during the regulatory process if changes are made to the proposed changes to the Hearing Aid Dispensers regulations.

Ms. Chang inquired about the motion the Board needs to make. Ms. Burns replied that the Board may wish to amend sections 1399.160.3(c)(3) and 1399.160.3(e)(3) to align it with the proposed language the Hearing Aid Dispensers Committee recommended on May 12, 2022. Ms. Halbo and Ms. Burns commented to clarify that the language is saying that Board-approved course providers cannot send or provide marketing materials to those enrolled to their course.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Karen Chang moved to approve the proposed regulatory text, as amended, for Sections 1399.160 through 1399.160.4 direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at Sections 1399.160 through 1399.160.4 as amended.**

**Gilda Dominguez seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Liranzo provided a background to the proposed regulations regarding fingerprinting requirements and a summary of changes to regulations.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the cost to get fingerprinted. Ms. Liranzo replied that it is at least fifty dollars (\$50) for the background check and an additional amount for the service fee.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Debbie Snow moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for Sections 1399.112, 1399.151.2, and 1399.170.14 direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at Sections 1399.112, 1399.151.2, and 1399.170.14 as noticed.**

**Dr. Amy White seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

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

Heather Olivares provided an update on the legislative calendar and deadlines.

Ms. Olivares provided an update on bills for active position recommendations. Ms. Olivares provided a summary of Board staff position recommendation on Assembly Bill (AB) 1733 by Assemblymember Quirk regarding state board meetings.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the history on disclosing Board member's meeting locations. Ms. Olivares replied that current laws require this and commented on the benefits to the Board and public from these proposed changes. Ms. Burns commented on the benefits of these proposed changes which includes Board members attending the meeting remotely without disclosing their location.

Mr. Borges inquired if this would reduce travel for Board members to attend Board meetings. Ms. Burns replied that it could as the proposed changes would require one physical location to be available to the public which can be where Board staff are located.

Debbie Snow inquired if Board members would be able to attend the Board meeting in-person. Mr. Burns replied that the proposed changes do not prohibit a Board member from doing so. Ms. Olivares commented on what the proposed changes requires. Michael Kanotz commented on how the proposed changes compare to current laws.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Karen Chang made a motion adopt a Support position on AB 1773.**

**Debbie Snow seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided a summary of Board staff position recommendation on AB 2686 by the Business and Professions Committee regarding the Board's sunset.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the suggested amendments from the Sunset Report. Ms. Olivares replied that the Board should adopt a Support position while Board staff continue to work with the Business and Professions Committee.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Holly Kaiser made a motion adopt a Support position on AB 2686.**

**Karen Chang seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided a summary of Board staff position recommendation on AB 2806 by Assemblymember Rubio regarding preschool mental health services.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the process to propose amendments to the Legislature. Ms. Olivares replied that Board staff submits a position letter to committee staff which outlines the Board's concerns and suggested amendments to address those concerns and, if the amendments are accepted, the Board can withdraw their opposition.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Holly Kaiser made a motion adopt an Oppose Unless Amended position on AB 2806 according to Board staff recommendation.**

**Tod Borges seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided a summary of Board staff position recommendation on Senate Bill (SB) 1031 by Senator Ochoa Bogh regarding inactive license fees.

There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

**Tod Borges made a motion adopt aa Oppose position on SB 1031.**

**Karen Chang seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided a summary of SB 1453 by Senator Ochoa Bogh regarding flexible fiber optic trans nasal endoscopic procedure, commonly known as the FEES procedure. Mr. Sanchez noted that the Board received a letter from Dr. Tulio Valdez who was not able to attend today's meeting.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the definition for "readily available" regarding other appropriate medical professionals. Ms. Olivares replied that this is not defined and

Board staff is recommending amendments to further define it or allow the Board time to define it in regulations.

Dr. Raggio inquired if there was any opposition to this bill. Ms. Olivares replied that there was no opposition on record at this time.

Ms. Burns read Dr. Valdez's comment from a letter submitted to the Board.

Dr. Raggio inquired about the current limitations to performing this procedure. Ms. Dominguez replied with her experience in performing this procedure in her workplace. Ms. Dominguez commented on ensuring that the public is protected from risks associated with this procedure and expressed agreement with allowing physicians as well as an otolaryngologist to order speech-language pathologists to perform this procedure. Ms. Dominguez suggested incorporating the recommendation from the article in the American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology that was included as an attachment for Board discussion. Ms. Dominguez commented on who should supervise the required 25 supervised procedure and the inclusion of an educational content to include continuing education and examination.

Dr. Raggio inquired of Ms. Dominguez on the location of her practice. Ms. Dominguez replied that her practice is in a medical facility with otolaryngologists and they have emergency procedures in place.

Dr. Raggio inquired of Ms. Dominguez if private practice would have the ability to establish protocols for emergency medical backup procedures. Ms. Dominguez replied that it would be suggested to have it in place and noted Tennessee's language regarding physicians as part of the emergency medical backup procedures.

Dr. Raggio inquired the type of patients who would need this procedure from a speech-language pathologist in private practice. Ms. Dominguez replied that in her medical setting they receive referrals for patients with head and neck cancer.

Dr. Raggio inquired if speech-language pathologists are performing this procedure in private practice because of a lack of individuals in a medical setting . Dr. White replied that a medical facility may not have an otolaryngologist.

Ms. Kaiser inquired of Ms. Dominguez about the supervision for the required 25 supervised procedure. Ms. Dominguez replied the training received from an otolaryngologist is valuable and beneficial in multidisciplinary settings.

Dr. Raggio inquired of Ms. Dominguez on the type of endoscopes used in these procedures. Ms. Dominguez replied that there are different manufacturers and different sizes and units. Dr. Raggio inquired if learning to use multiple scopes is necessary. Ms. Dominguez replied that it depends on the type of scope and the techniques used.

Dr. Raggio inquired of Ms. Dominguez if manufacturers provide training on autoclave. Ms. Dominguez replied that at her facility trainings are provided through their supplier in order to maintain accreditation.

Mr. Borges inquired of Ms. Dominguez if a person is competent to perform procedure with any type of scope if they were trained using one type. Ms. Dominguez replied that this isn't specified in the materials that was included for Board discussion.

Dr. White inquired of Ms. Dominguez if portable equipment exists that would allow this procedure to be performed at locations based on the patient's medical needs. Ms. Dominguez replied that portable FEES companies exist in other states and defers to the public for more information. Dr. White commented on the possibility of allowing these procedures to be performed outside of medical facilities. Ms. Dominguez commented that most nursing homes have protocols for emergency medical backup procedures.

Dr. White inquired if the bill language differentiates adult and pediatric. Ms. Burns replied there is no language differentiating that.

Mr. Borges inquired about the invasiveness of the procedure. Ms. Dominguez replied that it is invasive and patients are provided information to give consent for the procedure. Mr. Borges commented on medical supervision provided by someone who isn't an expert on the part of the body the procedure is being performed. Dr. White commented on the data provided in the article from the American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology regarding the risks associated to this procedure that was included as an attachment for Board discussion.

Ms. Burns commented on the different level of emergency medical backup procedures across different locations and contraindications.

Dr. Raggio inquired the status of the bill in the legislative process. Ms. Olivares replied that it is almost through the process in the Senate and will need to go through the process in the Assembly.

Dr. Raggio inquired of the position recommendation on this bill. Mr. Olivares replied that Board staff do not have a recommendation and that it was left to the Board to decide. Mr. Kanotz commented on the different type of positions available to the Board and what they express to the Legislature. Mr. Sanchez commented that the Board may want to consider amendments. Ms. Olivares provided a summary of Board staff suggested amendments which includes delayed implementation, clarity in the supervision and written verification requirements, reporting requirements for adverse events during a procedure, and additional contraindications. Mr. Sanchez commented that the suggested amendments will improve the language that currently exists. Ms. Olivares commented that Board staff are working with the sponsor of this bill on the suggested amendments.

Ms. Chang inquired if this is a procedure speech-language pathologists currently can perform. Ms. Olivares replied that they can but are limited in the location and commented that this bill expands the locations. Ms. Burns commented that this bill will also change the supervisor who needs to be available.

Ms. Kaiser suggested a Support If Amended position. Dr. White expressed her agreement and commented on the importance to balance public safety and access to care. Ms. Dominguez and Ms. Chang expressed agreement to the suggested position.

Dr. Raggio inquired about additional training requirements. Ms. Olivares replied that there isn't and commented on the recommendation for certifying competency in this procedure outlined in the article from the American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology that was included as an attachment for Board discussion. Ms. Olivares noted Board staff can discuss with the sponsor of this bill if they would consider amendments for additional training requirements. Ms. Dominguez commented on the creditability of the author and the article from the American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology. Ms. Dominguez commented on the benefits of having additional medical professionals in the room when performing these procedures.

Dr. Raggio inquired if treating dysphasia can be performed in a private practice or home. Ms. Dominguez replied that there are treatments performed in private practice or home such as Modified Barium Swallow.

Ms. Olivares inquired if the Board wished to suggest amendments to require the physician to be on-site. Ms. Dominguez replied she would like to see the physician in the same facility in regard to emergency procedures and not over the shoulder supervision once trained in the procedure.

Laura Wasco, Senior Director of Legislative Affairs with Ball/Frost Group representing CSHA, commented on the goal to clarify the eligibility to perform the procedure and locations where they can be performed.

Jennifer Kizner, Speech-Language Pathologist and Clinical Specialist at Stanford Health Care, commented on her experience performing procedure and its history and background. Dr. Raggio inquired if any radiology is involved in the procedure. Ms. Kizner replied that they only assist with the Modified Barium Swallow. Dr. Raggio inquired about patients with contraindications and experiences with adverse events during a procedure. Ms. Kizner replied that she experienced a couple nose bleeds and one or two vasovagal episodes but nothing that required transfer to a higher level of care. Ms. Kizner commented on the emergency procedure and other medical professionals available in her setting. Dr. Raggio inquired if this procedure is safe to perform in private practice. Ms. Kizner replied that she would want to know their emergency procedures. Dr. Raggio inquired about FEES courses. Ms. Kizner replied that she trains speech-language pathologists with an otolaryngologist and trained speech-language pathologists. Ms. Burns inquired about performing this procedure in community facilities. Ms. Kizner replied that skilled nursing facilities should be able to



have the appropriate emergency procedures and commented on the importance to evaluate the patient to verify prior to the procedure that it is still appropriate to perform it on them in the condition they are in at that time. Ms. Kaiser inquired about the supervision of the 25 supervised procedure. Ms. Kizner replied that an otolaryngologist shows how to safely pass the scope and the examination and assessments are within the scope of practice of a speech-language pathologist.

Kenya Gomez-Tydor with Emanate Health in West Covina commented on how procedures are handled in her organization and the benefits to patients for being able to perform these procedures where they are located.

**Gilda Dominguez made a motion to adopt a Support if Amended position on SB 1453 and delegate to the Executive Officer, or their delegate, to request of and negotiate amendments with the author and sponsor of the bill to achieve a reasonably delayed implementation so that the bill can be clarified through regulations, clarity on the supervision and written verification for the 25 required procedure and competent to perform these procedures, reporting requirements for adverse event that occur during the procedure, and inclusion of additional contraindications identified in the meeting**

**Tod Borges seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided an update on bills with active positions taken by the Board. Ms. Olivares provided a summary of AB 1662 by Assemblymember Gipson regarding criminal conviction licensure disqualification determination and noted it has an Oppose Unless Amended position. Ms. Olivares commented on the recent amendments to the bill and recommended the Board to change their position to Oppose as the fees do not cover all the cost the Board would incur to process the request for pre-determination or any appeals to the pre-determination.

Mr. Borges inquired of the intent of this bill. Ms. Olivares replied that it would give people with criminal history an opportunity to ask if they would be disqualified for licensure prior to starting a training program. Ms. Burns commented that the bill lacks clarity in what happens after the pre-determination is made and the potential for a costly appeal process if the pre-determination made is disqualification.

David Bouilly commented on the Board's Oppose position on AB 1662.

**Holly Kaiser made a motion to change the Board's position to an Oppose position on AB 1662.**

**Debbie Snow seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried 7-0.** (Ayes: Raggio, Kaiser, Borges, Chang, Dominguez, Snow, White)

Ms. Olivares provided an update on bills with recommended watch status. There was no Board discussion nor comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations on bills with recommended watch status.

#### 14. Legislative Items for Future Meeting

Dr. Marcia Raggio solicited legislative items for future meetings from the Board. Ms. Olivares noted Board staff have no additional items at this time.

Dr. Raggio inquired if items can be added after today's meeting. Ms. Olivares replied that Board members can contact Board staff with their suggested legislative items.

Dr. Raggio solicited legislative items for future meetings from the public. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

#### 15. Future Agenda Items

Dr. Marcia Raggio solicited future agenda items from the Board. There was no Board discussion.

Dr. Raggio solicited future agenda items from the public. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies, or associations.

16. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board will Meet in Closed Session to Discuss Disciplinary Matters Including Proposed Decisions, Stipulated Decisions, Defaults, Petitions for Reductions in Penalty, Petitions for Reconsideration, and Remands.

The Board met in closed session and subsequently adjourned for the day.

#### 17. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2022 and after the closed session on Friday, May 13, 2022.