



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Teleconference**  
**November 30 - December 1, 2023**

**Full Board Meeting – Thursday, November 30, 2023**

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

Holly Kaiser, Board Vice Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order at 1:05 and 2:51 p.m. Ms. Kaiser called roll; six members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Board Members

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

Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
Lisa Snelling, Licensing Coordinator  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Bryce Penney, DCA Office of Public Affairs  
Ann Fisher, DCA SOLID  
Olivia Trejo, DCA Office of Human Resources

2. Swearing In New Board Member

Ms. Kaiser swore in Dr. Charles Sanders as a member of the Board, whereupon Dr. Sanders took the oath of office administered by Ms. Kaiser.

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

The Board was in recess at 1:09 p.m.

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Ms. Kaiser asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public, outside agencies,

or associations.

3. The Board will Meet in Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(a)(1) to Conduct its Annual Evaluation of its Executive Officer

The Board met in closed session to conduct its annual evaluation of its Executive Officer and subsequently adjourned for the day.

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

### **Audiology Practice Committee Meeting – Thursday, November 30, 2023**

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

Dr. Amy White, Committee Chair, called the Audiology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Dr. White called roll; three members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### **Committee Members**

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

#### **Staff Present**

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
Lisa Snelling, Licensing Coordinator  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Bryce Penney, DCA Office of Public Affairs  
Ann Fisher, DCA SOLID

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding General Application Requirements and Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Aide Requirements as Stated in Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157

Dr. White invited Maria Liranzo to provide an update on possible action to amend the regulations regarding audiology aides. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to regulations.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee would like to amend the definition of “industrial audiology aide” and suggested that it incorporate requirements the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) has for the hearing conversation program.

Dr. White asked for the number of industrial audiology aides registered with the Board. Cherise Burns replied that the Board does not have data that is readily accessible. Ms. Liranzo noted that the Council of Accreditation in Occupational Hearing Conservation (CAOHC) also doesn’t have data on the number of technicians that is readily accessible.

Dr. White asked if a CAOHC certification is required for industrial audiology aid. Ms. Liranzo replied that DIR does permit those not certified by CAOHC and can include registered audiology aides.

Dr. White commented on the CAOHC certification which includes training, testing, and recertification, and asked what options the Board has to distinguish audiology aides from CAOHC certified technicians. Ms. Liranzo replied that the regulation could have language to exempt those who are certified by CAOHC from parts or all of the Board’s regulations. Dr. White expressed agreement with the suggestion.

Karen Chang asked what CAOHC is. Dr. White replied that CAOHC training is for aides who work in industrial settings, such as manufacturing companies or military, and are trained to test hearing and create hearing protection.

Ms. Chang asked if an audiology aide can do what CAOHC certified technicians do. Dr. White replied that she does not know the answer. Ms. Burns commented that audiology aides registered with the Board are not doing the same work as industrial audiology aide. Ms. Chang and Dr. White commented on what is within and outside the scope of practice of an industrial audiology aide. Ms. Burns commented on industrial audiology aides not doing the same work as an audiology aide registered with the Board.

Ms. Chang asked if an industrial audiology aid goes through the Board. Ms. Burns replied most aides are in private practice and noted that not a lot of them practice in specialized areas like this. Ms. Burns replied that the definition could be updated to align with DIR. Ms. Liranzo suggested the definition could mean a technician certified by CAOHC.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee would like to amend the number of aides a supervisor is allowed to supervise and suggested that it could be similar to the definition of support personnel used in the regulations related to speech-language pathology assistant (SLPA).

Dr. White asked what the current proposed changes are for SLPA regulations. Ms. Liranzo replied that it will be three (3) full-time equivalent support personnel, which are SLPA and speech-language pathology (SLP) aides, but no more the six (6). Ms. Liranzo noted that for audiology the definition of support personnel could include hearing aid dispenser trainee or temporary licensee.

Dr. Sanders asked what full-time equivalent means and would it need a definition in regulations. Ms. Liranzo replied that it would be two part-time for one full-time and it would need to be defined in regulations. Dr. White commented on the importance in providing part-time flexibility and expressed support to align number of audiology aides with SLP aides.

Ms. Chang asked how many personnel an audiologist can currently supervise. Ms. Burns replied

that they could supervise three (3) aides and one (1) hearing aid dispenser trainee or temporary licensee for a total of four (4) personnel.

Ms. Chang and Dr. Sanders expressed support for the suggested changes.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee could clarify the phrase “future dispositions of patients” used in CCR section 1399.154.8(d) and suggested amending it to increase clarity. Dr. White replied that “future dispositions” could be removed as it may not be meaningful language for the practice of audiology. Dr. Sanders commented that it is not needed.

Ms. Chang asked if treatment ends. Dr. Sanders replied that it doesn’t always end.

Ms. Chang suggested it could say “future treatment plan.” Ms. Liranzo asked if it is redundant to what is already written. Dr. White replied that it is redundant to “evaluate, treat, and manage.” Ms. Burns suggested that it say, “evaluate, treat, and manage patient care.”

Karen Halbo asked if the supervisor is always evaluating and treating the patient. Dr. White replied yes because aides assist the supervisor. Ms. Halbo suggested that it say “evaluate, treat, and manage all patient care.” Dr. White expressed agreement with the suggestion.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee would like to amend the regulations to specify that a new form is required for each supervisor. Ms. Chang replied that all supervision should be registered with the Board.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee would like to amend the responsibilities of supervisors to align with supervision regulations for Required Professional Experience and SLPA such as a minimum years of practice experience, supervisors notifying their aides of disciplinary action against the supervisor, continuing professional development (CPD) requirements, supervisors reviewing laws and regulations with their aide, and supervisors providing emergency plans.

Dr. White asked if CPD will also be required for supervisors of hearing aid dispenser trainee and temporary licensee. Ms. Liranzo replied that it is a proposed change and noted that supervisors of audiology aide currently do not have to complete education in supervision.

Ms. Burns asked if the suggested number of hours for practice experience applies to audiologists. Dr. White replied that there are audiologists who work full-time in school setting. Dr. Sanders and Dr. White expressed support for the suggested language to the responsibilities of supervisors.

Ms. Burns asked if there are any comments or questions with section 1399.154.11 and if the names to the acronyms listed in subsection (a) are correct. Dr. White replied that the names to the acronyms are correct and suggested “impedance battery tests.”

Dr. White asked if aides would be permitted to prepare patients for tympanometry, videonystagmography (VNG), electronystagmography (ENG), or auditory brainstem response (ABR). Ms. Burns replied that it would be interpreted as preparing and cleaning and not conducting the evaluation.

Dr. White asked how 1399.154.11(k) should be interpreted. Dr. Sanders replied that aides would not be permitted to adjust the gain setting. Ms. Chang expressed agreement.

Dr. White asked if aides should be permitted to download programming into a hearing aid device. Dr. Sanders replied that the programming is the prescription and it is set by the audiologist.

Ms. Chang asked what happens if the volume is set too loud. Dr. White replied that they would need to see an audiologist if it is more than a volume change using the control feature.

Ms. Chang asked if there are any tasks outside of the scope of an aide that is missing. Dr. White replied that (I) is ambiguous. Ms. Burns commented that broad language provide room for changes in the practice of audiology.

Ms. Liranzo asked if the Committee would like to remove supervision and training requirements regarding industrial audiology aides and how it would like to use the definition of indirect supervision. Dr. White replied that having the different definition is useful and agreed that removing reference to industrial audiology aides if they are outside the Board's purview. Ms. Liranzo noted that the regulations does not specify requirements for indirect supervision and suggest removing it or specifying activities that would require indirect supervision.

Dr. White asked if cleaning hearing aids is a task for an aide and, if so, that would be an example of indirect supervision. Dr. Sanders expressed agreement.

Dr. White asked if each level of supervision needs a list of tasks an aide can do. Ms. Liranzo replied that there is one for immediate supervision and noted that the SLPA regulations list tasks for each level of supervision. Ms. Burns commented that indirect supervision could be for tasks that are indirect to client care such as programming and cleaning. Dr. White commented on other tasks under indirect supervision such as pairing a hearing aid to another device.

Dr. White asked if tasks that can be perform under indirect supervision can added to section 1399.154.9(e). Ms. Liranzo replied that it can be added there. Ms. Burns commented that a list of tasks will be needed of what doesn't count as direct client care.

Dr. White asked if it has to be an inclusive list. Ms. Burns replied that there may be a way to define it without it being an inclusive list. Ms. Chang commented on the definition of direct supervision. Dr. Sanders commented that indirect client care would be activities a consumer could do on their own but is unable to. Ms. Liranzo suggested adding paragraph 1 to state that indirect supervision can be provided when the aide is performing indirect client care such as programming a device or cleaning equipment.

Ms. Chang asked for clarification regarding the programming of a device. Dr. White replied that hearing aid programming is in the provider's computer unless it's an over-the-counter hearing aid.

Ms. Chang asked for clarification of the proposed language. Ms. Burns replied that it would be programming a device, cleaning, or activities consumer could do on their own but is unable to. Ms. Burns commented that the language could be a list of two or three examples. Ms. Halbo commented to confirm.

Ms. Liranzo noted that training requirements for industrial audiology aides will be removed to align with earlier discussions. Ms. Liranzo provided a summary of changes proposed today:

- amend the definition of industrial audiology aide as a technician certified by the CAOHC;
- require aides with more than one supervisor to submit the same form;
- define support personnel to include aides and hearing aid dispenser trainee or temporary licensee and allow full-time equivalent for the purpose of supervising three personnel full time;
- revise supervision requirement to require supervisors to evaluate, treat, and manage all patient care;
- remove the industrial audiology aide from the supervision requirements and specify tasks that can be performed under indirect supervision; and
- revise supervision requirement to require supervisors to complete continuing education in supervision, a minimum level of practice experience prior to supervision, notifying their aides of disciplinary action against the supervisor, review laws and regulations with the aides, and provide their aide with a plan to handle emergencies.

Ms. Halbo asked if audiology support personnel include hearing aid dispenser trainees . Ms. Burns replied that it is not currently in the regulation and will be added to the proposed text as discussed earlier.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

### **Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee Meeting – Thursday, November 30, 2023**

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

Holly Kaiser, Committee Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. Ms. Kaiser called roll; two members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### Committee Members

Holly Kaiser, Speech-Language Pathologist, Committee Chair  
Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist

#### Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
Lisa Snelling, Licensing Coordinator  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Bryce Penney, DCA Office of Public Affairs  
Ann Fisher, DCA SOLID

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

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

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

Ms. Kaiser invited Maria Liranzo to discuss on possible action to amend the regulations regarding speech-language pathology assistant (SLPA) scope of responsibility. Ms. Liranzo provided a background on tasks outside of a SLPA's scope of responsibility.

Gilda Dominguez commented on the importance and benefit of reviewing laws and regulations of neighboring states and requested staff to prepare for the Committee the scope of practice for both the occupational therapy assistant and physical therapist assistant. Ms. Dominguez commented on the scope of practice for the occupational therapy assistant and physical therapist assistant and their ability to perform tasks within an established plan of care. Ms. Dominguez further commented on SLPA's ability to perform this task with training and an established plan of care.

Cherise Burns and Ms. Liranzo noted possible proposed language would include training and competency, facilities with emergency medical back, and standard protocol for contraindications.

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

4. Discussion and Possible Action to Amend Regulations Regarding General Application Requirements and Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Aide Requirements as Stated in Title 16, CCR Sections 1399.151.2, 1399.151.3, 1399.151.4, 1399.154 through 1399.154.12, and 1399.157

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Liranzo to provide an update on possible action to amend the regulations regarding speech-language pathology (SLP) aide. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to regulations.

Ms. Kaiser and Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement with suggested language to require aides with multiple supervisors to register each supervisor with the Board.

Ms. Kaiser suggested keeping the word "future" in CCR section 1399.154.2(d). Ms. Burns commented on the difference of future care in audiology and SLP. Ms. Kaiser and Ms. Dominguez commented on future care in the practice of speech-language pathology.

Ms. Kaiser asked what the Audiology Practice Committee decided on this item. Ms. Liranzo replied that they decided to use "evaluate, treat, and manage all patient care".

Ms. Kaiser asked if there was a way to incorporate the word "future." Karen Halbo replied that the word "all" includes it.

Ms. Kaiser and Ms. Dominguez expressed agreement to require supervisors to have practice experience prior to supervision, notify their aide of disciplinary action against the supervisor,

complete continuing education in supervision, review laws and regulations with their aide, and provide the aide with a plan to handle emergencies.

Ms. Liranzo noted other sections that were amended to align with other parts of the regulations such as the number of support personnel and experience accrued as an aide not being applicable for licensure as a SLPA.

Ms. Kaiser asked what the training requirements are. Ms. Liranzo replied that the supervisor provides instruction and demonstration and noted staff have no recommendations to amend the section on training requirements.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

### **Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee Meeting – Friday, December 1, 2023**

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

Tod Borges, Committee Chair, called the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee (Committee) meeting to order at 9:01 p.m. Mr. Borges called roll; four members of the Committee were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### Committee Members

Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser, Committee Chair  
John Dandurand, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist  
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

#### Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
Lisa Snelling, Licensing Coordinator  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Bryce Penney, DCA SOLID  
Ann Fisher, DCA SOLID

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

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

#### 3. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Foreign Body In The Ear Canal and Other Pre and Post Fitting Observations That Require Referral for Medical Opinion as Stated in Business and



## Professions Code Sections 2538.36 and 2539.6

Mr. Borges invited Maria Liranzo to provide an update on possible action regarding foreign body in the ear canal. Ms. Liranzo provided a background on foreign body in the ear canal.

Mr. Borges commented that the Business and Professions Code (BPC) does not specify postfitting care as it does with prior to the fitting or selling of a hearing aid.

Dr. Amy White asked what authority the Board has to make these types of changes. Ms. Burns replied that the Board can recommend statutory changes as part of the Sunset Review process or find a legislator to author a bill separately.

Mr. Borges commented on the need to address postfitting care in laws or regulations and clarify the definition of foreign object.

Ms. Burns commented on the definition of foreign object and if it includes in-the-ear hearing aids. Mr. Borges commented that Lyric hearing aids are often inserted deeper in the ear than a dome. Dr. White commented on the definition of foreign object as something that is not innate to the ear or natural to the human body. Mr. Borges commented on items that can be found in the ear such as battery, Q-tip, or bugs. Dr. Charles Sanders commented on items that were intentionally and unintentionally in the ear.

Dr. White commented on the importance of understanding why BCP section 2538.36 was added. Ms. Burns commented that it was probably not written with the advancement of hearing aid technology in mind. Dr. White asked when it was written. Ms. Burns replied that staff would need to conduct further research to answer those questions.

Paul Sanchez asked if there are items similar to domes that dispensers would be able to remove. Dr. White replied that if a physician uses the same billing code for Medicare to remove a foreign object and cerumen, so the way the billing code purposes they are the same, but that doesn't help us.

John Dandurand commented on the statute being written when early hearing aid devices were behind-the-ear hearing aids that didn't require specifying postfitting care with behind-the-ear hearing aids with large earmolds typically would never get stuck in the ear canal and expressed support to specify language for postfitting care whether its defining foreign body or addressing the issue of dome removal. Dr. White and Mr. Borges noted that in-the-ear hearing aids like Lyric would need to be considered in the language, even though that may be difficult to define. Mr. Dandurand commented on postfitting care for Lyric hearing aids and noted consumers are given a tool to remove the device themselves when the battery dies, and how that would need to be included in the definition as well. Dr. White commented on the potential for foam being left behind after removal of the Lyric as well and on the standard needing to be the same regardless of whether it is pre- or post-fitting and protect consumers. Mr. Borges commented that licensees cannot be held accountable because there is no statutory requirement for postfitting whether that means only addressing the issue of dome removal. Mr. Borges commented that the vast majority of hearing aid fittings do involve hearing aids with domes, so potentially the discussion could be more narrowed. Dr. White commented that it would leave out those fitting Lyric hearing aids.

Mr. Borges noted that a company published guidelines to remove domes. Ms. Burns noted that it's a

national company that developed these guidelines outside of California.

Michael Kanotz commented that the definition of a hearing aid dispenser and their limitations of the scope of practice also has to be taken into account. Since the only definition of postfitting care is counseling found in BPC section 2538.11(a), and is vague, he recommended statutory changes to clarify postfitting care and address concerns discussed during the meeting as it would be hard to justify a regulation without a statutory change. Mr. Kanotz further commented that BPC 2538.36 is phrased an advisement to consult with a licensed physician but presumed that meant if a foreign body was present the dispenser would not fit the hearing aid to the client.

Dr. White and Mr. Borges asked for next steps to make a statutory change. Ms. Burns replied that the Committee may want to make statutory changes for pre- and post- fitting either through the Sunset process, presuming it is non-controversial, or a separate legislative proposal. Mr. Sanchez commented on narrowing down the statutes that need changes. Ms. Burns added that we would want to reach out to the otolaryngology community for issues of safety and concerns prior to the legislative process.

Ms. Burns recommended the Committee to delegate two Committee Members to work with staff to draft statutory language for a couple years from now and noted the current statutory language as written does not permit hearing aid dispensers to perform dome removal but that we are seeking better clarification on this issue.

Mr. Borges and Mr. Dandurand asked Mr. Kanotz what the law says about a hearing aid dispenser performing dome removal or Lyric hearing aid insertion. Ms. Burns commented that there is a statute that covers the repair and replacement of a hearing aid that could cover the Lyric issues. Mr. Kanotz replied that the scope of practice needs to be updated because it lacks clarity in what dispensers can do as part of postfitting care.

Ms. Liranzo commented on what Mr. Kanotz stated about BPC 2538.36 being an advisement to consult with a licensed physician if a foreign body is in the ear canal and staff interpretation that it is not permitted. Ms. White commented on the scope of practice does not include any retrieval.

Mr. Borges and Dr. White volunteered to help staff with drafting potential statutory language.

Mr. Borges asked for public comments.

Joe Bartlett commented that ear mold impressions place cotton blocks deep into the ear canal and a level of expectation to perform some functions across the ear canal and expressed support for increased clarity to the law on this topic while keeping consumer protection as the first priority.

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 a.m.

### **Full Board Meeting Agenda – Friday, December 1, 2023**

#### **3. Call to Order / Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum**

Holly Kaiser, Board Vice Chair, called the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board) meeting to order at 9:49 a.m. Ms. Kaiser called roll; seven members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

### Board Members

Holly Kaiser, Speech-Language Pathologist, Board Vice Chair  
Tod Borges, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Karen Chang, Public Member  
Gilda Dominguez, Speech-Language Pathologist  
John Dandurand, Hearing Aid Dispenser  
Charles Sanders, Dispensing Audiologist  
Amy White, Dispensing Audiologist

### Staff Present

Paul Sanchez, Executive Officer  
Cherise Burns, Assistant Executive Officer  
Maria Liranzo, Legislation/Regulation/Budget Analyst  
Tenisha Ashford, Enforcement Coordinator  
Lisa Snelling, Licensing Coordinator  
Michael Kanotz, DCA Legal Counsel  
Yuping Lin, DCA Legal Counsel  
Karen Halbo, DCA Regulation Counsel  
Bryce Penney, DCA SOLID  
Ann Fisher, DCA SOLID  
Brad Lencioni, DCA Fiscal Office  
Yvonne Dorantes, DCA Executive Office

#### 4. Acknowledgment of Dr. Marcia Raggio's Service to the Board

Ms. Kaiser invited Paul Sanchez to acknowledge Dr. Marcia Raggio for her service to the Board. Mr. Sanchez commented on Dr. Raggio's service to the Board and read the certificate of appreciation from the Board and a resolution from DCA. Cherise Burns read a statement from Dr. Raggio to the Board.

Ms. Kaiser asked for Board discussion.

Ms. Kaiser, Dr. Amy White, Karen Chang, Tod Borges, and Gilda Dominguez commented on Dr. Raggio's service to the Board.

Ms. Kaiser asked for public comments.

Nick Brokaw on behalf of the California Academy of Audiology commented on Dr. Raggio's service to the Board.

Dr. Raggio expressed her gratitude for the comments provided.

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

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

#### 6. Review and Possible Approval of the August 24-25, 2023, Board Meeting Minutes

Ms. Kaiser opened the discussion on the review and possible approval of Board's meeting Minutes. Maria Liranzo provided a summary of the Minutes.

Ms. Kaiser asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

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

**Karen Chang moved to approve the Board meeting Minutes.**

**Gilda Dominguez seconded the motion.**

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

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

Ms. Kaiser invited staff from DCA Board and Bureau Relations to provide an update. Yvonne Dorantes welcomed Charles Sanders to the Board and acknowledged Dr. Raggio's service to the Board. Ms. Dorantes provided an update on Business, Consumers Services, and Housing Agency's new secretary; DCA's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee; Federal Professional License Portability and State Registration for servicemember and their family; in-person meetings and the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act; required board member trainings; out-of-state travel; Promise Campaign; and state employee food drive.

Ms. Kaiser and Ms. Chang commented on training provided to Board members.

Ms. Chang asked when the Form 700 is due. Ms. Dorantes replied that the official deadline is April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Chang asked how Board members can reach Ms. Dorantes. Ms. Dorantes replied by providing her email.

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

#### 8. Board Chair's Report

Ms. Kaiser noted that there will be elections for Board officers later at this meeting and invited Ms. Burns to discuss the Board calendar. Ms. Burns commented that the Board will vote on meeting dates later at this meeting which will be posted on the Board's website.

Ms. Kaiser invited Mr. Sanchez to discuss Board representation for the Department of Health Care Services' Audiology Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Sanchez provided background and noted that Dr. Raggio held the position and requested that an audiologist fill the position. Dr. White volunteered to fill the position.

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Dominguez to provide a report on the discussion from the Enforcement Ad

Hoc Committee. Ms. Dominguez provided a report on the discussion.

Ms. Kaiser invited Dr. White to provide a report on the discussion from the Audiology Practice Committee. Dr. White provided a report on the discussion.

Ms. Kaiser provided a report on the discussion from the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee.

Ms. Kaiser invited Mr. Borges to provide a report on the discussion from the Hearing Aid Dispensing Committee. Mr. Borges provided a report on the discussion.

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

## 9. Executive Officer's Report

Ms. Kaiser invited Paul Sanchez to provide the Executive Officer's report.

Mr. Sanchez provided an administration update on staff vacancies and hiring to fill two vacancies.

Mr. Sanchez reported on outreach efforts including a presentation at the California Academy of Audiology's Convention and meeting with California Speech Language Hearing Association's board leaders.

Mr. Sanchez reported on the budget including the fund condition and highlighted the total revenue, total of expenditures, fund balance, and months in reserves in the fund condition, and total expenses and projected expenses for the current year in the budget report.

John Dandurand asked why there is a decline in revenue and increase in expenditure in the budget year. Mr. Sanchez explained that projections are typically conservative and Ms. Burns explained the nature of two-year cycles in renewals that can result in higher renewal revenue every other year.

Ms. Chang asked what a good surplus percentage is for a board of this size. Mr. Sanchez replied that it is a matter of opinion but typically three to five percent and noted the connection of surplus with staff vacancy. Ms. Burns commented on the surplus percentage.

Ms. Chang asked about the Overtime/Flex Elect/Lump Sum. Mr. Sanchez replied this category include overtime and deferred to Ms. Burns for other items under this category. Ms. Burns replied the increase is due to a recent retirement.

Ms. Chang asked about the unencumbered balance under Overtime/Flex Elect/Lump Sum. Ms. Burns replied that it is a projection based on the Board's typical overtime and the retirement that has been paid out. Mr. Sanchez commented that the overtime is high for the Board because of the practical examination and annual licensing peak season.

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

Mr. Sanchez reported on licensing including processing times and practical examination results. Ms. Burns commented that the Board is clearing backlogged paper applications and online applications

after the Board's most recent hire.

Mr. Sanchez reported on enforcement data including complaints, citations and fine, formal discipline for the last twelve months, and noted that voluntary surrender of licenses is not reviewed by the Board members but by the executive officer who has the authority to accept them.

Mr. Dandurand asked if the practical examinations date for next year are available. Ms. Burns replied that they will be available to the public on the Board's website.

Mr. Borges asked about the low number of candidates for the September practical examination. Ms. Burns replied that it was an overflow from August.

Mr. Borges asked about the recruitment of examiners. Ms. Burns replied that there is a stable group of examiners but additional examiners are welcomed and noted that two new examiners were recently onboarded. Ms. Burns commented on the benefits of being an examiner for the hearing aid dispensing practical examination.

Ms. Kaiser commented on the Board's relationship with the California Speech Language Hearing Association (CSHA) and noted the passing of their former board chair, Michelle Linares. Ms. Kaiser expressed condolences to the passing of CSHA's former board chair, Michelle Linares.

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

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

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Liranzo and Ms. Burns to provide the legislative report.

Ms. Liranzo reported on the legislative calendar and deadlines, Board-sponsored legislation, bills with active positions taken by the Board, and bills with recommended watch status.

Ms. Burns commented on Senate Bill 544 regarding the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

Ms. Kaiser asked if separating committee meetings from Board meeting will be considered. Ms. Burns commented on her experience working for a board that did that and noted that they had a meeting almost every month. Ms. Burns commented on the different potential ways the Board can meet.

Ms. Kaiser asked if the meeting always have to be on a Thursday or Friday. Ms. Burns replied with her experience working on a board that had meeting on other days of the week and impacts to board member's clinical hours.

Ms. Dominguez asked for clarification on the alternative to have a staff present at one location while members meeting remote. Ms. Burns replied that this applies to the committee meetings and not the Board meetings.

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

11. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt a Legislative Proposal for an Omnibus Bill to Amend Business and Professions Code (BPC) sections 2538.3, 2538.10, 2538.25, 2538.27, and 2539.1

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Liranzo to discuss possible action to adopt a legislative proposal for an omnibus bill. Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes.

Ms. Dominguez asked if social media can be added to the definition of “advertise” in BPC section 25381.10(a). Ms. Burns replied that it is something that should be part of the sunset and not this process.

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

**Holly Kaiser moved to adopt the legislative proposal as noticed, direct staff to take all steps necessary to submit the proposal, and authorize the Executive Officer, or their designee, to take all steps necessary to complete the process for the legislative proposal.**

**Tod Borges seconded the motion.**

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

12. Legislative Items for Future Meeting

Ms. Kaiser asked for legislative items for future meeting. Ms. Burns noted that Board staff does not have any items.

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

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

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Liranzo to provide the regulatory report. Ms. Liranzo provided an update on the Board’s regulatory packages and noted the stages of the regulatory process is included with the report. Mr. Sanchez and Karen Halbo commented on the stages of the regulatory process.

Ms. Kaiser asked for public comments on the regulatory report.

Joe Bartlett commented on the proposed changes to regulations regarding advertising for hearing aid dispensing and the inclusion of internet advertising.

Ms. Liranzo provided a background on proposed changes to the continuing education requirements for hearing aid dispensers and noted draft Board responses to public comments, all comments received, and literature used to draft Board responses are included in the meeting materials.

Ms. Kaiser asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

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

**Tod Borges moved to approve the proposed Board responses to Comments, direct staff to send out an Addendum to the Initial Statement of Reasons for a 15-day public comment period and take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking process, including the filing of the final rulemaking package with the Office of Administrative Law, authorize the Executive Officer to make any nonsubstantive changes to the proposed regulations before completing the rulemaking process, and adopt the proposed regulations at 16 CCR sections 1399.140, 1399.140.1, and 1399.144, as noticed.**

**Charles Sanders seconded the motion.**

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

Ms. Liranzo provided a background on proposed changes to the continuing professional development requirements for speech-language pathologists and audiologist and noted the item is a hand carry.

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board to modify the text to redefine self-study which will provide flexibility on the grading system and when the evaluation should be completed.

Mr. Borges asked if the proposed changes would require a pass/fail instead of a grade of seventy (70) percent. Ms. Liranzo replied that the language grade will be removed in its entirety.

Mr. Borges asked if this would allow provider to determine a passing grade. Ms. Liranzo replied that it would as there are different grading system such as a percentage, letter grade, pass or fail, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Ms. Dominguez asked if there is a requirement that requires learners to respond on whether the learning objectives have been met. Ms. Burns replied that this is the preference.

Ms. Kaiser asked if there are opportunities for a person who doesn't pass the evaluation to retake it. Ms. Liranzo replied that the provider would determine what happens. Ms. Kaiser expressed agreement to check learning.

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board modify the text to accommodate public comments by allowing more hours from courses related to the practice and revising the definition of direct client care to include instruments and technology used for assessment and diagnosis or intervention. Ms. Liranzo also recommended the Board to revise courses outside of the scope of continuing professional development to be similar to proposed changes to hearing aid dispensing continuing education requirements.

Ms. Dominguez asked if ethical issues could be moved from the definition of indirect client care to direct client care. Ms. Burns replied that she hasn't seen ethics as a direct client care course in other CPD models. Ms. Kaiser commented that American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) requires a specified number of hours to be on ethics and ethics courses covering direct client care. Ms. Burns asked how many hours are required and commented on how providers advertise their courses and how staff evaluate course during an audit. Ms. Dominguez replied that ASHA requires one hour out of the thirty (30) hours to be in ethics and two (2) hours in cultural competency,



humility, and response practice and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Ms. Burns noted staff is recommending revision to definition of courses related to the practice to use similar language regarding cultural competency and diversity, equity, and inclusion .

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board to not modify the text to accommodate public comments to increase the number of hours through self-study. Ms. Liranzo noted public comments regarding other states and professional organizations do not limit the number of hours for self study and licensees with various neurotypes and mental health needs learn better through self-study. Ms. Liranzo commented on research and literature on self-study courses and noted that there doesn't seem to be a consensus that self-study is the best method. Ms. Liranzo further noted that research and literature discussed the importance of connecting with other licensees and professionals, such as opportunities provided in "live" courses, to promote ongoing competency and reduce professional isolation.

Ms. Liranzo noted a public comment not related to this rulemaking.

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board not modify the text to accommodate public comments to revise the definition of self-study and course advertising. Ms. Liranzo noted that specifying different course delivery method could confuse licensees and the section for course advertising is not a part of this rulemaking.

Ms. Liranzo noted a public comment regarding regulations specifying courses by ASHA-approved providers are accepted by the Board that did not need to be accommodated as it is already specified in regulations in 16 CCR section 1399.160.69(a).

Ms. Kaiser commented on the research and literature regarding self-study and professional isolation.

Ms. Kaiser asked for examples of hybrid courses. Ms. Liranzo replied that it's a combination of asynchronous and real-time learning.

Ms. Kaiser asked if the Board considered a course with both "live" and asynchronous learning as a "live" course. Ms. Burns replied that if there is a live component in the learning, whether it is online or in-person, the course is considered a "live course. Ms. Burns noted that a hybrid is a "live" course and for that reason it is not necessary to revise the definition of self-study to include the word "hybrid". Ms. Kaiser expressed agreement that it would not add clarity to include the word "hybrid" or other course delivery method.

Ms. Dominguez expressed support to increase the number of hours for indirect patient/client care courses. Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board to discuss an increase to the number of hours for indirect patient/client care courses, revising the definition of courses related to the practice, and making technical corrections to course content.

Dr. White asked if the hours can be rounded down so that it is closer to one-third. Ms. Liranzo replied that the current proposed change is one-third of the self-study hours and the recommendation is to make it one-quarter of the required hours.

Ms. Dominguez asked if it would be feasible to add courses and count only to the maximum hours instead of rounding up. Ms. Burns replied that it becomes difficult if there is too much rounding. Ms.

Burns asked if most courses are one and a half hours or in whole hour increments and noted that the Board does not accept a half hour course. Ms. Liranzo replied that there are one and a half hour courses and two and a half courses offered but they may not be as common as one-hour courses.

Ms. Dominguez asked how hours would be counted if a licensee takes more hours. Ms. Burns replied that it would be counted to the maximum hours and commented on reducing the need to cut hours from completed courses.

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

**Gilda Dominguez moved to modify the proposed regulatory text for 16 CCR sections 1399.160 through 1399.160.4, and direct staff to take all steps necessary to notice the modified regulatory text.**

**Amy White seconded the motion.**

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

Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to regulations regarding general application requirements and hearing aid dispensers and dispensing audiologists examination requirements.

Ms. Burns commented on the current practical examination process and what the proposed changes will do.

Mr. Dandurand asked if priority is given to trainees with license near expiration. Ms. Burns replied there is no regulations that gives them priority. Ms. Burns commented on the list of applicant types and circumstances that affect priority such as the applicant is not available due to illness or they are not ready for the examination, as they were already accepted under current regulations and therefore can sit for any future examination.

Mr. Borges asked how the Board handles those who are not within the maximum number of allowable applicants. Ms. Burns replied that the proposed changes will require the Board to notify the applicant fourteen (14) days prior to the examination. Ms. Burns commented that the Board will maintain the application in the order received for the next available examination.

Ms. Liranzo commented that this proposed change will remove the practical examination requirement for dispensing audiologists which may change the demand for the examination.

Ms. Chang asked how the Board handles those who are not within the maximum number of allowable applicants but are not able to make the next available examination if they are within the allowable number. Ms. Burns replied that they will be on the list for the next available date until they are able to attend and noted that military applicants are given priority. Ms. Chang noted that applicants will now have to complete one application instead of a new application for each examination.

Ms. Chang asked if there is a way to apply electronically. Ms. Burns replied that the Board is in the

process of implementing it and commented on the feature the Board will have to accept applicants or keep them in a queue. Ms. Burns further commented on the current process of accepting applicants via the mail.

Mr. Borges asked if the Board is requiring equipment to have the capability of establishing Speech Recognition Threshold and Word Recognition Scores. Dr. White replied that the text was already there.

Mr. Borges asked if this should be included if this isn't part of the actual text. Ms. Chang asked if it was part of the test in the past. Mr. Borges replied that he doesn't recall it being part of the test he took. Ms. Burns replied that this is old regulation text that is being updated. Ms. Liranzo noted the Board can decide to remove it. Mr. Borges commented on it not being necessary. Dr. White commented on it covering general topics that may be covered as no one is to know what is exactly on the examination.

Ms. Liranzo recommended the Board to increase the examination fees to cover the cost of administering them. Ms. Burns noted that the proposed change will allow applicants to retake the section they failed for half the total fee amount.

Ms. Dominguez asked if the total current fees are \$750 or \$725. Ms. Burns replied it is \$725 for both examinations. Ms. Liranzo noted that the memo has a typo.

Mr. Borges asked if a mechanism to charge half the fee will be created. Ms. Liranzo replied there will be with the proposed changes. Ms. Burns commented that DCA's Office of Profession Examination Services found if an applicant fails one section of the examination it is acceptable to only have them retake that section.

Ms. Chang asked for clarification on when they would pay half the fee amount. Ms. Burns replied they will pay half the fee when they fail one part of the examination and noted that there are currently two sections in the practical examination.

Ms. Chang asked what happens if they failed the written examination. Ms. Burns replied they would have to pay the full amount because it's only one part and not two parts like the practical examination. Mr. Borges noted that applicants cannot take the practical until they pass the written.

Ms. Chang commented on the timeframe to make the regulation effective and asked if the fees take into account any cost increase that may occur when it completes the rulemaking process. Ms. Burns replied that the statute only allows the Board to set the fee by actual cost and therefore the Board will need to monitor cost in the future to determine if it needs changes. Mr. Sanchez commented on the fee being based off past fiscal years which can be found in Attachment E of the meeting materials. Mr. Borges expressed support to increase the fee if a partial fee is being provided for re-take. Mr. Sanchez commented on how the Board used to administer the practical examination.

Ms. Chang asked if the Board could increase the fee by an additional twenty-five dollars (\$25). Ms. Liranzo replied the fee has to be based on actual cost and staff developed the projected fee based on past spending. Ms. Chang asked if the Board is playing catch up. Ms. Liranzo replied that the Board has been paying one hundred dollar (\$100) per applicant for the last three to four years and noted the last fee increase was in 2011. Ms. Burns commented that playing catch-up with examination fees is common for other boards that administer an examination.

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

**Amy White moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for 16 CCR sections 1399.112, 1399.120, 1399.121, 1399.122, and 1399.152.4 as proposed, 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, 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, including any non-substantive changes to the package, and adopt the proposed regulations at 16 CCR sections 1399.112, 1399.120, 1399.121, 1399.122, and 1399.152.4 as noticed.**

**Charles Sanders seconded the motion.**

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

Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to regulations regarding processing times.

Ms. Kaiser asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

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

**Tod Borges moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for 16 CCR sections 1399.113, 1399.141, 1399.151.1, 1399.153.2, 1399.160.6, 1399.170.4, and 1399.170.13, 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, 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, including any non-substantive changes to the package, and adopt the proposed regulations at 16 CCR sections 1399.113, 1399.141, 1399.151.1, 1399.153.2, 1399.160.6, 1399.170.4. and 1399.170.13 as noticed.**

**Amy White seconded the motion.**

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

Ms. Liranzo provided a background and summary of changes to regulations regarding audiology licensing requirements related to supervised clinical experience.

Ms. Kaiser asked for Board discussion. There was no Board discussion.

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

**Charles Sanders moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for 16 CCR section 1399.152.2, 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, 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, including any non-substantive changes to the package, and adopt the proposed regulations at 16 CCR section 1399.152.2 as noticed/amended.**

**Amy White seconded the motion.**

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

#### 14. Discussion and Possible Action on the Executive Officer Salary or Executive Officer Level Increase

Ms. Kaiser invited Mr. Kanotz to discuss possible action on the executive officer salary or level increase.

Mr. Kanotz noted that this item was moved to closed session and there is no additional discussion.

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

#### 15. Election of Board Officers

Ms. Kaiser asked for nomination for Board chair and vice chair for 2024.

Ms. Kaiser nominated Ms. Dominguez for Board chair. Ms. Dominguez accepted the nomination.

Ms. Dominguez nominated Dr. White for Board vice chair. Dr. White accepted the nomination.

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

**Approved the nomination of Gilda Dominguez for Board chair.**

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

**Approved the nomination of Amy White for Board vice chair.**

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

Ms. Kaiser congratulated the new Board officers.

Mr. Sanchez expressed his gratitude for Ms. Kaiser's service to the Board.

#### 16. Potential Dates for Board Meetings in 2024

Ms. Kaiser invited Ms. Burns to discuss potential date for Board meetings in 2024.

Ms. Burns asked if Board members were available on March 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> and noted other days of the week can be considered. Ms. Burns also noted that February 29<sup>th</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup> or April 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> are other days to consider. Ms. Burns noted February 29<sup>th</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup> as acceptable dates.

Ms. Burns asked if Board members were available on May 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> and noted June 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>, June 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup>, or June 20<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> are other days to consider. Ms. Burns also noted that May 30<sup>th</sup> and May 31<sup>st</sup> or May 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> are other days that can be considered or other days of the week can be considered such as May 21<sup>st</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup> or May 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Burns commented that the dates were determined based off dates that didn't fall on conferences, holidays, and practical examination days. Ms. Burns further commented that the first, second, and fourth meetings will be planned to be in Sacramento and the third will be planned to be in Southern California.

Mr. Sanchez asked if a poll can be sent to determine the second meeting date. Ms. Burns replied that a poll can be sent to Board members.

Ms. Burns asked if Board members were available on August 15<sup>th</sup> and 16 and noted August 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> or September 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> are other days to consider. Ms. Burns noted September 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> as acceptable dates.

Ms. Burns asked if Board members were available on October 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> or November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Burns noted December 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>, or December 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> are other days to consider.

Ms. Dominguez asked if these meeting are guaranteed to be two days. Ms. Burns replied that they may be one day meeting. Ms. Burns noted that other days of the week can be considered such as December 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Burns noted that a poll can be sent to Board members for the fourth meeting.

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

#### 17. Future Agenda Items

Ms. Kaiser asked for future agenda items. There were no items for future agenda.

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

#### 18. 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 did not meet in closed session to discuss disciplinary matters.

#### 19. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.