

FLORIDA | Board of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology

Ad Hoc Committee Teleconference Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2019
2:00 p.m.

Conference Number:
1-888-585-9008
Conference Code:
346-983-002



Peter Johnson, PhD
Chair

Frederick Rahe, Au.D.
Vice-Chair

Kama Monroe
Executive Director

Tuesday, February 12, 2019

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Peter Johnson, Chair, at approximately 2:01 p.m.

Those present for all or part of the meeting include the following:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Johnson, Chair
Frederick Rahe, Au.D., Vice-Chair

BOARD STAFF PRESENT:

Kama Monroe, Executive Director
Carol Taylor, Program Administrator
Christa Peace, Regulatory Specialist III

BOARD COUNSEL

Rachelle Munson, Board Counsel

COURT REPORTER:

For The Record

OTHERS PRESENT

Charlene Westman
Debbie Campbell

Program Operations Administrator, Carol Taylor took roll for the record. She then relinquished the meeting to the Board Chair, Dr. Peter Johnson.

Chair, Dr. Peter Johnson, called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees. He stated the meeting was a continued discussion on the proposed changes of the rules governing the supervision of Speech Language Assistants.

Dr. Rahe gave a brief overview of the January 22nd meeting, wherein FLASHA representatives proposed new wording (indirect supervision) in lieu of redefining direct supervision. The indirect supervision language introduced telecommunication and new technology that will be used when supervising Speech Language Assistants.

Shannon Morey from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) explained how the Florida Association of Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists (FLASHA) and ASHA guidelines differs from the Florida Board of Speech-Language, Pathology & Audiology guidelines.

FLASHA representative, Ms. Campbell, clarified that ASHA's definition to direct and indirect supervision are different from the Florida Board of Speech-Language, Pathology & Audiology definitions. Discussion ensued regarding direct supervision and the board's recent experiences regarding the terminology, as well as, the difference between the standards.

Board counsel stated the board's rules would have to be written in a manner which is complicit with the statutory parameters. She noted that ASHA's standards are not incorporated in the board's rules.

Ms. Westman stated that what they are attempting to do is to establish protocols as noted in the statute. Discussion ensued regarding establishing protocols.

At Dr. Johnson's direction, board counsel agreed to review the language included in the proposed Section 64B20-XX. She further noted that the language is an area that will require discussion.

Dr. Rahe summarized that the most recent wording does not eliminate direct supervision, but instead includes telecommunication devices as a means to direct supervision.

Discussion ensued regarding the definition of telecommunication, including what would be included as a telecommunication method in the proposed rule.

A discrepancy was identified in the proposed form. The contents of the proposed form were discussed regarding how the evaluation would work, including timeframes for proficiencies and what happens at the end of the six months if proficiency was not met. It was determined that the idea is, that the assistant meets a level of proficiency by the end of the third two-month period.

Ms. Westman and Ms. Campbell will revise the proposed language and forward to the ad hoc committee.

Board Counsel, Rachele Munson stressed the importance that every word be reviewed and contemplated to ensure the proposed language is clear. Someone reading the language should be able to read the language and know exactly what is required of them.

Questions that were asked by Board Counsel

1. What telecommunication methods will be included in the proposed rule?
2. So, the form would read evaluation for every two months of the professional employment experience?
3. Would the assistant need three of the evaluation forms consecutively completed for compliance to be met?
4. If you have an SLP who is not holding down a full-time position, does none of this apply?
5. What is equivalent part-time?
6. How does it work out?
7. Is this over a six-month period?
8. Under what circumstances would a full-time professional employment candidate go beyond six months?
9. How will the supervising licensee, who is facing liability, identify that this person has not demonstrated proficiency?
10. How much does it take to throw you into a bad situation as an assistant?
11. In what instances would an evaluator sign off on the form?
12. Is there a language that should be included on the form to establish what must be achieved?
For example, in the first evaluation if they have all achieve except two below, the second evaluation they have all achieve except one below, and in the third evaluation they have all achieve, did they do it?
13. If the evaluator doesn't sign off, is it a rolling six months or will an additional 6 months be added?

Any new proposed language will be further discussed at the April 1, 2019 Board meeting.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:55 p.m.