

AGENDA ITEM 6

APPROVAL OF JULY 31, 2012, BOARD MEETING MINUTES.

The draft minutes are attached for review.



TELECONFERENCE BOARD MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 31, 2012

Board Members Present

Bobbi Jean Tanberg, President
Eric Alegria
Mary Evert
Linda Florey
Luella Grangaard
Nancy Michel

Board Staff Present

Heather Martin, Executive Officer
Norine Marks, Legal Counsel
Jeff Hanson, Analyst

Board Member Excused Absence

Kathay Lovell

1. Call to order, roll call, establishment of a quorum.

Bobbi Jean Tanberg, President, called the meeting to order at 9:35 am. Linda Florey, Secretary, called the roll; a quorum of the Board was established.

2. Approval of the March 22, 2012, Board meeting minutes.

The March 22, 2012, Board meeting minutes were noticed in error; the March 22, 2012, Board meeting minutes were adopted at the June 27-28, 2012, meeting.

The March 12, 2012, Board meeting minutes should have been noticed; however, the meeting minutes were not available for review. The March 12, 2012, meeting minutes will be provided at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting.

3. Discussion and consideration of position on SB 764 (Steinberg), Developmental services: telehealth systems program.

Discussion ensued on positive and negative aspects of the bill. Board Members liked the bill's intent to increase public access to services. Concern was expressed that the bill did not detail the types of services that could, or could not, be provided through telecommunication. There was common consensus that educating a parent by telecommunication would lend itself well via telehealth. However, concern was expressed that practitioners may misinterpret the more intricate and sensitive services or interventions could be provided via telehealth when perhaps it would conflict with best practices. Board Members indicated practitioners will be required to use good judgment. Concern was expressed about potential consumer safety issues in the delivery of services proposed in the legislation along with inconsistencies in the way the 21 independent regional centers may implement the bill.

- ❖ Luella Grangaard moved for the Board to oppose the legislation.
- ❖ Mary Evert seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued on the motion to oppose. Concern was expressed for taking an opposing position at a late stage in the legislative cycle. Out of respect for the bill's author and the fact the

bill would increase access to services for disabled clients it was decided that it would be in the best interests of others for the Board to modify its position.

- ❖ Luella Grangaard moved to direct the Executive Officer to submit a letter of concern to the author expressing appreciation for the author's intent to increase public access to developmental services and ask that the Board be invited to participate in the poll/study that will be conducted if the bill is passed.
- ❖ Mary Evert seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Bobbi Jean Tanberg | Aye |
| Mary Evert | Aye |
| Linda Florey | Aye |
| Luella Grangaard | Aye |
| Eric Alegria | Aye |
| Nancy Michel | Aye |

- ❖ The motion was adopted.

4. Discussion and consideration of request by the Occupational Therapy Association of California's to collaborate on position on SB 924 (Price, Walters, Steinberg), Physical therapists: direct access to services: professional corporations.

Ms. Martin referred to the letter contained in the meeting materials from the Occupational Therapy Association of California (OTAC) requesting that the Board work collaboratively with them on seeking amendments to SB 924. Jennifer Snyder, with Capital Advocacy, representing OTAC and the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), reported the purpose of the letter is to put on the record that OTAC opposes the legislation unless amended. Ms. Snyder indicated that if the Board and OTAC collaborated it could potentially open the possibility of an amendment or at least set the stage for clean-up language next year. Since the Board had already submitted a letter to the author expressing opposition unless the bill is amended, they saw no reason to take further action. Ms. Snyder was encouraged to have OTAC submit a letter to the author advising him of their position.

5. Public comment session for items not on the agenda.

There was no public comment regarding items not on the agenda.

The Board convened in CLOSED SESSION pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3) from 10:15 am to 10:38 am to deliberate on a Disciplinary Decision. The Board returned to Open Session at 10:39 am.

6. Requests/suggestions for future agenda items.

Mary Evert asked that updated information relative to SB 924 be provided.

Heather Martin advised Board Members that it is likely a special meeting will be needed for a Disciplinary Decision before the October meeting in San Jose. Due to many scheduling conflicts it appeared September would be the best time to hold the special meeting. Board Members were directed to email Ms. Martin dates they would not be available in order for her to determine what would be the best date to hold the special meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:47 am.