



**PA Compact Communications Committee Meeting Minutes**

December 4, 2025

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Jean Fischer	WI alternate	x	x
Justin Hepner	VA delegate	x	x
Camille Luman	OK alternate	x	x
Rachel MacArthur	ME alternate	x	x
Mark Spangler	WV alternate	x	x Jamie Alley serving as alternate
Brooke Yates	MT delegate	x	x
Chandni Bhatka	KS alternate	x	
<b>Total voting members present</b>		Quorum = 4/7	6/7
Marisa Courtney	Vice Chair PA Commission		
Kathy Scarbali	Ex-Officio – AAPA		x
Jerica Kent	OH board staff		x
Tim Terranova	Chair PA Commission		x
Greg Thomas	ex-officio NCCPA		x
Name	Non-Member Role		Attendance
Nahale Kalfas	Interim Legal Counsel		
Carl Sims	CSG		x
Abigail Mortell	Interim Executive Director		x

Name	Agenda	Minutes	Newsletter
Jean Fischer		2	1
Justin Hepner			
Camille Luman	2		2
Rachel MacArthur			
Mark Spangler			
Brooke Yates	1	1	
Chandni Bhatka			
<b>TOTALS</b>	motion passes	motion passes	

**Welcome**

**Call to order/Roll Call**

Chair Fischer calls the meeting to order at 2:00pm ET.

A. Mortell takes roll.

9

## 10 **Review and Adopt Agenda**

- 11 • Committee reviews the agenda; Chair Fischer calls for a motion to adopt the agenda.

- 12 • **Motion:**

- 13 ○ **Brooke Yates motions to adopt the agenda.**
- 14 ○ **Camille Luman seconds the motion.**
- 15 ○ **All in favor, Motion carries.**

16

## 17 **Review Minutes from September 4 meeting**

- 18 • Committee reviews the minutes from September 4, 2025.

- 19 • **Motion:**

- 20 ○ **Brooke Yates motions to adopt the minutes.**
- 21 ○ **Jean Fischer seconds the motion.**
- 22 ○ **All in favor, Motion carries. Rachel MacArthur, Jamie Alley, abstain,**

23

## 24 **Compact Map Colors**

- 25 • Chair Fischer updates the committee of commission staff's suggestion to invert the colors  
26 of the compact map on the PA Compact website so that member states appear blue while  
27 states with legislation filed appear in orange.

- 28 ○ No objections to this change.

29

## 30 **December Newsletter**

- 31 • Chair Fischer opens the discussion on the newsletter.

- 32 ○ Chair Corner

- 33 ■ T. Terranova requests that "ex-officio members" be added to the first sentence.
- 34 ■ Chair Fischer notes the typo in pacompact.org to be correct.
- 35 ■ G. Thomas asks if "the compact" should be capitalized.
- 36 ■ T. Terranova suggests there is not a right way, but it can be capitalized if that is  
37 the committee's preference.
- 38 ■ N. Kalfas notes other compact commissions tend to capitalize "the Compact"  
39 when referring to their specific compact, which this commission could choose  
40 to do as well.
- 41 ■ G. Thomas suggests going with capitalization for clarity that the commission is  
42 referring specifically to the PA Compact.
- 43 ■ A. Mortell notes the newsletter will be proofed again to update all occurrences  
44 of "the Compact" to be capitalized.

- 45 ○ Legislative Update

- 46 ■ G. Thomas agrees with the addition of the language "No states are actively  
47 issuing privileges yet," to emphasize to the public that privileges are not yet  
48 available.
- 49 ■ A. Mortell asks if the committee would like that language in a different color  
50 font.
- 51 ■ G. Thomas and Chair Fischer note a different font color is unnecessary.

- 52 ○ Committee Synopsis

- 53                   ▪ No comments from the committee.
- 54           ○ Timeline
- 55                   ▪ Chair Fischer recommends spelling out RFP.
- 56                         • No objections.
- 57                         • A. Mortell notes the first occurrence is in the Chair’s Corner, so it can be
- 58                                 expanded there and abbreviated elsewhere.
- 59                         • Chair Fischer requests RFP to be spelled out in both the Chair’s Corner
- 60                                 and Executive Committee Synopsis in case a reader skips to that part of
- 61                                 the newsletter.
- 62                   ▪ K. Scarbalis points out RFI would also need to be spelled out.
- 63           ○ FAQ Highlight
- 64                   ▪ Chair Fischer explains the present FAQ was chosen by staff from the website
- 65                                 FAQ list, but it could be changed to a different question if the committee
- 66                                 prefers.
- 67                   ▪ T. Terranova notes sometimes other requirements PAs must complete besides
- 68                                 CMEs that need to be completed to maintain a compact privilege.
- 69                   ▪ N. Kalfas recommends adding a sentence at the end that other member state
- 70                                 requirements may apply in accordance with the relevant section of the
- 71                                 compact.
- 72                   ▪ G. Thomas – Continuing education units should be changed to continuing
- 73                                 education credits since that is the terminology, and “units” is a term used in
- 74                                 nursing.
- 75                   ▪ N. Kalfas suggests citing to and linking section 4 of the model legislation, so the
- 76                                 answer is speaking specifically to CMEs and not all that a practitioner must to
- 77                                 do to maintain a compact privilege. Also, should the language be continuing
- 78                                 medical education requirements?
- 79                   ▪ G. Thomas agrees.
- 80                   ▪ A. Mortell edits language throughout question and answer to reflect continuing
- 81                                 medical education/CME credits/requirements.
- 82

### 83 **Review of Commonly Asked Questions**

- 84           • Chair Fischer asks A. Mortell for an overview of the FAQs under review and how often
- 85                         questions are sent to the PA Compact email.
- 86                   ○ A. Mortell reports it averages one email a week with questions often repeating,
- 87                                 particularly those asking how to apply for a compact privilege. The FAQ sheet
- 88                                 provided to the committee for review today is comprised of the following questions:
- 89                                 i. *What steps should PAs interested in the compact complete now?*
- 90                                 ii. *Is the application for a compact privilege open and available yet? Can*
- 91                                         *I apply for a compact privilege?*
- 92                                 iii. *Is the application for a compact privilege open and available yet? Can*
- 93                                         *I apply for a compact privilege?*
- 94                                 iv. *Does a misdemeanor conviction render a PA ineligible for a compact*
- 95                                         *privilege?*

- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- 124
- 125
- 126
- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- Question i. is not currently answered on the website FAQ list, so the staff has drafted an answer for the committee’s consideration. Questions ii. and iii. are answered on the website FAQ, so the committee needs to review the answer and ensure it is satisfactory or make any necessary edits. Question iv. is one that has been sent a few times to the compact email, and the suggested answer is the result of collaboration between staff, N. Kalfas, and Rules Committee Chair Loucka. The answer includes notice to PAs that though they may be ineligible to practice in a state through the Compact due to a felony or misdemeanor, they should contact the licensing authority in that state to determine if there are other pathways to licensure they may utilize.
  - Chair Fischer recommends the committee begin with discussing question iv. and agrees with the addition of the language about alternative pathways for practitioners disqualified from using the Compact.
  - K. Scarbalis asks if the committee should wait to put out an FAQ on misdemeanors and compact eligibility because the Rules Committee may produce a rule on the issue, which could require this committee to amend the FAQ.
  - J. Alley shares similar concerns to K. Scarbalis, in addition to noting the answer is not easily understandable and clear for practitioners. It currently reads as a barrier rather than clear guidance.
  - N. Kalfas – The commission has only had to answer this question twice, so it is not a bad idea to wait to address it in an FAQ until the Rules Committee has addressed it. It is unlikely there is any wiggle room in practitioner eligibility for those with felony or misdemeanor convictions, but it is a conversation for the Rules Committee to have.
  - Chair Fischer concludes the committee will table this question until after Rules has addressed it.
    - No objections.
  - N. Kalfas notes if it is not too late this topic could be added to the December Rules Committee meeting agenda.
    - J. Alley and A. Mortell confirm it can be added given the time until the December 15 Rules meeting.
  - Question i.
    - Chair Fischer suggests changing “may continue” to “should continue.”
    - N. Kalfas suggests adding language that practitioners should check with the licensing boards in their state of qualifying licensure for information.
      - T. Terranova notes it is too early to send practitioners to individual state boards for information regarding the compact.

- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- 144
- 145
- 146
- 147
- 148
- 149
- 150
- 151
- 152
- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156
- 157
- 158
- 159
- 160
- 161
- 162
- 163
- 164
- 165
- 166
- 167
- 168
- 169
- 170
- 171
- 172
- 173
- 174
- 175
- J. Alley suggests referring the practitioner specifically to the timeline in the newsletter rather than simply the PA Compact website as a whole.
    - No objections to this change.
  - N. Kalfas notes that if information on advocating for the PA Compact is included here it would need to account for and take into consideration those groups who assist with the advocacy efforts for the PA Compact.
  - A. Mortell clarifies that adding information on advocacy is a suggestion by staff for expanding on the existing FAQ answer, so the committee may choose to forego adding any information related to advocacy and maintain an answer that only speaks what individual practitioners who are interested in utilizing compact can do to track compact developments.
  - N. Kalfas recommends the committee shelf any additional response related to advocacy since it can be troublesome to provide information on advocacy from places other than the partner organizations who lead those efforts.
- Question ii.
- A. Mortell explains this question is often sent to the PA Compact email, but it is already answered on the FAQ list, so the committee may choose to leave it as is or add information to supplement the existing answer.
  - N. Kalfas suggests saying “projected” instead of “estimated” for consistency with the language used in the timeline.
  - K. Scarbalis asks if it is possible to insert a map of the states as part of the answer, since even when the compact becomes operational practitioners must have a license in a member state and the state in which they wish to practice using a compact privilege must be a member state for them to utilize it.
    - J. Alley suggests changing “purchase” to another word such as “obtain,” since there is more involved in getting a compact privilege than deciding to purchase one.
    - T. Terranova suggests “apply for.”
    - J. Alley – That could lead into the information K. Scarbalis suggested adding, since applying for something would suggest a process and application requirements.
    - C. Luman – Regarding K. Scarbalis’s suggestion, adding a map is too much information based on the question. If that

176 information is added, it could be under another question, but it  
177 could be more information than is necessary at this time.  
178 • Chair Fischer – Practitioners need to know that they need a  
179 qualifying license in a member state to apply for a compact  
180 privilege, is that covered in a different FAQ.  
181 • J. Kent suggests adding the map of the compact states to the  
182 first question as part of the resources interested practitioners  
183 can monitor.  
184 • C. Luman – In the FAQ, under who qualifies for a compact  
185 privilege, it is explained that PAs must hold a license in  
186 qualifying state to utilize the compact.

187 ○ Question iii.

- 188 ■ Chair Fischer explains the committee could leave the answer as is, or  
189 that the fee will include a commission fee and potentially a state fee.
- 190 ■ N. Kalfas suggests adding “It will include an administrative fee to the  
191 commission and potentially a state fee,” but it is not necessary to  
192 add.
- 193 ■ K. Scarbalis favors leaving the language as it is because there are still  
194 too many unknowns regarding fees to change it now when more  
195 changes may be necessary later.
- 196 ■ T. Terranova agrees with leaving the language as is. People are not  
197 concerned with where the fee goes or how it is split, rather they want  
198 to know what the fee is, so the answer does not need to be more  
199 complicated.
- 200 ■ J. Kent agrees, though in the future when it is decided people may  
201 want to know how the fee is split, so that may be something to revisit  
202 once the fee is established.

- 203  
204 • Adoption of the December Newsletter.

205 • **Motion:**

- 206 ○ **Jean Fischer motions to adopt the December newsletter with formatting edits to be**  
207 **made by A. Mortell as discussed during today’s meeting.**
- 208 ○ **Camille Luman seconds the motion.**
- 209 ○ **All in favor, Motion carries.**

210  
211 **Delegate Questions and Comments**

- 212 • T. Terranova as commission chair requests the committee establish a regular meeting  
213 schedule for 2026.
- 214 • Chair Fischer recommends meeting quarterly, first week of the month quarter.
  - 215 ○ Committee decides to meet the first week of March, June, Sep., Dec. on Thursday at  
216 2:00pm ET.

217

218 **Public Questions and Comments**

- 219     • None.

220

221 **Adjourn**

- 222     • Hearing no further business or discussion, Chair Fischer adjourns the meeting at 2:57 p.m. ET  
223     with no member opposition.