



PA Compact Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

November 10, 2025

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Jamie Alley	WV Delegate	x	x
Susan Gile	KS Delegate	x	x
Lucy Treene	VA Alternate	x	
Valeska Barr	OK Delegate	x	x
Elizabeth Huntley	MN Delegate	x	x
Stephanie Loucka	OH Delegate	x	x
Catherine Marie Patterson	TN Delegate	x	x
Larry Marx	UT Delegate	x	x
Robert Sanders	WI Delegate	x	
Amber Houge	IA Delegate	x	x Laura Delaney attending as alternate
Total voting members present			8/10
Marisa Courtney	Vice Chair PA Commission		x
Kathy Scarbalis	Ex-Officio – AAPA		x
Tim Terranova	Chair PA Commission		
Name	Non-Member Role		Attendance
Nahale Kalfas	Interim Legal Counsel		x
Abigail Mortell	Interim Executive Director		x
Carl Sims	CSG		x
Laura Monick	OH staff		x

VOTES					
Name	Agenda	Amend Minutes from August 25, 2025	Adopt Minutes as Amended	Approve draft rule 3 – compact privilege to Executive Committee	Approve draft rule 4 – data system to Executive Committee
Jamie Alley				1	
Valeska Barr		2			2
Elizabeth Huntley					
Stephanie Loucka					

Catherine Marie Patterson					
Larry Marx	2	1	1		1
Robert Sanders					
Susan Gile	1		2	2	
Lucy Treene					
Amber Houge					
TOTALS	Motion passes	Motion passes		Motion passes	Motion passes

4 **Welcome**

5 **Call to order/Roll Call**

6
7 Chair Loucka calls meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. ET.

8 Met Quorum at 12:35 p.m. ET.

9 A. Mortell takes the roll. 8/10 voting members present.

11 **Review and Adopt Agenda**

12 Committee reviews the agenda; Chair Loucka calls for a motion to adopt the agenda.

13 **Motion:**

- 14 • Susan Gile motions to adopt the agenda.
- 15 • Larry Marx seconds.
- 16 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

18 **Minutes from August 25, 2025**

19 Committee reviews the draft minutes. Chair Loucka calls for a motion to amend the minutes from the August 25, 2025, meeting to add Lucy Treene to the roll call.

21 **Motion:**

- 22 • Larry Marx motions to amend the August 25, 2025, minutes.
- 23 • Valeska Barr seconds.
- 24 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

26 Chair Loucka calls for a motion to adopt the minutes from August 25, 2025, as amended.

27 **Motion:**

- 28 • L. Marx motions to adopt minutes as amended.
- 29 • Gile seconds.
- 30 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

32 **Draft Rule 3 – Compact Privilege Process**

- 33 • Chair Loucka clarifies that rule 1 is the rule on rulemaking, and rule 2 will be reserved for the rule on definitions, so the compact privilege process will remain rule 3.
- 35 • Chair Loucka opens the floor for comments or questions on rule 3.

- 3.3 Eligibility for Compact Privilege
 - S. Gile – If someone does not have a compact privilege, how will they state or demonstrate they are complying with the state’s laws and regulations where the patient is located if they do not yet have a privilege in that state? This seems like it belongs under process or somewhere else.
 - N. Kalfas – This was imbedded as a reminder that practitioners are expected to comply with the other state laws and regulations where the patient is located. The idea was that it be a notice rather than something they could prove at this point.
 - Chair Loucka – Points 10, 11, and 12 are grouped as prospective.
 - S. Gile suggests changing the wording to “agrees to comply with...”
 - N. Kalfas – It could go either way. The language as it stands authorizes an attestation requirement minimally. Or it could say “attest to compliance,” but that would limit the commission to an attestation in the data system.
 - S. Gile agrees with the language as drafted.
 - Chair Loucka notes this as a potential FAQ or education point for the Communications Committee.
- 3.1 Definitions
 - J. Alley asks whether changing “Remote State” to “Participating State” in the “Compact Privilege” definition is acceptable since it now deviates from the definition given in the compact.
 - Chair Loucka suggests reverting the definition to match the compact since the change does not appear to be necessary. If a reason for changing to “participating state” arises, a change can be made following this meeting.
 - No objections to restoring the definition to how it appears in the compact language.
- 3.4(e) – Addition of a cross reference to data system rule
 - No objections to this addition.
- 3.5 Compact Privilege Cycle and Continued Participation
 - Chair Loucka notes the addition of section c and asks L. Monick to explain.
 - L. Monick – The section contains the renewal process that was previously discussed and is not laid out in the statute. For “determine a PA has not been found guilty of a felony or misdemeanor,” the committee wanted that general language to allow those states that have an attestation at renewal to comply with that requirement. Once the qualifying license is renewed, the state will notify the compact commission, so the licensee can move forward with obtaining new privileges for those states they wish to practice in.
 - V. Barr – On the processing part of this, will the commission/data system notify states that practitioners want to renew their privileges, at which point the state of qualifying license confirmed they have renewed their qualifying license properly?
 - N. Kalfas and C. Sims confirm that that is how other commissions have envisioned the process.
 - N. Kalfas asks V. Barr clarifying question – Would you like to be notified that a practitioner is trying to renew, or that they have renewed?
 - V. Barr – The way it is reading is that when Oklahoma, as the state of qualifying license, completes a renewal, then Oklahoma notifies the compact commission, which would require Oklahoma to track which PAs are part of the compact and

which are not. Alternatively, if a PA enters the compact data system and checks a box to renew a compact privilege, and Oklahoma is notified as the state of qualifying license to verify if that PA has renewed properly, then Oklahoma can give that notice without keeping track on the state end of what practitioners are utilizing the compact.

- S. Gile – When someone has a state of qualifying license that is not Kansas, if the license in another state is a two-year license, and Kansas has a one-year license, their privilege in Kansas will be on the same schedule as their state of qualifying license. When the PA goes to renew their qualifying license, Kansas will receive notice that they have renewed, so their privilege, assuming they continue the Kansas privilege, would renew as well. Kansas would change their privilege date to match that of their qualifying license.
- N. Kalfas confirms that the state of qualifying license is what states track through. So long as a practitioner is still qualified, the privilege will reissue, and the state of qualifying license will be notified that it has been reissued.
- S. Gile – When someone has a qualifying license in a state with a 2-year renewal cycle, will they get a Kansas privilege for 2 years for 1 year renewal rate?
- Chair Loucka – It is likely the renewal fees would have to be split, so PAs are paying proportionately between 1- and 2-year renewals.
- J. Alley – To V. Barr’s point, for the state that is the state of qualifying license, there is a need to know the PAs in your state who are practicing with your state as their SQL, if you don’t otherwise ask this information at renewal, regarding the attestation for felonies and misdemeanors. When the practitioner renews, the state will have to validate that point to the commission as part of the practitioner’s eligibility to maintain privileges. There will need to be some internal reconciliation.
- Chair Loucka – Some early adopters of the IMLC did not identify who their SQL practitioners were, but it has become apparent that it is necessary.
- V. Barr – For clarification, is a state responsible for keeping track of practitioners using that state as their SQL and notifying the commission that the license has been renewed?
- N. Kalfas – The system should be doing the heavy lifting there.
- L. Monick recommends flagging this as a need for data system developers.

• 3.5.e

- J. Alley – Is there any issue with the term being “distributed” rather than perhaps “be made available,” because if you are a participating state that has nothing to do with certain compact participants, you likely do not want to receive notifications and information about them.
- Chair Loucka and S. Gile agree with this point. No objections to this change.

• 3.6.a

- Chair Loucka explains the committee had determined that it is likely a PA will terminate their SQL when they know the new state they wish to designate. So, the process would be to designate the new state prior to termination. Question to those on the committee that are PAs, does this feel like the right process?
- K. Scarbalis – In general, most people have an idea of where they are going. Even those who are retiring.

- M. Patterson agrees with language addition.
- 3.6.d
 - S. Gile – Even if someone does designate a new SQL before terminating their previous qualifying license, all their privileges would terminate, which seems like a burden to practitioners, particularly financially, and state boards.
 - N. Kalfas – If not for that qualifying license, a practitioner does not have access to the compact portal. All privileges are tied to the QL through which a practitioner entered the portal.
 - S. Gile – If a practitioner gets a new license they wish to designate as their new SQL, could the commission notify those states where the practitioner has privileges under their old SQL with the new license information (ex. Expiration date), so the practitioner may maintain their privileges under the new SQL?
 - N. Kalfas – That process poses some issues to equitability between member states, specifically regarding payments at renewal.
 - L. Monick – In the statute, every part of the privilege is tied to the qualifying license that was used to gain initial access to the compact portal. If a practitioner has a privilege on a 2-year cycle that is approaching renewal, and they shift their QL to a state with a 3-year cycle, it enables them to bypass the renewal process and fees. The cleanest way that we conceived was terminating the qualifying license, which in turn would terminate all the privileges.
 - N. Kalfas – Additionally, a practitioner has other options. They do not have to terminate their qualifying license. There is also the conversion section of the compact.
 - J. Alley – It is rare that someone will change their SQL since PAs do not have to maintain minimum contact with the state unlike the IMLC, other than maintaining the license itself. There is language in the compact that says the privileges expire when the SQL does, which necessitates this situation.
 - N. Kalfas – This is a mutual recognition model compact, which relies solely on the qualifying license, unlike an expedited licensure model compact. To allow people to maintain privileges based on something they no longer hold would be legally untruthful.
 - Chair Loucka notes this is a point for the Communications Committee to inform PAs to choose their SQL wisely since it is a cumbersome process to change it and poses additional costs.
- Chair Loucka requests a motion to transmit draft rule 3 to the Executive Committee with revisions made during the present meeting.

Motion:

- J. Alley motions to approve draft rule 3 as amended to move to the Executive Committee.
- S. Gile seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Draft Rule 4 – Compact Data System

- Chair Loucka recommends renumbering data system rule 5 to rule 4.
 - No objections.
- Chair Loucka notes the changes on the first page are related to separating joint investigations into a separate rule and removing that language from data system rule.

- No objections.
- 4.1 Definitions
 - “Joint investigations” definition was removed consistent with the committee’s decision to create a separate rule on that topic.
 - Definition for “minor infraction” was added pursuant to the committee’s discussion during the August 25, 2025, meeting.
 - K. Scarbalis: Will people reading the rule know what NPDB means?
 - Chair Loucka and S. Gile suggest spelling it out in the definition.
 - No objections.
 - L. Monick notes the definition is the only place it is used, so spelling it out there makes sense.
 - 4.1.t
 - Chair Loucka notes the comment that definitions will likely be needed for “public action” and “public complaint” for 4.4.
 - L. Monick recommends returning to this point after the committee reviews 4.4.
 - Chair Loucka agrees.
 - J. Alley mentions there was a discussion that these terms may not need to be defined, and it can be left up to the state to ascertain.
- 4.3 Uniform Data Set
 - 4.3.c.8
 - A. Mortell clarifies the comment to include “and accept service of process from participating states” after “receive correspondence” was noted during a previous committee meeting for the committee to revisit.
 - Chair Loucka does not see it necessary to add the language since if someone agrees to receiving correspondence, that is inclusive of all communications from the commission.
 - No objections to omitting the additional language and maintaining only “receive correspondence.”
 - N. Kalfas asks the committee if any of their states allow service of process in compliance with the Admin Procedure Act via email if it is not already some large agency, for example registered with the office of administrative hearings.
 - L. Marx confirmed Utah does, and Chair Loucka confirms Ohio does.
 - J. Alley notes WV does not, but the board asks applicants to agree to it, which they sometimes do.
- 4.4 Reports of Adverse Actions and Significant Investigative Information
 - J. Alley – These changes were intended to streamline this section regarding documents and timeframes. The section now contains a summary of the information rather than providing copies of documents. The timeframes are now five days rather than ten and are uniform throughout.
 - L. Monick – The committee settled on a checkbox to indicate whether there was significant investigative information and contact information, so states can work together from there.
- 4.5 Confidentiality

- J. Alley – Language was added to end of 4.5.c to make it clear that participating states cannot redisclose any adverse action or significant investigative information they receive to people who are not other participating states unless there is an order from a court of competent jurisdiction. It also provides protection to the state if they do get one of those subpoenas, so that they may comply with it.
 - No objections to this section.
- 4.6.e
 - Chair Loucka notes that the same practice with regard to confidentiality is mirrored in this section.
 - J. Alley – The language in 4.6.e.1 is discretionary. We added a “may” instead of a “shall” again to accommodate the differences in states, so no one feels they are in a situation where they are stuck between the compact and their state law. The court order language previously discussed is mirrored at the end of 4.6.e.3 as well.
 - S. Gile suggests changing “may not be redisclosed” to “shall not be redisclosed” in 4.6.e.3.
 - J. Alley notes it is “shall” in 4.5.c, so it makes sense to change it here to match.
 - Chair Loucka agrees with changing to “shall.”
 - N. Kalfas – For the committee’s general information, there are several states wherein “may not” means “shall not” to them.
 - J. Alley – To most states “may” is discretionary not directive. “Shall” is probably what it should say.
 - S. Gile notes “shall” is stronger.
 - N. Kalfas agrees with the change, though it will be changed in those states where “shall not” means “may not,” which would be non-substantive.
- Chair Loucka notes the remaining changes relate to removing sections related to joint investigations, which will be added to a new, separate rule.
- 4.1 Definitions, cont.
 - Chair Loucka returns to the comment on the need for definitions for “public action” and “public complaint” and suggests it is not necessary to define these terms since the meaning of “public” will vary greatly among states. We have accounted for practice in the way the rule is structured. It can be an issue with the IMLC where there are definitions that states do not fit squarely within, which causes greater confusion.
 - J. Alley agrees with not adding those definitions and notes if they turn out to be necessary, then the committee can add them later to the rule on definitions or amend them to this rule.
 - S. Giles agrees.
 - N. Kalfas notes the committee could also do both—amend the rule on definitions and data system rule.

Motion:

- L. Marx motions to approve draft rule 4 as amended to move to the Executive Committee.
- V. Barr seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

266 **Delegate Comments**

- 267 • J. Alley thanks Chair Loucka for her work leading this committee.
268 • Chair Loucka thanks L. Monick for her help.

269
270 **Public Comments**

271 None.

272
273 **2026 Meeting Planning**

- 274 • A meeting poll for the next meeting will be sent out.
275 • A meeting poll for 2026 meetings will also be sent out so the committee can establish a
276 standing meeting time for the year.

277
278 **Next Steps**

- 279 • Chair Loucka notes the committee will next work on the rule on joint investigations, and
280 a draft will be circulated prior to the next committee meeting.

281
282 **Adjourn**

283 Chair Loucka adjourns the meeting at 1:50 p.m. ET.

DRAFT