



1 **PA Compact Rules Committee Meeting Minutes**
 2 **July 10, 2025**

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Jamie Alley	WV Delegate	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	Joined after roll
Larry Marx	UT Delegate	x	Joined after roll
Robert Sanders	WI Delegate	x	
Total voting members present			6
Marisa Courtney	Vice Chair PA Commission		x
Kathy Scarbalis	Ex-Officio – AAPA		x
Nathan Smith	OH board staff		
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	Minutes (June 4)
Jamie Alley	2	
Valeska Barr		2
Elizabeth Huntley	1	1
Stephanie Loucka		
Catherine Marie Patterson		
Larry Marx		
Robert Sanders		
TOTALS	Motion passes	Motion passes

4 **Welcome**
 5 **Call to order/Roll Call**
 6
 7 Chair Loucka calls to order the meeting at 11:01 a.m. ET.
 8 Met Quorum at 11:01 a.m. ET.
 9 A. Mortell takes roll. 4/7 members present.
 10
 11 **Review and Adopt Agenda**

12 Committee reviewed the agenda; Chair Loucka called for a motion to adopt the agenda.

13 **Motion:** Committee reviews the agenda.

- 14 • Elizabeth Huntley motions to adopt the agenda.
- 15 • Jamie Alley seconds.
- 16 • Agenda is adopted.

17

18 **Minutes from June 4, 2025**

19 **Motion:**

- 20 • Elizabeth Huntley motions to adopt the minutes.
- 21 • Valeska Barr seconds.
- 22 • The minutes are approved.

23

24 Marie Patterson joined meeting at 11:08 a.m. ET.

25 L. Marx joined meeting at 11:11 a.m. ET.

26 L. Monick noted she will share written comments on behalf of Chair Terranova who could not
27 attend this meeting.

28

29 **Draft Rule 2 – State of Qualifying License Process**

30

31 2.0 Purpose

- 32 • Chair Terranova (via L. Monick) – In line 15, suggests leaving in ultimate responsibility
33 sentence, but not sure if the others are needed. Also ok with keeping all or none.
- 34 • J. Alley – Favors the inclusion of “ultimately” in Purpose paragraph.
- 35 • L. Marx – Approves of the “Purpose” paragraph, as the commission needs to look to the
36 states for validation of the qualifying license.

37

38 2.1 Definitions

- 39 • Chair Terranova – Suggests “service member” definition is no longer necessary since all
40 references to it in the rule have been removed.

41

42 2.1 State of Qualifying License Designation

- 43 • Chair Terranova – Line 65, suggestion to add at the end of the sentence “and meets all
44 other requirements as defined in compact law.”
 - 45 ○ Chair Loucka and L. Marx agree with the suggestion.
- 46 • V. Barr – In 2.2, we have licensees sign an attestation that they are unaware of any type
47 of investigation, is this referring to any time they are applying with the state of qualifying
48 license, or only when they terminate one license (as referred to in 2.1a)?
 - 49 ○ Chair Loucka – Clarifies question, do licensees only sign an attestation regarding
50 knowledge of investigations when they are switching their state of qualifying
51 license, and if so, why are they not doing that at the point of initial compact
52 licensure?
 - 53 ○ V. Barr confirms.
 - 54 ○ N. Kalfas – The Commission has authority pursuant to the language in the
55 compact to require that attestation at any point in the process.
 - 56 ○ L. Monick – The original discussion that the committee had on the attestation,
57 particularly when the applicant is voluntarily terminating and picking a new state
58 of qualifying license, was to prevent a licensee avoiding any kind of upcoming

59 discipline. The statute does not contemplate denying any kind of application
60 based on pending discipline, only if they have been disciplined.

- 61 ○ L. Marx – Attestation should be on initial application as well as redesignation.
- 62 ○ N. Kalfas – Until there is a final decision in an ongoing disciplinary investigation,
63 the Commission is not prevented from proceeding with granting a license, but
64 having the attestation allows states to inquire and know that an investigation is
65 ongoing.
- 66 ○ K. Scarbalis – Agrees with L. Marx's point.
- 67 • J. Alley – There is a lot of information to help a PA understand what to do when they are
68 terminating a state of qualifying license and picking a new one, but very little regarding
69 the initial point of licensure. 2.1 seems to be written so regulators understand, while 2.2 is
70 written so PAs understand.
 - 71 ○ Chair Loucka – Agrees, it should be something both regulators and PAs can
72 understand.
- 73 • L. Monick – Now that we have taken out requirements for designating a state of
74 qualifying license in 2.1a, we do have language in rule 3 for Compact Privilege Process,
75 where more of the information on the process of getting a privilege is, has the purpose of
76 this rule changed and do we need to restructure? We will need to leave in a process for
77 when licensees voluntarily terminate their state of qualifying license, but could it be
78 merged with rule 3 rather than having a separate rule?
 - 79 ○ Chair Loucka – Agrees it could be one rule about the privilege itself and break the
80 privilege process into establishing initial privilege and switching state of
81 qualifying license.
 - 82 ○ K. Scarbalis – Is it possible to direct people to rule 3 for further steps?
 - 83 ○ Chair Loucka – There are two options, first to refer people to rule 3, and second to
84 combine rules 2 and 3. Favors combining the rules.
 - 85 ○ J. Alley – Agrees the rules can be combined.
- 86 • Chair Terranova – Add language “neither the Commission nor the data system shall
87 receive or maintain...” to line 106.
 - 88 ○ Chair Loucka – Likes that addition for the purpose of FBI audits.
 - 89 ○ J. Alley – Add “the Commission, the data system, or other participating state” so
90 the language is broader.
 - 91 ○ N. Kalfas – Make the language plural, “other participating states,” in case the
92 licensee is getting privileges in multiple participating states.
- 93 • J. Alley – Is there any contemplation that a PA would be able to start the process of
94 establishing a new qualifying state license before terminating their current one?
95 Regarding continuation of practice, there could be a time-out of up to 60 days in
96 licensee's ability to practice because they cannot start in their new state with practice
97 privileges under the new state of qualifying license. Would it be possible to establish a
98 process of transferring state of qualifying license before termination of current license
99 occurs?
 - 100 ○ Chair Loucka – Could make it so the initial state of qualifying license does not
101 terminate until the approval of the new state of qualifying license.
 - 102 ○ N. Kalfas – Provided the following language from the Nursing Compact for
103 change in primary state of residence, which is a process analogous to a PA
104 changing their state of qualifying license:
 - 105 ■ “403. CHANGE IN PRIMARY STATE OF RESIDENCE (1) A nurse
106 who changes his or her primary state of residence from one party state to

107 another party state may continue to practice under the existing multistate
108 license while the nurse's application is processed and a multistate license
109 is issued in the new primary state of residence. (2) Upon issuance of a new
110 multistate license, the former primary state of residence shall deactivate its
111 multistate license held by the nurse and provide notice to the nurse. (3) If a
112 party state verifies that a licensee who holds a multistate license changes
113 primary state of residence to a non-party state, the party state shall convert
114 the multistate license to a single state license within fifteen (15) calendar
115 days, and report this conversion to the Coordinated Licensure Information
116 System. History: Adopted December 12, 2017; effective January 19,
117 2018."

- 118 ○ K. Scarbalis – Believes most people would terminate after acquiring a new active
119 license, besides emergency situations or movement required by military duty.
120 Agrees with deference to Nursing Compact language suggested by N. Kalfas
121 language.
- 122 ○ Chair Loucka – A draft of that process will be included in the next draft.
- 123 ○ V. Barr – It would be preferable if in this process the Commission would notify
124 the original state of qualifying license.
- 125 ○ N. Kalfas – Other commissions have established that the data system provides
126 notification.

Draft Rule 3 – Compact Privilege Process

130 Chair Loucka – Rule 2 will be added to rule 3.

3.1 Definitions

- 133 • Chair Loucka – Definition of “NCCPA” has been added.

3.3 Eligibility for Compact Privilege

- 136 • Chair Loucka – Edit made on line 78 in accordance with added NCCPA definition.

3.4 Compact Participation Process

- 139 • Chair Loucka – Opens floor for comments.
- 140 • Chair Terranova – Do we need additional language on line 119 (subsection a.4)?
141 Concerned that using the term “discrepancies” may be limiting.
 - 142 ○ L. Monick – Recalls previous discussion, when an application is received and the
143 background check turns up questions, the licensing agency must request
144 additional information.
- 145 • Chair Terranova – Line 127 (subsection b.2), change language to notify the applicant to
146 complete a background check, since the state board does not conduct the background
147 check.
- 148 • L. Monick – Referring to Chair Terranova’s first comment on 3.4, “discrepancies” keeps
149 it contained to what issues are turned up on the background check but doesn’t overly
150 limit what the agency can ask for follow up.
 - 151 ○ J. Alley – FSMB uses “unusual circumstances.”
 - 152 ○ N. Kalfas – Sees a difference between “discrepancies” and “unusual
153 circumstances.” Potentially add both and include language “in accordance with
154 compact requirements.”

155 ○ L. Marx – Agrees with N. Kalfas and J. Alley. Would like to include something
156 less connotative. Often what is needed is information to complete the application.
157 ○ L. Monick – Could add “information requested by the state of qualifying license
158 related to the application under review.”
159 ○ Chair Loucka – May be too broad.
160 ○ N. Kalfas – Include “in accordance with compact language.”
161 ● Chair Loucka – For second comment from Chair Terranova, it seems to be a technical
162 drafting correction.
163 ○ N. Kalfas – sent suggested language in the chat for 3.4, b.2, state of qualifying
164 licensure shall “receive and review” criminal background checks.
165 ● Chair Loucka – 3.4 subsection c will be cleaned up consistent with the deletions in rule 2
166 ● Chair Loucka – Moves to discuss 3.4 subsection d.
167 ○ N. Kalfas – Add “authorize the issuance of” compact privilege, currently reads
168 like the privilege is issued by the state itself.
169 ○ Chair Loucka – Disagrees because the states do authorize the system to issue the
170 privilege.
171 ○ J. Alley – Agrees with Chair Loucka. From a regulatory perspective, the state is
172 issuing the privilege, and the data system provides the corresponding materials.
173 ○ N. Kalfas – Clarification could be provided by defining the term “issue” because
174 the data system does not authorize practitioners but provides the materials
175 authorized by the states.
176 ○ J. Alley – Some states have practice requirements that require follow up from the
177 state in which it is issued.
178 ○ K. Scarbalis – Clarifying point, licensees will apply for the license through the
179 data system, but the privilege is issued through the states?
180 ○ Chair Loucka – That is correct.
181 ○ N. Kalfas – Clarification, the data system effectuates what the states authorize?
182 ○ Chair Loucka – Correct.
183 ○ K. Scarbalis – Potentially make an FAQ explaining this process.
184 ○ N. Kalfas – The Communications committee will have to create multiple FAQs to
185 explain this process to people.
186 ● Chair Loucka – Plan to continue discussion on rule 3 at the next meeting.
187 ● V. Barr – Has some points about rule 3 to discuss at the next meeting.
188 ● N. Kalfas – Requests review of the addition of line 170 (3.5 subsection a).
189 ○ Chair Loucka and J. Alley – Will give this more thought.

190 **Next Steps**

191 ● Chair Loucka – Add content from rule 2 to rule 3, clean up items that have been
192 discussed, leave track changes that have not been discussed. Additionally, committee
193 members will receive a template to provide comments on draft rule 5, which will be
194 submitted in advance and reviewed during the next meeting. The next meeting will also
195 be scheduled for longer than 1 hour.

196 **Delegate Comment**

197 None.

198 **Public Comment**

199 None.

203

204 **Next Meeting**

205 A poll will be sent out to schedule the next meeting, which will occur around the end of August
206 or beginning of September.

207

208 **Adjourn**

209 Chair Loucka adjourns meeting at 12:04 p.m. ET.

DRAFT