



Physical Therapy Compact Commission Rules and Bylaws Committee Meeting Minutes

May 22, 2019

4:00 – 5:00 p.m. (ET)

Via WebEx

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kathy Arney, North Carolina, Committee Chair (Joined at 4:30)
Barbara Behrens, New Jersey
Scott D. Majors, Kentucky
Joseph Shanley, New Hampshire
Andrew Wodka, Washington

MEMBERS ABSENT: Cheris Frailey, Colorado
Charlotte Martin, Louisiana

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT: T.J. Cantwell, Compact Administrator

FSBPT STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Rosa, Managing Director, Post-Licensure Services

Call to Order

T.J. Cantwell called roll and determined a quorum was present. The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM, ET.

Discussion of Potential Rules Changes

The Committee reviewed potential changes to the Rules and agreed that staff should draft language regarding amendments to Rule 6.7 and 3.5 for review at the next meeting. The Committee also agreed not to proceed with a member state suggestion that investigatory information should only be shared if the adjudicated complaint results in disciplinary action. There were no additional suggestions made by the Committee. (Attached)

Discussion of Potential Bylaws Changes

There were no suggested changes to the Bylaws and no additional suggestions were made by the Committee.

Discussion of Potential Procedure and Policy Changes

The Committee reviewed potential changes to Procedures and Policies and agreed that staff should draft language regarding the handling of requests for information by the public and member states. The Committee also agreed the item regarding the procedure for how to report disciplinary action should wait since amendments to Rule 6.7 might impact the policy. The Committee decided not to move forward on a member state suggestion requesting the direct transfer and verification of

jurisprudence scores from the Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy to the Physical Therapy Compact Commission.

Kathy Arney suggested updating the policies to clarify that the 3.5 % bank processing fees collected by the Commission are rounded up to the nearest dollar. The Committee agreed an amendment should be drafted.

Next Steps

The Committee requested staff to draft amendments to the agreed upon items for review and discussion at the next committee meeting.

Next Meeting

The Committee will schedule the next meeting for late June.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 PM, ET.

2019 Compact Rules, Bylaws, and Policies for Review

As of 5/22/19

Suggestions from Compact Member States

I would like to see the consideration of the following changes to the Compact:

1) That a mechanism be developed in order for the Federation of State Boards to communicate directly with the Compact to transfer jurisprudence scores for individuals engaging in the Compact. It is a needless use of staff resources to receive the scores from FSBPT only to transfer them to the Compact.

(Possible change to Procedure and Policy Manual)

2) Modification that only adjudicated Complaints resulting in disciplinary action be reported to Compact as is the case with the NPDB. Complaints are confidential until such time that the Board review and considers the complaint and makes a determination of disciplinary action. No dismissed complaints are made public. (Possible change to Rule 6.7)

Suggested Procedures and Policies for Review

- 1) Consider clarifying the process for reporting disciplinary actions in order to make sure action is taken as soon as possible.
- 2) How should the Commission handle requests for information by the public and member states? What information should/can be restricted?
- 3) Add language regarding how the processing fees are assessed so that it is clear how it works – under compact fee section. 1.6

Suggested Bylaws for Review

NONE

Suggested Rules for Review

- 1) Rule 6.7 – Indicating Availability of Investigatory Information
 - a. Consider a clarification of the rule regarding investigatory information
- 2) Rule 3.5 – Expiration or Termination of a Compact Privilege
 - a. In paragraph C consider what interpretation of what the revocation of license means – do all states use “revoked” the same way? Is this different than “denied”
 - b. Should a license denial be considered an encumbrance

- c. Should paragraph C be moved to Rule 3.3? Agree can be moved
- d. Can/should the Commission terminate a compact privilege if proof of residence is not provided after requested during audit?