

Social Work Licensure Compact Commission

Inaugural Meeting Agenda

September 17th, 2024: 10am ET – 3pm ET

Zoom: https://csg-org.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZYvdeqtrzkrHt1_qNWwyfVCqaRb0BVxxdAn

I. Attendees

a. Delegates Present:

- i. Alabama- Rachel Dickinson
- ii. Arizona-Tobi Zavala
- iii. Colorado-Reina Sbarbaro-Gordon
- iv. Connecticut-Chris Andresen
- v. Georgia- Deborah Sills
- vi. Iowa-Tony Alden
- vii. Kansas-David Fye
- viii. Louisiana-Hyacinth Mckee
- ix. Kentucky-Hank Cecil
- x. Maine-Angela Fileccia
- xi. Minnesota-Youa Yang
- xii. Missouri-Justin Bennett
- xiii. New Hampshire-Bethany Cottrell
- xiv. Nebraska-Sean Loving
- xv. Ohio-Kevin Fowler
- xvi. Rhode Island- Laura Mello
- xvii. South Dakota- Kelli Willis
- xviii. Tennessee-Tara Watson
- xix. Utah- Jana Johansen
- xx. Vermont-Noura Eltabbakh
- xxi. Virginia-Jaime Hoyle
- xxii. Washington-Lana Crawford

b. Interim Chair Present:

- i. Laura Groshong, CSWA

c. Interim Legal Counsel:

- i. Samantha Nance, EMWN

d. Interim Staff Present:

- i. Matt Shafer, CSG
- ii. Dan Logsdon, CSG
- iii. Kaitlyn Bison, CSG

II. Welcome and Introductions of Interim Staff

- a. **Interim Staff:** M. Shafer outlined housekeeping and introduced interim staff, including Dan Logsdon, Kaitlyn Bison, and Samantha Nance.
- b. **CSG's Role:** M. Shafer detailed CSG's involvement and role with DDH compact.

III. Call to Order

- a. L. Groshong calls on delegates by state alphabetical order to introduce themselves and elaborate on their role on the board.
- b. *Agenda Review:* M. Shafer reviewed and asked for questions about the agenda (none received).

IV. Legislative Update/Legal Opinion on Legislative Deviations

- a. K. Bison describes the legislative review process and affirms that no material deviations were enacted.
- b. K. Bison provided an update on state enactments and pending bills. No material deviations reported.
- c. S. Nance explains non-material changes and requests delegates to flag any potential amendments to compact legislation in their states.
- d. S. Nance invites questions from delegates.
 - i. H. Cecil- KY asks if CSG will continue to monitor and M. Shafer explains the timeline of CSG's role with the commission.

V. Discussion of Data System

- a. L. Groshong calls on Isabel Eliassen to present update on Compact Connect
- b. I. Eliassen invites questions.
 - i. A. Fileccia-ME asks how the data system will be chosen.
 - ii. J. Bennet-MO asks if there is an anticipated launch date.
 - iii. I. Eliassen addresses all of the questions stating that the executive committee will choose the vendor, and there is not an anticipated launch date as of yet.

VI. Review Commission Governance Structure

- a. L. Groshong hands over to S. Nance to review the commission governance structure.
- b. S. Nance provides an overview of the governance structure, including the delegates' responsibilities.
- c. S. Nance invites questions (none received).

VII. Discussion of Compact Commission By-Laws

- a. S. Nance reviewed the draft by-laws and governance structure and expected roles.
- b. S. Nance continues with an overview of the by-laws and rulemaking within the confines of the compact language.
- c. S. Nance discusses item in blue of optional provision of Past Chair that would be filled at officer level – merely option and provides for governance continuity.

- d. S. Nance points to meeting requirements that mirror the compact language.
- e. S. Nance overviews public notice of meetings, and the ability of the commission to establish appropriate committees (ex. Finance committees, etc.)
- f. S. Nance asks for any delegate questions (none received).

VIII. Discussion of Rule on Rulemaking

- a. S. Nance discussed rulemaking processes and common misconceptions.
- b. S. Nance recommend this rule to be adopted quickly to allow for future rules to be made.
- c. S. Nance asks for questions from delegates.
- d. T. Watson -TN asks what the threshold will be for public comments.
- e. S. Nance gives examples of other commission thresholds, but it will be up to the commission to decide.
- f. L. Mello-RI comments about how a number threshold may not be appropriate as very few comments are usually received.
- g. S. Nance mentions that that is useful and could set the threshold very low to adjust.

IX. Discussion of Leadership Nominations

- a. L. Groshing calls on M. Shafer to discuss available leadership roles and future procedures for voting and nomination.
- b. M. Shafer explains further leadership positions for executive committees.
- c. M. Shafer asks for questions from delegates.
 - i. A. Muhammad- OH, asks if alternates can be on committees.
 - ii. S. Nance mentions that elections are for individuals, may need to flip delegate and alternate for operations purposes.
 - iii. H. Cecil-KY asks if that can be included in the by-laws.
 - iv. S. Nance mentions that it could be clarified further in the bylaws and state outright.

X. Lunch

XI. Discussion of Commission Finances and Staff Hiring

- a. L. Groshing calls on M Shafer to discuss commission finances.
- b. M. Shafer emphasized the commission's unique opportunity to utilize existing data systems and discussed funding, staffing, and secretariat roles.
- c. CSG is contracted with ASWB until the end of 2025, with staffing decisions to be made later.
- d. Jennifer Henkel is called on to provide information on ASWB's HRSA grant, which provides \$150,000 annually until 2029 for commission development and support.
- e. L. Mello-RI inquired about grant resources for states implementing the compact, and J. Henkel confirmed that similar support could be offered.

XII. Discussion of Future Rules for Consideration

- a. L. Groshong calls on M. Shafer to discuss potential rule introductions.
- b. M. Shafer proposed future rules regarding definitions and administrative issues.
- c. The qualifying national exam definition will be broad, allowing the commission to specify the ASWB exam.
- d. S. Nance emphasized that this flexibility is common across professions and welcomes questions from delegates.
 - i. L. Mello-RI asked if RI licensees could take the compact exam if the exam is suspended.
 - ii. J. Bennett-MO inquired about changes to state language if alternative pathways are identified.
 1. S. Nance indicated that changes could be necessary depending on the commission's decisions.
 - iii. L. Mello-RI questioned whether "substantial equivalency" supports alternative pathways.
 1. S. Nance agreed that it does allow for such pathways.
 - iv. R. Dickinson-AL asked if a state could deny applicants wanting to take the exam first.
 1. M. Shafer clarified that adopting substantial equivalency would not give grounds for denial.
- e. M. Shafer mentions the aim to establish the ASWB exam as the national qualifying exam, with future discussions on alternative pathways.
- f. M. Shafer will introduce potential rules for adoption at the next meeting, focusing on the qualifying exam, interstate compact authority, and administrative issues.
- g. S. Nance explained the broad language in the rules for flexibility.
- h. L. Mello- RI expressed concern that the exam requirement may exclude licensees from compact privileges.
- i. C. Andresen-CT raised concerns about disparities in ASWB exam pass rates.
- j. R. Dickinson-AL stated that they would not accept licensees without exam completion, even outside the compact.
- k. L. Mello-RI highlighted bias against certain demographics in the exam results.
- l. M. Shafer discussed the need for consistent language regarding supervised practice equivalency.
- m. C. Andresen-CT mentioned issues faced in professional alliance or alternative disciplinary programs.
 - i. S. Nance confirmed that states are not prohibited from using such programs.
- n. J. Bennett-MO requested information on fee structures for compact licenses to ensure accessibility.
 - i. M. Shafer explained that fees are set by the state, with an example being a nominal fee of \$45 for the PT compact.

XIII. Ex Officio Organization Selection

- a. Summary:
 - i. Various organizations were proposed for selection, and a motion was made to establish a rotating seat among the ex-officio members. After some discussion and clarifications, the motion to create a rotational seat passed with majority support.
 - ii. Concerns were raised about including organizations not present for discussion, but the decision was made to send invitations to gauge interest in filling the rotating seat.
- b. L. Groshong calls on M. Shafer to discuss the memo and compact language and calls on Samantha to explain the role of ex-officio members.
 - i. Up to four national social work associations will be selected.
- c. Establishing a rotating seat:
 - i. J. Bennett-MO asked if the fourth ex-officio seat could be a rotating member, which S. Nance said is open for discussion.
 - ii. Hank Cecil suggested considering various organizations:
 1. Council on Social Work Education
 2. National Association of Black Social Workers
 3. Social Welfare Action Alliance
 4. Case Management Society of America
 - iii. A. Fileccia-ME supported the inclusion of the Council on Social Work Education.
- d. M. Shafer called on representatives from four national organizations to introduce themselves and clarified that the organizations must be nationally recognized.
- e. J. Bennett called for a motion to establish a rotating seat, seconded by Deborah Sills.
 - i. Tony Alden sought clarification on which organization was being discussed.
 - ii. Hank Cecil proposed splitting the motion to consider NABSW separately and make it a rotating seat, which J. Bennett seconded.
 - iii. H. McKee raised a question about how the rotation would be decided.
- f. Tony Alden moved to approve a rotating seat for niche organizations to be decided later, and the motion passed with 19 yes votes, 1 no vote and 1 abstaining.
- g. The amended motion included a rotational vote for the list including CASW.
 - i. T. Zavala – AZ expressed concern about including organizations not previously contacted.
- h. A motion to designate one seat as rotational was made.
 - i. J. Johansen - UT inquired about the rotation process, questioning who would determine it.
 - ii. S. Nance indicated they are working on a framework.
 - iii. J. Bennett - MO confirmed with S. Nance that ex-officio members would participate in larger commission and executive meetings.
 - iv. D. Sills - GA questioned the selection process for organizations.

- v. H. McKee - LA mentioned sending formal invitations to other organizations.
- i. A voice vote passed the motion to establish a rotating chair among the four seats.
 - i. J. Bennett - MO suggested reaching out to other organizations of interest.
 - ii. S. Nance clarified the need for a formal invitation outlining responsibilities for the rotating seat, which was seconded by H. Cecil and Kelli S.
 - iii. H. McKee-LA proposed using a list of organizations from the ASWB coalition as a starting point.
- j. A voice vote to send invitations passed.
 - i. H. Cecil - KY identified ASWB, NASW, and CSWA as three spots for representation.
 - ii. D. Sills - GA mentioned viewing CSWE as more of an accrediting body, while B. Cottrell suggested tabling the motion until invitations were sent.
- k. J. Johansen-UT seconded the motion to table.
 - i. T. Alden - IA raised concerns about notifying organizations not present at the meeting.
 - ii. T. Zavala - AZ noted that only the four invited organizations were involved in discussions.
 - iii. R. Dickinson - AL supported starting with the initial four organizations.
 - iv. J. Bennett - MO emphasized that these organizations represent the profession and its clients.
- l. The motion to table the decision on the three organizations as ex-officio seats passed with 20 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 abstaining.
- m. S. Nance indicated that the executive committee would not be formed yet.
- n. There will be one rotating seat, and CSG will reach out to gauge interest in filling that position.
- o. L. Groshong asked if ex-officio members could join committees.
 - i. S. Nance stated that committees are formed by the commission, and it depends on specific needs and mandates, as there might arise a need for a committee with ex-officio members.
- p. T. Alden – IA highlighted the need for in-person engagement in discussions for the next meeting.

XIV. Questions from Delegates/Public Comment from Non-Delegate Attendees

- a. Laura asked for questions from delegates (none received).
- b. She invited members of the public to raise their hands or submit questions/comments in the chat, explaining the expected nature of public comments.
 - i. Dana Paglia from Michigan discussed pursuing exam alternatives and emphasized that NASW Michigan is fully engaged. She encouraged the commission to consider the importance of these initiatives.

- ii. Dr. Jasmine Smith from NASW California noted the absence of their organization in the licensure process. She supported including additional organizations in future discussions and stressed the need for equitable policies regarding the ASWB exam and alternative processes.
- iii. Pilar Binilla, a public social worker, expressed concern about the legal implications of ASWB's significant role in funding and committee membership, highlighting potential conflicts of interest and the importance of inclusivity.
- iv. Henry O'Keefe, a contract lobbyist and private attorney in Oregon representing NASW, shared his insights on proposed changes to the licensing board before they are enacted in Oregon, and requested assistance with meetings regarding deviations from compact language.

XV. Review Transition Plan and Next Steps

- a. L. Groshong calls on K. Bison to present overview of transition plan.
- b. K. Bison presents on timeline of commission set up, next steps, and wraps up meeting – asks about format of next meeting.
 - i. Overall preference from delegate for hybrid meeting

XVI. Adjourn

- a. L. Groshong calls for a voice vote to adjourn the meeting and the motion passes.