

DDH Dentist and Dental Hygienist Compact

DDH Compact Executive Committee
August 4th, 2025, 1:00 p.m. ET

Register for Zoom: https://csg-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_31_hwGCFQGumUhG5HbQPLw

State	Name	Voting Member	Attendance
Wisconsin	Dr. Matthew Bistan	X	X
Minnesota	Bridgett Anderson	X	X
Virginia	Jamie Sacksteder	X	X
Ohio	Corey Schaal	X	X

1:02 p.m. ET

Call to Order

Abigail Mortell (CSG) calls roll. Committee has quorum.
Jay Philips filling in for Samantha Nance.

Adoption of Agenda*

- Corey Schaal motions to adopt the agenda.
- Jamie Sacksteder seconds the motion.
- Motion passes unanimously; agenda is adopted.

Approve July 7 Meeting Minutes*

- Bridgett Anderson motions to adopt the July 7 meeting minutes.
- Corey Schaal seconds the motion.
- Motion passes unanimously; July 7 meeting minutes are adopted.

Approve June 2 Meeting Minutes*

- Chair Bistan motions to adopt the June 2 meeting minutes.
- Jamie Sacksteder seconds motion.
- Motion passes unanimously; June 2 meeting minutes are adopted.

1:10 p.m.

Committee Reports

Rules Committee Update – B. Anderson

- CSG provided a Share Act Update.
- The committee discussed criminal background checks and how compact participation is affected for states that do not require them.
 - J. Sacksteder: Virginia has never done background checks. The way the current law is written indicates Virginia cannot come into compliance because the background check needs to be done at initial licensure,

DDH Dentist and Dental Hygienist Compact

which none of the current licensees will have done. Officials are continuing to work on the matter to see how compliance could be met.

- C. Schaal: Notes a point of interest in the discussion was the idea that while Virginians cannot participate in the compact until the lack of background checks is resolved, people in other member states could apply for privileges to practice in Virginia.
- Next meeting agenda: Continue clinical assessment discussion after committee has conducted additional research into the matter.

1:18 p.m.

Approve Draft RFP Language*

- Isabel Eliassen introduces herself to the committee as the project manager for CompactConnect and is available to answer any questions regarding data system development.
- Chair opens the floor for questions and comments on the latest draft RFP.
- 6.2 Instructions for Proposals – Interviews
 - J. Sacksteder, question: Regarding the sentence, “Offerors will NOT be able to use or present any slides, graphs, charts, or other written presentation materials, including hand-outs.” This seems unusual based on previous experience going through an RFP process, what is the reasoning behind this specification?
 - J. Philips contacts S. Nance about this item and will report to the committee when he receives a response.
 - The committee moves on to other questions in the meantime.
- 3.0 Objectives
 - B. Anderson: Under 3.1, “State Licensing Professional/Practitioner” user stories, it was added that, “As a privilege applicant, I want to be able to look up scope of practice laws in other states so that I know what each state privilege allows.” Why would this information need to be incorporated into a data system when it is available elsewhere?
 - Chair Bistan: Idea was to provide information on what aspects of scope of practice differ between states.
 - C. Schaal: During the last meeting’s discussion it was thought that the scope of practice for different member states would be referenced or linked so practitioners could easily access them, but the format would not be overly interactive. The idea is to imbed states’ existing resources on scope of practice within the data system.
- 4.0 Contract Place of Performance & Contract Type and 6.2 Instructions for Proposals – Price Submissions
 - C. Schaal: Are there any potential problems with releasing an RFP without a budget included?

DDH Dentist and Dental Hygienist Compact

- I. Eliassen: The first time the RFP was ever used there was a relatively low budget, so the committee wanted to avoid receiving submissions outside of their budget. The Social Work Commission sent out an RFP without a budget, and they received one submission that was ultimately outside their budget. It is totally possible to send out the RFP without an included budget, but the committee may receive RFPs with a wide range in terms of cost.
- C. Schaal: Has no issue with sending out the RFP without a budget and turning down offers that are outside of the budget.
- Chair Bistan agrees.
- C. Schaal: What is the timeline for CompactConnect to be up and running?
- I. Eliassen: We are still planning that the build of the compact data system will be complete by the end of September 2025. Additional features may continue to be built out and enhanced, but the core functions will be active by that time. The main issue right now is that significant effort is required to onboard states into the system, so it is unclear how many states will be actively utilizing and contributing to the data system soon after it is operational. Some states are in the midst of their own data system changes on the state level and do not want to begin onboarding CompactConnect until their migrations are complete.
- 6.2 Instructions for Proposals – Interviews, returning to J. Sacksteder’s question above
 - J. Philips (on behalf of S. Nance): The intention of preventing offerors from using presentation materials was to defer to the technical submissions rather than the aesthetics of a more grandiose solution or bid. It is within the scope of the committee to discuss changing this aspect and allowing offerors to utilize presentation materials. This language was a holdover from the source draft, so the origin of it is not completely clear. Given the structure of this RFP, the submission is assumed to be in written form rather than a presentation.
 - Chair requests that the paragraph be read aloud for those in the meeting not able to view the document on the screen.
 - A. Mortell reads the paragraph including the line “Offerors will NOT be able to use or present any slides...”
 - J. Philips: As this is currently structured, the commission may invite presentation materials to be used after the technical submission is made. After receiving submissions in response to the RFP and extending invitations to interview, the commission may ask them to provide visual materials during their presentations.
 - J. Sacksteder: It appears this would be during the interview process, so it would be unusual that the offerors would not be allowed to utilize presentation materials.
 - C. Schaal: Suggests removing the sentence about not being permitted to use presentation materials.
 - B. Anderson agrees.
 - Chair Bistan: That sentence will be struck and the subsequent sentence maintained.

- Chair calls for a motion to approve draft RFP language
 - B. Anderson motions to adopt the draft RFP language with deletion.
 - C. Schaal seconds motion.
 - Motion passes unanimously; draft RFP language is adopted with deletion.

1:33 p.m.

Delegate Comments and Questions

- B. Anderson: Will the RFP be issued for eight weeks, according to Dan Logsdon's suggestion?
- D. Logsdon: Yes, eight weeks is recommended.
- I. Eliassen: Yes, four weeks is usually too short, and three months is too long, somewhere in the middle is advisable.
- B. Anderson agrees with the eight-week suggestion.
- C. Schaal agrees with the eight-week suggestion.
- Chair Bistan agrees with the eight-week suggestion.
- D. Logsdon: The Social Work Commission had some late submissions that they permitted, so it is possible for the commission to extend the deadline by a few days if needed.

1:36 p.m.

Public Comment and Questions

- No comments or questions.

1:39 p.m.

Adjourn

- C. Schaal motions for adjournment.
- B. Anderson seconds.
- Motion passes unanimously; meeting adjourns at 1:39 p.m. ET.

* Indicates agenda item requires Commission vote