

DDH Dentist and Dental Hygienist Compact

DDH Compact Rules Committee Minutes

November 20th at 2pm ET

Register for Zoom: https://csg-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_7CAw4JUORNqx76nfZfiWTg

Public Participation: To request the opportunity to submit written or oral public comment, please contact dentalcompact@csg.org with the subject line "Public Comment Request" at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Please identify which agenda item you are requesting to comment on.

State	Name	Attendance
Minnesota	Bridgett Anderson – Rules Chair	x
Ohio	Corey Schaal	x
Virginia	Jamie Sacksteder	x
Washington	Catharine Roner-Reiter	x
Wisconsin	Dr. Matthew Bistan	x

- Samantha Nance (legal counsel), Kaitlyn Bison (CSG) and Imani Smith (CSG) were present for the meeting.

2:00p.m. ET

Welcome and Call to Order

- Meeting called to order 2:03pm EST.

Roll Call

- Imani Smith took the roll.

Adoption of Agenda*

- Corey Schaal moved to adopt the agenda, Sacksteder seconded. Voted passed.

Approve Meeting

Minutes*

- Roner-Reiter pointed out incorrect comments recorded regarding examinations and Washington state requirements.

- Roner-Reiter moved to adopt minutes with changes, Sacksteder seconds. Vote passes.

2:10pm ET

Clinical Assessment Continued Discussion
Review Draft

- Anderson presents the topic.
- Schaal points out to Nance, reference for Clinical Assessment being changed to “2D”. And exam route for hands-on and OSCE requirements. Inquires about ordering for numbering for rules.
 - Nance answers the 2D would need to be 1.2 due to rule adoption. Notes interpretive language and phraseology – asks if there is an “and/or” distinction regarding the OSCE.
 - Anderson notes the language intention is for “and”.
 - Nance notes the limitations placed on OSCE question, as seen in case of Washington state.
 - Bistan iterates emphasis language correction to rule to allow for pathways to allow hands-skill in tandem with DLOSCE or residency pathways.
 - Nance iterates statue definition including “examination or process” for framework in allowance of rule.
 - Schaal notes his interpretation limiting hands skills but allowing for residencies/PGY1s. Need for further definition of “examination”.
 - Sacksteder notes individualized processes amongst states. Example of limitations in Virginia’s requirements regarding the DLOSCE.
 - Anderson notes feedback from newer compact states regarding intake and communication regarding exam requirements and sovereignty. Notes presentation to states allows for that and desire to resolve issue.
 - Roner-Reiter notes for Washington that DLOSCE would be allowed as a pathway. Inquires if Washington would be isolated in not having access to DLOSCE pathway.
 - Nance agrees with concern. Notes consistencies in consideration for the rule and its future signatory impacts. Reiterates previously given opinion, unsure if it would develop into Washington’s unparticipation.
 - Schaal notes Nance’s concern over the rule limiting Washington’s participation.
 - Nance notes that they would satisfy the requirements in one version, and nuance of requirements as mandatory for clinical assessment’s amongst Washington’s individual allowances versus the compact requirements.
 - Sacksteder notes letter from yesterday regarding ADA’s involvement with ADeX. Notes that she believes the conversation may become moot and confusion regarding limits.
 - Anderson notes that it is uncommon for a state to require only the DLOSCE and that rule does not shut any prospectives out. Provides example with Ontario DLOSCE and pathways.
 - Schaal inquires to legal counsel a question on potential provision in 3B for unrestricted licenses. Also asks about using OSCE as an alternative

pathways.

- Nance provides analysis on “catchall’s”, and “a state must require for licensure” in 3A. Notes all states accept a hands skills pathway.
- Anderson asks Nance to research further and present next month.
- Nance agrees she will communicate opinion
- Schaal asks about hands skills amendable requirement in Washington state.
 - Roner-Reiter notes is undetermined but would be advocated around.
 - Anderson asks about when requirement was set.
 - Roner-Reiter notes she will inquire and report back. Reads the (current) 1.1 section.

2:35 p.m.ET

Background Checks Continued Discussion

Review Draft

- Anderson introduces the topic.
- Schaal notes this section would be Chapter 3, and a change to section 1.1. Previous 6-10 year window regarding Background checks.
- Asks question of legal counsel regarding “mutuality”. Whether there is a federal requirement per completion of background check.
- Nance points out that “mutuality” is mostly common law, flexible regarding timelines. Endorses the approach, wants for allowance of time/allowance. Notes state withdrawal matter. Iterates conversation in tandem with data system considerations and privilege issuance system.
- Sacksteder notes the parameters or standard of licensure denials across states.
- Schaal notes the requirements of section 3.5 regarding criminal background check from FBI and state’s criminal data center. Notes those with licenses who haven’t had background checks.
- Sacksteder notes standards differing across states.
- Schaal notes inter-state reliance on differing state’s standards and not enforcing standard per state-by-state requirements.
 - Sacksteder notes that differing standard’s are not conducive.
- Nance notes that compacts typically allow states to retain their own standards per sovereignty and inter-state relations.
- Sacksteder notes that instead of “new” should be changed to “all” licensees in section 1.1. And confusion on language and intent on acceptance of licenses.
 - Schaal notes the background check issue in Virginia/Maine. Allowing for action for new compact privilege licensees. Notes need for grandfathering in

those not having had background checks.

- Anderson agrees on rule for timeline.
- Roner-Reiter notes issue in Maine regarding distinction between licensee applicants for compact or regular. Suggests matter be placed in section 1.3.

2:45 p.m.ET

Delegate Comment/Questions

- Kaitlyn Bison (no commissioner) notes scheduling/availability for December meeting.
- Anderson iterates mid-December meeting.

Public Comment/Question

- None submitted.

3:00 p.m.

Adjourn

- Anderson entertains motion to adjourn. Schaal seconds.

** Indicates agenda item requires Commission vote.*