What will ASWB’s mobility implementation plan look like when it is rolled out at the 2017 Delegate Assembly? Members of the Mobility Task Force met in person in February to begin laying out the elements of the plan using an organizing infrastructure known as the collective impact model to guide their efforts.

Led by co-chair and ASWB President M. Jenise Comer of Missouri, task force members discussed whether the proposed plan for expediting the process of obtaining licenses in multiple jurisdictions was sufficient or if it needed to address license portability, which would enable licensees to practice electronically in multiple jurisdictions using their current license. The consensus was to proceed with the plan as proposed, noting that mobility was the first step along a continuum that will include portability for electronic practice in the future.

Task members next broke into teams to flesh out sections of the collective impact model by developing strategies and activities in three areas: common progress measures, mutually reinforcing activities, and communications.

“Millennials don’t have the geographic paradigm [of jurisdictional boundaries]. ...They challenge the way we think.”
—Mobility Task Force member Mark Hillenbrand, Iowa

Advancing the plan for mobility

Mobility Task Force members (from left): Joan Cloonan (ID), Carmen Collado (NY), co-chair M. Jenise Comer (MO), Lisa Crockwell (NL), Mark Hillenbrand (IA), Jim Akin (NASW-FL), Fran Franklin (DE), Florence Huffman (KY), Ellen Burkenemper (MO), and Harold Dean (AR). Not shown: Co-chair Dorinda Noble (TX) and Kim Madsen (CA).
Defining activities and strategies in these areas will help the Mobility Readiness Teams at the jurisdictional level in their outreach to legislators, practitioners, educators, the public, and other stakeholders. The task force also discussed the next steps for engaging the Mobility Readiness Teams and the anticipated time line.

The draft implementation plan will be shared first at ASWB’s 2017 Education Conference in Henderson, Nevada, in April, in order to get additional feedback from membership. The plan will be presented during the Board Member Exchange and the Administrators Forum and will include a demonstration of the prototype software that is being developed in support of the plan.

Members are encouraged to visit www.MovingSocialWork.org to get updates on the progress of the mobility initiative, find out what social workers are saying about their experiences getting licensed in multiple jurisdictions or transferring their license, and add their personal statement of support.

## Mobility Readiness Teams

During the Mobility Task Force report presented at the 2016 Annual Meeting of the Delegate Assembly, co-chairs Dorinda Noble of Texas and M. Jenise Comer of Missouri discussed how member boards could form and use Mobility Readiness Teams to disseminate information quickly to stakeholders in their jurisdictions. Based on a snowflake model of organization, Mobility Readiness Teams are designed to be led by the member board and include representation from practitioners (NASW chapter executive director or designee) and educators (a CSWE member or a faculty member from one of the local schools of social work). When members were surveyed during the presentation about their readiness to form a team, the majority surveyed indicated that they were ready but needed partners (45.6%). Members were assured that their efforts to form Mobility Readiness Teams would be supported.

---

### How do you imagine your jurisdiction developing a Mobility Readiness Team? (choose one)

1. We already created our MRT
2. Regulators, educators, and practitioners are positively connected and ready to commit to an MRT
3. I am ready, but I don’t have any partners
4. It’s too hot in my jurisdiction to create a snowflake and keep it from melting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.9% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>27.9% (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>45.6% (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>20.6% (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 68