



## **MN Board of Pharmacy Advisory Task Force on Technician Duties and Scope of Practice – Ratio and Supervision Small Group**

**10/2/2024**

### **Meeting Purpose:**

To discuss potential changes to Minnesota’s pharmacy technician-to-pharmacist ratio regulations, evaluate associated risks and opportunities, and outline next steps for recommendations to the Minnesota Board of Pharmacy.

### **Attendees:**

#### **Present:**

- ✓ Joshua Teeters-small group lead
- ✓ Roseann Hines
- ✓ Robin Hammer- small group lead alternate
- ✓ Michelle Aytay
- ✓ Mike Waldt
- ✓ Aaron Peterson

**Absent:** Deb Frazey

#### **Shared Site-**

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oef0M8CUIAAKJsYH66xD\\_9VvskstjcW3?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oef0M8CUIAAKJsYH66xD_9VvskstjcW3?usp=sharing)

#### **Charter**

---

## Summary of Discussions

Topic	Discussion	Actions
	<p>Current MN Statute 151.102 <a href="#">151.102 Pharmacy Technician</a></p> <p>Current MN Rule <a href="#">6800.3850 Pharmacy Technicians</a></p>	
<b>Current Ratio &amp; Flexibility</b>	<p>Current MN statute (3:1 +1 certified) and rule (2:1)</p> <p>Committee members agree these may not reflect modern practice needs and that flexibility and expansion is necessary to accommodate diverse practice settings.</p>	<p>Gather/discuss historical context and national ratio data for comparison.</p>
<b>National Landscape &amp; Stakeholder Input</b>	<p>24 states have no ratio; MPA previously proposed eliminating ratios, then recommended 1:6 compromise to MN BOP. MPhA and NACDs supports elimination of ratios. MN BOP previously expressed concerns regarding full elimination but may consider expansion.</p>	<p>Share MPA history and proposed revisions with group.</p>
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<p>Risks of increasing vs. maintaining current ratio discussed. Concerns include patient safety, workflow strain, and staffing shortages. Need to identify risks objectively for decision-making.</p>	<p>Develop risk matrix for “stay vs. change” scenarios; create shared doc for risk analysis.</p>
<b>Definitions &amp; Scope</b>	<p>Debate on whether ratios should include clerks/support staff. Consensus: focus on technicians first; clerks out of scope for now.</p>	<p>Clarify technician definition and scope for recommendations</p>
<b>Certification &amp; Tiering</b>	<p>Discussion on whether to require certification for higher ratios. Concern about complexity and unintended barriers.</p>	<p>Draft options for ratio language, including option for certification considerations.</p>

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Next Steps &amp; Polling</b>	Suggestion to poll larger group on ratio preferences (status quo, 1:6, no ratio) and create/rank perceived risks.	Create poll questions and shared doc for risks.

---

<b>Task</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Develop poll for larger group (ratio options + risk ranking)	Mike/Michelle	
Review/Clarify/Define Technician Definition and Scope	All	Ongoing
Upload MPA proposed revisions and related docs	Robin	Before 10/8 meeting
Compile and share historical context & national data – update template	All	Before 10/8 meeting

### **Next Steps**

- Prepare ratio options (status quo, 1:6, no ratio) and risk assessment summary utilizing template for larger group discussion.
- Conduct polling to gauge broader group preferences and risk priorities.

### **Upcoming Meetings:**

- 10/8 10:30am-12:30pm Full Advisory Task Force Meeting
- 10/16 2pm-3pm Committee on Ratio and Supervision (reoccurs every other Thursday on week opposite of full group meeting)
- 10/22 10am MN Board of Pharmacy Meeting – may attend virtually or in person.
- 10/30 2pm-3pm Committee on Ratio and Supervision (reoccurs every other Thursday on week opposite of full group meeting)

