

Detailed Meeting Summary

Meeting Purpose

To review subgroup recommendations on pharmacy technician scope of practice, governance, and regulatory alignment, and to discuss next steps for refining proposals and gathering data for Board of Pharmacy consideration.

Detailed Summary of Discussions

Topic	Discussion	Actions
1. Adding a Pharmacy Technician to the Board of Pharmacy	<p>Presenter: Cassie Doyle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Current MN Board: 6 pharmacists, 3 public members; no technician representation.- 23 states already include technicians; NABP and PTCB support inclusion.- Benefits: operational insight, compliance, patient safety, equity in decision-making, modernization of governance.- Minimal cons identified; main concern: maintaining odd number of board members for voting.- Options discussed: add a seat vs. replace a public member seat.- Legislative change required; timing could align with upcoming term expirations (2026–2028).- Group agreed to recommend replacement rather than addition to avoid governance complexity.- Need to clarify which seat to replace and check	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Cassie to refine proposal and include recommendation on which seat to replace.- Michelle to gather national board composition data for comparison.- Cassie to check MN statutes for governance definitions.

	<p>statutory definitions for public vs. professional members.</p>	
<p>2. Aligning CE Reporting and Registration Dates</p>	<p>Presenter: Sharon Su.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current: CE reporting due July 31 (odd years); registration due Dec 31 (annually). Creates redundancy and compliance challenges. - Proposed alignment to reduce burden and improve efficiency. Suggested dates: May 31 (align with Wisconsin) or Oct 31. - Pros: streamlined process, improved compliance, operational efficiency. - Cons: potential administrative burden for Board; impact on fiscal year; possible overlap with pharmacist CE deadlines. - Discussion: NABP CE Monitor integration could reduce burden; Board currently exploring this. Some concern about December being problematic for employers and technicians. - Board perspective: Combining CE and renewal may require system changes and could increase burden unless CE Monitor integration is complete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sharon to revise proposal considering Board's operational constraints and fiscal year.
<p>3. Technician Duties – Medication Histories & Broader Role Expansion</p>	<p>Presenter: Kimball Blake.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current MN rule prohibits technicians from performing tasks requiring professional judgment; Board previously ruled med histories fall under this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kimball to add literature summary and national comparisons to proposal. - Include training and policy requirements in recommendation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal 1: Reinterpret rule to allow technicians to collect med histories under pharmacist review. - Proposal 2: Broader statutory change to allow technicians to perform any task delegated by a pharmacist, except explicitly prohibited tasks. - Pros: improves efficiency, supports pharmacist clinical roles, aligns with other states. - Cons: requires legislative change; interpretation risk; need for clear training and documentation standards. - Discussion: Literature supports safety of tech-collected med histories; NABP model language favors delegation flexibility. Group emphasized including training requirements and data-driven safety evidence. 	
<p>4. Technician Duties – Accepting New Verbal Prescriptions & Transfers</p>	<p>Presenter: Alyssa Freund.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current MN law prohibits technicians from accepting new verbal prescriptions. - Proposal: Allow pharmacists to delegate this task to trained technicians, similar to Wisconsin’s model. - Rationale: Reduce pharmacist interruptions, improve workflow, allow pharmacists to focus on clinical care. - Pros: efficiency, consistency across state lines, supports pharmacist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alyssa to refine proposal using Wisconsin language and include delegation safeguards. - Cassie to share research articles on safety of technician order entry and delegation.

	<p>clinical roles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cons: risk of transcription errors, variability in technician competency, need for clear delegation and training standards. - Discussion: 94% of prescriptions are e-prescribed, so impact may be limited but still relevant for dental/eye offices. <p>Concerns about clarifications requiring clinical judgment—must remain pharmacist responsibility. Group agreed language should remain broad to allow flexibility.</p>	
<p>5. Technician-to-Pharmacist Ratios</p>	<p>Presenters: Roseann Hines & Robin Hammer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current MN: 1:3 (statute) or 1:2 (rule); certified techs allow +1. - NABP recommends flexibility; 24 states have no ratio. - MPA previously proposed eliminating ratios; Board rejected but open to increasing ratio (e.g., 6:1). - Discussion: Should ratio apply to all techs or only those in dispensing roles? How to handle non-dispensing settings? Risks: Too much flexibility could compromise safety; too rigid could harm operations. - NABP Model Act language: “Pharmacist in charge shall ensure sufficient staff to safely provide services” with site-specific policies and training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ratio subgroup to draft poll to gauge group preferences (eliminate ratio, increase ratio, adopt flexible language). - Michelle to include NABP language and national comparisons in next discussion.

	- Group concerns: impact on pharmacist staffing, complexity of defining roles, risk of unsafe staffing if left entirely to discretion.	
--	--	--

Action Items (Prioritized)

Task	Responsible Parties	Deadline
Gather national board composition data for technician representation	Michelle	Before next meeting
Refine proposal on adding technician to board (include seat replacement recommendation)	Cassie	Before next meeting
Revise CE alignment proposal considering board feedback	Sharon	Before next meeting
Add safety data and literature to medication history proposal	Kimball	Before next meeting
Refine delegation proposal for verbal prescriptions & transfers; include supporting data	Alyssa Freund	Before next meeting
Share research articles on delegation safety	Cassie	Before next meeting
Draft and distribute poll on technician-to-pharmacist ratios	Ratio Subgroup (Roseann, Robin, Michelle)	Within 1 week
Schedule next large group meeting	Mike	ASAP

Next Steps

- Distribute updated proposals and supporting data before next meeting.
- Complete subgroup revisions and submit updated templates.
- Conduct ratio poll and review results in next session.
- Prepare for continued discussion on technician duties and governance changes.