

Technician Scope and Duties Task Force – Large Group Meeting Summary

Date: November 20, 2025

Meeting notes:

- **Simplification and Consensus-Building Process for Recommendations:** Michelle Aytay, Rachel, and Aaron Patterson (HLB) led a discussion on streamlining the group's recommendations for the Board of Pharmacy, focusing on presenting clear, concise proposals and using a post-meeting poll to gauge consensus and gather feedback before public posting and board review.
 - **Streamlining Recommendations:** Michelle Aytay and Rachel explained the need to simplify the group's recommendations, moving from detailed, data-heavy drafts to concise statements that clearly outline each recommendation, its rationale, and supporting background, making it easier for stakeholders and the Board of Pharmacy to review and act upon.
 - **Consensus Polling Approach:** The group agreed to present recommendations during the meeting, allow for clarifying questions, and then send out a poll afterward to collect members' positions and comments, ensuring all voices are heard and areas of disagreement are identified for further discussion or mitigation.
 - **Public Posting and Stakeholder Feedback:** Aaron Patterson (HLB) emphasized the importance of making recommendations available to stakeholders and the public via the Board of Pharmacy website, with a system for submitting comments tied to specific numbered recommendations, enabling transparent feedback and tracking.
 - **Timeline and Next Steps:** The group discussed the upcoming holiday schedule and the need to finalize a set of recommendations for the December Board of Pharmacy meeting, with Michelle Aytay committing to send out a calendar invite and coordinate the poll.
- **Technician-to-Pharmacist Ratio Reform:** Roseann R Hines presented a recommendation to eliminate or increase the technician-to-pharmacist ratio, supported by national trends and literature, with group discussion focusing on current variance processes, statutory barriers, and the impact on workflow and training requirements.
 - **Recommendation and Rationale:** Roseann R Hines recommended eliminating or increasing the technician-to-pharmacist ratio to provide

greater flexibility in pharmacy staffing, citing national trends, literature showing no negative safety impact, and the need to adapt to evolving roles and technology.

- **Current Variance Process:** CPhT and Roseann discussed the current process for obtaining a variance to exceed the ratio, noting it is time-consuming and often requires board approval, which can be a barrier for rapidly growing pharmacies needing immediate staffing adjustments.
- **Statutory and Regulatory Barriers:** Aaron Patterson (HLB) clarified that the ratio is set in statute, making variances difficult, and explained that only certain non-dispensing roles are exempt from the ratio, with limited precedents for exceptions such as call center scenarios.
- **Training and Supervision Concerns:** The group discussed the potential burden on employers to ensure adequate training and supervision if ratios are expanded, as well as the need for clear delineation of roles and ongoing competency assessments to maintain safety and quality.
- **National Landscape and Trends:** Roseann provided a visual overview of state-by-state ratio policies, highlighting that nearly half of states have no ratio or a high ratio, and that recent changes have trended toward increasing flexibility rather than imposing stricter limits.
- **Expansion of Technician Roles: Medication Histories, Transfers, and New Orders:** Kimball, Alyssa, and Mike presented recommendations to expand technician responsibilities to include medication histories, non-controlled prescription transfers, and accepting new verbal orders, with group discussion addressing regulatory language, training, and alignment with other states.
 - **Technicians Gathering Medication Histories:** Kimball recommended revisiting the rule prohibiting technicians from gathering medication histories in acute and institutional settings, citing supporting statutes, recent ISMP guidance, and evidence from other states, with discussion on the board's previous interpretation regarding professional judgment and the need for new training protocols.
 - **Technician-Facilitated Prescription Transfers:** Alyssa proposed allowing technicians to accept and provide non-controlled prescription transfers using electronic or fax systems, aligning with federal regulations and practices in other states, and discussed the need for clear policies, training, and consideration of legal differences between states.

- **Technicians Accepting New Verbal Orders:** Mike summarized a recommendation (originating from Alyssa) to permit pharmacists to delegate the acceptance of new verbal orders to technicians, with group input on terminology (verbal vs. phone vs. new orders), applicability across care settings, and the importance of flexible, non-prescriptive language to accommodate institutional policies.
- **Technician Trainee Registration and Workforce Development:** Wade introduced a proposal to create a pharmacy technician trainee registration for individuals aged 16 and up, aiming to improve workforce recruitment and clarify technician qualifications, with group support and discussion on administrative considerations and fee structures.
 - **Trainee Registration Structure:** Wade outlined a two-tier system: technician trainees (age 16+, high school enrolled or graduated, renewable for two years) and full technicians (age 18+, high school graduate, 240 hours of experience or reciprocity, and board certification), designed to facilitate early entry into the pharmacy workforce.
 - **Recruitment and Career Pathways:** Roseann R Hines and Alyssa supported the proposal, noting that earlier exposure to pharmacy work can influence career decisions and help address recruitment challenges, with comparisons to similar pathways in medical assistant programs.
 - **Administrative and Fee Considerations:** Kimball raised the issue of registration fees for trainees, suggesting a lower cost than full technician registration to reduce barriers for younger entrants, with Wade agreeing that a reduced fee would be appropriate.
- **Technician Representation on the Board of Pharmacy:** Cassie Doyle presented a recommendation to add a pharmacy technician member to the Board of Pharmacy, replacing a public member, to enhance operational insight and workforce representation, with group consensus on its value and minimal discussion of potential drawbacks.
 - **Rationale and Benefits:** Cassie Doyle explained that technician representation would provide frontline operational insight, support workforce development, and ensure regulatory decisions reflect real-world challenges, aligning with practices in several other states.

- **Potential Drawbacks:** The main con identified was the perception of reducing public representation on the board, but the group generally agreed the benefits outweighed this concern.
- **Technician Product Verification (TPV) and Tech-Check-Tech Expansion:** Samantha recommended adopting Technician Product Verification (TPV) statewide, supported by national data and existing institutional practices, with group debate on whether to propose a pilot program or a full implementation and consensus to make a strong recommendation for adoption.
 - **Recommendation and Evidence:** Samantha advocated for TPV, citing studies showing no negative impact on patient safety, the creation of technician career paths, and alignment with national trends, with Rachel and Roseann R Hines noting that many institutions already use similar models and have robust supporting data.
 - **Implementation Approach:** The group discussed whether to recommend a pilot program or full adoption, with consensus (led by Roseann and Cassie) to make a strong, unqualified recommendation for TPV, leaving implementation details to the board and emphasizing the need to avoid overly cautious, incremental steps.
 - **Perceived Challenges:** Potential challenges identified included the time required for statutory and rule changes, and the perception (not supported by data) that TPV may be less safe, which the group agreed should be addressed through education and reference to existing evidence.
- **Registration Portability for Pharmacy Technicians:** Mike presented a proposal to allow technicians with recent experience and good standing in other states to transfer their registration to Minnesota, with group discussion on appropriate timeframes and the transferability of base training.
 - **Proposal Details and Rationale:** Mike explained that the proposal, modeled after Ohio and Florida, would allow technicians who have practiced for at least one year in the past five years in another state to register in Minnesota, aiming to address workforce shortages and leverage experienced technicians.
 - **Discussion on Timeframes and Training:** Kimball and Samantha discussed the pros and cons of different look-back periods (e.g., three vs. five years), with consensus that base training is generally transferable and advanced skills would require retraining regardless of the timeframe.

- **Alignment of Technician Registration and CE Reporting Deadlines:** Sharon proposed aligning the annual registration and continuing education (CE) reporting deadlines for technicians to reduce confusion and administrative burden, with group support and acknowledgment of the need for a transition plan and rule updates.
 - **Current Challenges and Proposal:** Sharon described the confusion caused by separate deadlines for registration and CE reporting, leading to compliance issues and extra reminders, and recommended aligning the two processes to streamline compliance and reduce administrative overhead.
 - **Transition and Implementation Considerations:** The group noted that updating rules and communicating changes widely would be necessary, but that the long-term benefits of clarity and improved compliance would outweigh the temporary challenges.
- **Defining Supervision Standards for Pharmacy Technicians:** Michelle Aytay and Rachel introduced a recommendation to simplify the definition of technician supervision, favoring a standard-of-care approach over prescriptive rules, with input from Josh on updating language to accommodate remote supervision.
 - **Standard-of-Care Approach:** Michelle Aytay and Rachel advocated for a flexible definition of supervision, stating that a licensed pharmacist should be responsible for technician actions without specifying direct or indirect supervision, to accommodate diverse practice environments and remote work.
 - **Remote Supervision and Language Updates:** Josh suggested removing or updating the 'pharmacist on duty' clause to reflect the increasing use of remote technology for supervision, with Rachel agreeing this would make the recommendation more forward-thinking and adaptable.
- **Next Steps: Polling, Finalization, and Board Presentation:** Michelle Aytay, Mike, and the group outlined next steps, including distributing a consensus poll with comment options, finalizing documents for public and board review, and preparing for the December Board of Pharmacy meeting, with attention to prioritization and stakeholder engagement.
 - **Consensus Poll and Feedback Collection:** The group agreed to send out a poll after the meeting to collect votes and comments on each recommendation, with a text box for feedback, especially for dissenting opinions, to ensure all perspectives are captured before public posting.

- **Stakeholder Engagement and Prioritization:** The group discussed whether to prioritize or rank recommendations for the board, ultimately deciding to present all developed proposals and allow the board to determine prioritization, while ensuring the poll allows for nuanced feedback on complex or multi-option topics.
- **Scheduling and Follow-Up:** Michelle Aytay committed to sending out calendar invites for the December board meeting. Mike will schedule a follow-up group meeting, with the group agreeing to reconvene after the board meeting to discuss outcomes and next steps.

Follow-up tasks:

- **Consensus Poll Creation and Distribution:** Create and distribute a poll to gather consensus on the recommendations discussed, including options for feedback and comments, and share the results with the group and Aaron. (Michelle Aytay, Mike)
- **Board Meeting Calendar Invite:** Send a calendar invite to the group for the December Board of Pharmacy meeting and provide call-in information for those who wish to attend. (Michelle Aytay)