OPEN MINUTES
Missouri Board of Pharmacy
Telephone Conference Call
October 31, 2011

The Missouri Board of Pharmacy met via telephone conference call in open session during the times and dates stated in the following minutes. Each item in the minutes is listed in the order it was discussed at the meeting. The meeting was called to order by President Pam Marshall at 11:02 a.m. on October 31, 2011. Members of the public and Board staff participated in the conference call in the Executive Conference Room at the Division of Professional Registration, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Board Members Present
Pam Marshall, R.Ph., President
Janine Burkett, R.Ph., Vice President
Barbara Bilek, R.Ph., Member
Melissa Graham, R.Ph., Member
James Riddle, R.Ph., Member

Board Members Absent
Anita Parran, Public Member

Staff Present
Kimberly Grinston, Executive Director
George McConnell, Inspector
Tammy Siebert, Executive I
Jason Menken, Compliance Coordinator

Others Present
Curtis Thompson, Legal Counsel
Steve Calloway, R.Ph., University of Missouri Hospital & Clinics
Marvin Feldman, University of Missouri
Bert McClary, R.Ph., Dept of Health and Senior Services
William McHugh, R.Ph., Mid-America Isotopes
Kacey Jetton, Walgreens Intern (participated from Pam Marshall's office)
Jennifer Copp, Walgreens Intern (participated from Pam Marshall's office)

#1 Pharmacy Technician Qualifications – The Board reviewed:

- 338.013 revisions
- 338.014 proposed language

Kim Grinston provided a verbal report regarding the revisions and proposed new language, and indicated that the Board had been granted extra time to submit its legislative proposal to the Governor's office, but a decision is needed today in order to include the proposal in the 2012 legislative session. Kim Grinston provided a report of

the technician working group's efforts and the result is what's before the Board today. The revisions to Section 338.013 are simply to add an additional classification of technicians; i.e., advanced pharmacy technician.
CONNIE CLARKSTON ENTERED THE MEETING ROOM AT 11:15 AM.

Discussion was held regarding the following:

James Riddle questioned what form of documentation would be required to report the 400 hours referenced in paragraph 6. Kim Grinston responded that it would likely be an affidavit from the pharmacist. Melissa Graham asked if this would be electronic or paper submissions. Kim Grinston replied it could be either, and reminded the Board that the affidavit is only for those techs being grandfathered to advanced technician registration classification.

James Riddle commented that many of the continuing education programs offered are free.

Melissa Graham inquired whether 10 hours of annual Board-approved training could be submitted instead of the 10 hours of CE required at renewal.

Jan Burkett inquired if the training expires if done consecutively. Kim reminded the Board that this is only for those being grandfathered.

Kim Grinston reported that a license fee to be determined by the Board would be required when technicians apply for an advanced pharmacy technician registration, and indicated there are standard costs associated with processing and issuing registrations.

Melissa Graham asked if techs would be required to apply for an advanced technician registration and then renew that registration the same year. Kim Grinston replied that they would not have to complete two processes; the office would issue an advanced technician registration with an expiration date extended to the next year.

Melissa Graham asked about timelines and when we could expect to have regulations in place after the statute is signed into law. Kim Grinston reported that 2014 is the earliest that the Board could get everything finalized, which is why 2014 is printed in paragraph 6.

Barbara Bilek asked if it takes 10 weeks (400 hours) to train a new technician in a retail pharmacy. Melissa Graham and Jim Riddle responded that sometimes it's necessary, but not usually. Barbara Bilek commented that it takes a little longer in a hospital setting.

Melissa Graham commented that the independent pharmacies she's spoken to are generally opposed to a certification only approach. Barbara Bilek asked if they are more likely to approve this 3-option approach. Ms. Graham commented that there's

concern about the added requirements for documentation and paperwork. Kim Grinston indicated that it will be up to the Board when creating the regulations to determine what is required.

Barbara Bilek spoke against the idea of requiring technicians to complete CE when it comes to small business. She commented that technicians working in hospitals already have competencies they must complete. Melissa Graham and Jim Riddle spoke against the CE requirements and the additional paperwork that will result.

Jan Burkett asked if other states require CE. Kim Grinston reported that some do, some don't, and there's a wide range of various requirements in between.

James Riddle asked Board members their feeling about whether the CE requirements should be lenient or strict. It was consensus that it should not be burdensome on the pharmacist-in-charge.

Discussion was held regarding whether delivery drivers will be required to register as advanced pharmacy technicians. It was consensus that it depends on the individual pharmacy setting and if the pharmacist-in-charge wants them registered as such.

Barbara Bilek inquired if (3)(c) "Dispensing systems" should be "dispensing processes." Kim Grinston reported it is meant to be interpreted based on the pharmacy setting.

Motion was made by James Riddle, seconded by Janine Burkett, to accept the proposed changes to Section 338.013, RSMo, as printed. Motion passed 4:0:0:1 with roll call vote as follows:
Janine Burkett – yes **Melissa Graham – yes** **James Riddle – yes**
Anita Parran – absent **Barbara Bilek – yes**

Motion was made by Barbara Bilek, seconded by Janine Burkett, to accept the proposed statutory language for Section 338.014, RSMo, as printed. Motion passed 3:1:0:1 with roll call vote as follows:
Janine Burkett – yes **Melissa Graham – no** **James Riddle – yes**
Anita Parran – absent **Barbara Bilek – yes**

<u>MOTION TO CLOSE</u>
Motion was made by Barbara Bilek, seconded by Jim Riddle, that the Board go into closed session at 12:18 p.m. and that all votes, to the extent permitted by law, pertaining to and/or resulting from this closed meeting be closed under Section 610.021(1), (3), (5), (7), (13) and (14) and under Section 324.001.8. Motion passed 4:0:0:1 with roll call vote as follows:
Janine Burkett – yes **Melissa Graham – yes** **James Riddle – yes**
Anita Parran – absent **Barbara Bilek – yes**

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC LEFT THE CONFERENCE ROOM IN JEFFERSON CITY AND MS. JETTON AND MS. COPP LEFT PAM MARSHALL'S OFFICE.

By motion duly made, seconded, passed and recorded in closed session minutes, the Board returned to open session at approximately 1:05 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

At approximately 1:06 p.m., upon motion made by Barbara Bilek, seconded by James Riddle, the October 31, 2011, conference call meeting was adjourned. Motion passed 4:0:0:1 with roll call vote as follows:

Janine Burkett – yes **Melissa Graham – yes** **James Riddle – yes**
Anita Parran – absent **Barbara Bilek – yes**

_____
KIMBERLY A. GRINSTON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Date Approved: 4/17/12