



Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation
Division of Professional Regulation

JB PRITZKER
Governor

DEBORAH HAGAN
Secretary
CECILIA ABUNDIS
Acting Director
Division of Professional
Regulation

<p>Department of Financial and Professional Regulation Division of Professional Regulation Collaborative Pharmaceutical Task Force Advisory Board Meeting</p>
--

Date: June 16, 2020
Meeting Convened: 12:40 P.M.
Meeting Adjourned: 1:40 P.M.
Location: The Collaborative Pharmaceutical Task Force convened the meeting at 12:40 P.M. CST on Monday, June 16, 2020, via WebEx conference call per Executive Order 2020-07 for the purpose of conducting a public meeting.

The following members were present for all or portions of the meeting:

Roll Call: Philip P. Burgess, MBA, DPh, RPh, Chairperson
Scott Meyers, MS, RPh
Helga Brake, PharmD
Brian H. Kramer, RPh, MBA
Jerry L. Bauman, PharmD
Adam Bursua, PharmD
Scott A. Reimers
Garth Reynolds, RPh
Thomas Stiede
Rob Karr late
Jayna Brown
Ryan McCann, PharmD

Staff Present: Munaza Aman, Associate General Counsel, IDFPR
Haley Lowrance, Assistant General Counsel, IDFPR
Alex Martell, General Counsel Law Clerk, IDFPR

Guests Present: Guests were present.

Topic	Discussion	Action
Roll Call & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chairman Philip P. Burgess provided introductions for the task force. Additionally, future meetings may be virtual throughout the summer pending an Executive Order. 	
Old Business	<p>A. <u>Approval of Previous Minutes</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The March Minutes Approved with edits votes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Scott Meyers moved to approve minutes Seconded by Brian Kramer <u>A vote was then taken to approve the minutes.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Ayes: Philip P. Burgess, Helga Brake, Brian H. Kramer, Scott Meyers, Jayna Brown, Scott A. Reimer, Thomas Stiede</u> <u>Nays:</u> <u>Abstains:</u> The May minutes were approved unanimously with the incorporated edits and corrections. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>A vote was then taken to approve the minutes.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Ayes: Philip P. Burgess, Helga Brake, Brian H. Kramer, Scott Meyers, Jayna Brown, Scott A. Reimer, Thomas Stiede</u> <u>Nays:</u> <u>Abstains:</u> <p>B. <u>Meeting Dates</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All meetings will continue to occur at 12:30pm via WebEx unless the Open Meetings Act exemption expires and In-person meetings are required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 21, 2020; August 18, 2020; and September 8, 2020. (Meeting to Finalize recommendations) The task force findings are due to the Department on October 1, 2020. <p>C. <u>Discussion Topics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chairman provided a recap of topics that will be discussed at future taskforce meetings. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Final review “Meal Break Timing” language- Jayna and Adam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jayna: Tried to incorporate language that incorporates the changes recommended by other members. Language was created in order to prevent issues with breaks at larger pharmacies. “No earlier than 3 hours from the time the pharmacists shift begins unless the pharmacist agrees to take the earlier break.” Adam 	<p>March Minutes Approved</p> <p>May Minutes Approved</p>

	<p>wanted to add the last paragraph that would specifically discuss hospital settings and the differences that those settings require. Adding definition for “product verification”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phil: Recap, pharmacists are in control. The language allows for an earlier break but only if the Pharmacist requests it. • Munaza: Who does the last paragraph really apply to? • Jayna: In a hospital setting, there are pharmacists that do not actually perform “product verification,” and so the mandated break language is not necessary for the hospital setting. • Brian: Dislikes the proposed language because the “product verification” issue occurs outside of the hospital setting. • Jayna: The language uses “clinical pharmacist,” which can apply outside of the hospital. The break requirement is about safety in filling prescriptions, so if there are pharmacists that • Scott Meyers: It is not just a hospital issue, but it is a big hospital issue. Pharmacists in a hospital setting sometimes are acting in administrative capacities that do not necessarily require a mandated break time. • Brian: There are pharmacists that do other things besides product verification that should be entitled to the same breaks as those verifying products. • Jayna: Setting specific language may not be the best option for this. Defining product verification could help to make this section clearer. • Brian: The language as it is presented begs for different interpretations. The biggest concern is a party taking advantage of this language. • Phil: Two issues. One is (g) people not doing product verification (mail order facilities). From a patient safety stand-point don’t we want those people to get the breaks? • Brian: (g) is too restrictive as it stands. If you work a 12-hour day, you should be entitled to your break • Munaza: If we are going to propose an exemption, maybe we should aim at those in administrative capacity. • Jayna: We may need Adam to provide a better explanation of the proposed language. • Elise Wozniak (Public Member Northwestern): I believe the language is an attempt to exempt people that are not working the day to day pharmacy tasks. • Phil: In my mind, there are pharmacists that fall between the cracks that this language produces. • Munaza: The language to me looks to be aimed at the safety concern. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna: Anyone that has a hand in the dispensing process should be included in the group guaranteed these breaks. • Phil: “Product Verification” needs to have a clearer definition to match the intent behind the language. There has to be some sort of carve out regarding pharmacists that are truly excluded from the dispensing process. • Brian: The beginning language produces issues. • Phil: Is there a consensus from the task force that we re-look at (g) and “product verification?” Are there issues with other sections? • Rob Karr: (b) should read “the break shall be allowed” instead of “shall be provided” • Scott Meyers agrees • Helga: Why not remove “provided?” • Jayna: We added “unless requested by the pharmacist” specifically for the professional judgement. • Rob Karr: The use of the word “allowed” would not create any issues in my view. • Phil: We are not ready to vote on this. Hopefully at the next meeting we can vote on this matter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provided v. Allowed ii. (g) iii. “product verification” <p>2. Review of expanding longevity on prescription refills language- Adam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adam was not initially present to discuss. The topic has been moved to the next meeting. <p>3. Review of questions to present to the Department of Insurance regarding the remuneration of pharmacists for patient care services separate from sale of drug product- Garth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garth was not initially present. • Scott Meyers: Discussed with Garth that we really need to look at the questions to present to the Department. I believe they are too confrontational as they stand. • Phil: I looked at the recap of the first meeting. We seem to have gone far from the original focus. • Brian: The questions do seem to be antagonistic, but it does seem to be within what was originally suggested. • Scott Meyers: I am going to look into other groups regarding the level of training that pharmacists receive compared to their compensation. • Phil: Scott, can you get together with Garth and discuss these questions? • Scott Meyers: Yes. • Brian: I can also provide some input on this matter. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phil: Scott Meyers and Brian will get together with Garth to work on these questions. • Scott Reimers: I just wanted to note that these questions need to be less confrontational so that these discussions with other Departments can be most productive. Question 5,7, 9, 10, and 13 are most appropriate in my view. • Phil: this will be revisited in July. • Garth: health care professionals’ mental health has been negatively affected by some inaction from some of these Departments, but I will work with the others. 	
New Business	<p>A. <u>New Business</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry: We should discuss the Statewide Order on Narcan (opioid antidote) • Phil: Does this work with our discussions on Standing Orders? • Jerry: I believe it does. • Adam: I reviewed all surrounding states with expanding refill longevity. I believe this matter should be withdrawn from future discussion. • Phil: It has been removed. • Garth: If a recording becomes available, can we get a copy if we missed some of the meeting? • Munaza: We will try to accommodate that. 	
Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjournment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion Scott Meyers ○ Jayna Brown Second ○ <u>A vote was then taken to Adjourn.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ayes: Philip P. Burgess, Helga Brake, Brian H. Kramer, Scott Meyers, Jayna Brown, Scott A. Reimer, Garth Renolds, Ryan Mcann, Rob Karr</u> <p>1. Adjourned 1:40 p.m.</p>	Motion Passed