



# Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation

---

## Division of Professional Regulation

J.B. Pritzker  
Governor

DEBORAH HAGAN  
Secretary

JESSICA BAER  
Director  
Division of Professional Regulation

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Department of Financial and Professional Regulation</b> <b>Division of Professional Regulation</b> <b>Collaborative Pharmaceutical Task Force Advisory Board Meeting</b></p>
--

Date: March 12, 2019  
Meeting Convened: 1:30 P.M.  
Meeting Adjourned: 3:15 P.M.  
Location: Chicago: JRTC CBD Rooms 14-612; SPI: Stratton CBD 349C

Roll Call: Philip P. Burgess, MBA, DPh, RPh, Chairperson  
Helga Brake, PharmD  
Scott A. Reimer, (Springfield)  
Scott Meyers, MS, RPh  
Thomas Stiede,  
Adam Bursua, PharmD  
Lemry Al Carter, RPh  
Garth Reynolds, RPh  
Jerry L. Bauman, PharmD

Staff Present: Lucienne Doler, IDFPR  
Munaza Aman, IDFPR

Guests Present: Katherine Lee Mosio, UI Health  
John Long, CVS Health  
Ryan McCann, Jewel Osco  
Joel Kurzman, NACDS  
Melissa Senatore, Teamsters 727  
Melissa Hogan, Roosevelt University College of Pharmacy  
Jan Keresztes, Talent First  
Noelle Chapman, NMH/KHP  
Kristyn Foust, Jewel Osco  
Amanda McKee, CVS Health  
Bret Benjamin, CVS Health  
James Ko, Much Shelist  
Jeremy Aguila, CVS Pharmacy  
Chuck Z., CVS Pharmacy  
Kathleen Johnson, RPH Innovations  
Laura Licari, IPHA  
Mike Bogdan, IPHA  
Kevin Swanson, Walgreens  
Isha Rana, UIC  
Zachary Frankenbach, Teamsters 727  
Debra Moorman, CPHA  
Joel Baise, Walgreens  
Rob Karr, SSPI

Topic	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> February minutes approved.</li> </ul>	
Discussion	<p><b>A. <u>Recommendations for “Grounds of Discipline” language related to multiple work place issues: Al Carter and Tom Stiede</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Al:</b> There has not been much of a change since our last discussion</li> <li>• <b>Tom:</b> The questions we came up with are: when and who does a discipline apply to? Do we need to consider a specific list of violations? and who is in charge for administering or adjudicating a discipline?</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> the grounds of discipline apply to all licensees (anyone licensed under the act)</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> we’re just worried about certain provisions being too broad, but at the end of the day it’s up to the Department to determine what is a violation and whether to enforce a rule.</li> <li>• <b>Audience:</b> is concerned about quotas and asked that licensees be protected from requirements that they were not trained for in school.</li> <li>• <b>Garth:</b> we need some definite guidance.</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> what would you define? Because there’s a purpose in provisions being broad, to make the Act more inclusive. Before we present our recommendations for legislation, we need to reach an agreement.</li> <li>• <b>Tom:</b> voices concerns over Whistleblower Act and a time frame.</li> <li>• <b>Luci:</b> I am not certain about the timeframe because it is usually a civil lawsuit. The whistleblower Act reminds licensees that the whistleblower act applies, and a civil suit may be filed.</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> my next step would be providing the Department with the work we have and have the Department review our language and see if anything is needed.</li> <li>• <b>Garth:</b> the reason there’s an issue on a proper timeline is because although we have inspectors working very hard, there’s still pharmacies who haven’t been inspected in years, and I recommend that we place that in the Act.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> I’m envisioning that we’ll eventually present to the Department language or provisions that need to be added and changed, and a general report which explains things we believe need to be changed. What the Department decides to do is beyond our control.</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> should we have the department look at this now?</li> <li>• <b>Munaza:</b> Asks Al to determine structure for how complaints get to investigators and board and investigations determine violations.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> we will come back to this and continue researching.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. <u>Recommendations for language related to allowed activities in the pharmacy when pharmacist is on break: Al Carter and Tom Stiede</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Al:</b> presents Minnesota meal break law for pharmacists and asks whether something similar would be similar in Illinois.</li> <li>• <b>Munaza:</b> In Illinois, the pharmacists must be on duty to practice. The rules do say that you cannot dispense if the pharmacist is not physically present. If pharmacist is on break, then they’re not on duty and available to supervise.</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> what if pharmacist dispensed/checked the order prior to break?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Munaza:</b> that is not a problem if the worker is simply performing cashier duties but the worker could not provide patient education or other tasks until the pharmacist return from break.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> we need to layout a recommendation of how the pharmacy can continue to function while the pharmacist is on break.</li> <li>• <b>Scott R.:</b> I'm concerned about a loophole which provide for the dispensing of medicine without patient counseling. You can't get around patient counseling.</li> <li>• <b>Al:</b> upon pharmacy discretion, this is already allowed for refills, but this is mostly aimed at new prescriptions.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> I get told that under Illinois's definition of new scripts, the number is in the 20-30 percent.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> Scott R., without considering new scripts, could you consider about pharmacies continuing on as they are currently functioning?</li> </ul> <p><b>C. <u>Recommendations for language related to prohibited technician activities: Brian Kramer, Scott Meyers and Garth Reynolds</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scott R.:</b> would these new suggestions allow pharmacy techs to administer vaccinations if delegated by the pharmacists?</li> <li>• <b>Scott M.:</b> yes, but this needs to be changed in the Act still.</li> <li>• <b>Scott R.:</b> we believe this is a problem and it would be a major change to the scope of practice.</li> <li>• <b>Helga:</b> I don't understand, you're comfortable with the admiration of flu shots but not vaccines.</li> <li>• <b>Scott R.:</b> administering vaccines to children would be a problem</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> We need to schedule to vote on this language next month so that everyone can have time to think about this. Scott R., if you have time, you can send us suggested language.</li> </ul> <p><b>D. <u>Recommendations for requirements for technician training for expanded activities: Brian Kramer, Scott Meyers and Garth Reynolds</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scott M.:</b> Reviews new suggested changes and language. Discussion about 2-year requirement for certification and training.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> If we are all okay with the 2-year requirement, then we will come back to this after Scott M. makes these changes.</li> <li>• <b>Scott R. .:</b> I don't see anywhere in that a pharmacy tech can administer vaccines, is that what we're advocating for?</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> Yes, but a tech does not independently decide and would have to be trained</li> <li>• <b>Garth:</b> a certain category of techs are already allowed to do this</li> <li>• <b>Scott R. .:</b> As a taskforce, we do not want loopholes to bypass consultations or patient counseling.</li> <li>• <b>Phil:</b> we do not want to avoid patient counseling. We might get back to making a decision for this language, unless we are still in disagreement. Majority vote is needed for changes to go forward.</li> </ul>	
<b>Adjournment</b>	Adjourned 3:15 p.m.	