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The 2019 National Pharmacist Workforce Study (NPWS) was funded by the Pharmacy Workforce Center, Inc. The PWC is a coalition of non-profit corporations whose mission is to serve the pharmacy profession and the public by actively researching, analyzing and monitoring the size, demography and activities of the pharmacy workforce.
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Objectives for the 2019 NPWS

- Describe demographic and work life characteristics of the pharmacist workforce in the United States during 2019.
- Describe work contributions of the pharmacist workforce in the United States during 2019.
- Examine new pharmacy workforce variables, including job burnout, workplace discrimination and harassment, opioid-related practice issues and pharmacist retirement during 2019.
Methods for the 2019 NPWS

• On-line survey of a random sample of 96,110 licensed pharmacists – Coordinated with NABP Foundation
• Three email waves sent to sample with a survey link
• Survey asked about:
  • Work status
  • Work setting
  • Job characteristics
  • Work life variables
  • Discrimination and harassment in the workplace
  • Opioid issues
• Descriptive statistics calculated for all variables
2019 Response Summary

- First time an electronic survey was used for NPWS
- 96,100 randomly sampled licensed pharmacists from the NABP
- 94,803 emails were verified as received to an inbox
- 8,466 pharmacists clicked on the survey link
- **5,467 usable responses** were received (5.8%*)
  - Usable defined as no missing data for each of five key variables: work status, gender, age, hours worked weekly and practice setting

*Using the number of pharmacists who clicked on the survey link as a denominator, 64.6% provided a usable response set
NPWS Response History

Number of Usable Responses

- 2000: 2,204
- 2004: 2,075
- 2009: 1,395
- 2014: 2,446
- 2019: 5,467

A trend showing an increase in usable responses from 2000 to 2019.
Distribution of Responding Sample
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David Mott, PhD
University of Wisconsin
david.mott@wisc.edu
Trends in Licensed Pharmacists’ Work Status

- Actively Practicing Pharmacy: 88.3%, 75.0%, 79.8%
- Working, not in Pharmacy: 2.0%, 3.0%, 5.5%
- Retired: 7.0%, 18.1%, 9.8%
- Unemployed: 2.7%, 3.9%, 4.9%
Actively Practicing Pharmacists by Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Retail</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Care</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actively Practicing Pharmacists:
% Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actively Practicing Pharmacists by Age Category

- Age <= 40
  - 2009: 24.4%
  - 2014: 31.6%
  - 2019: 47.7%

- Age > 40
  - 2009: 75.6%
  - 2014: 68.4%
  - 2019: 52.3%
Actively Practicing Pharmacists Working Part-time

Working ≤ 30 hrs/week at primary employer

Overall
- 2009: 23.7%
- 2014: 17.7%
- 2019: 14.5%

Female
- 2009: 29.8%
- 2014: 20.5%
- 2019: 16.0%

Male
- 2009: 18.4%
- 2014: 13.7%
- 2019: 11.9%
Reasons for Part-time Work: 2019

% Moderately and Very Influential in Decision to Work PT

- No Choice but to Work PT: 25.6%
- Employee No FT Pos Avail: 84.0%
- No Find FT Job: 72.5%
- Employee Cut Hrs from FT to PT: 39.4%
Pharmacist Contributions to the U.S. Health Care System
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Proportion of U.S. Pharmacists by Segment 2009, 2014, 2019

- Medication Provider: 41% (2009), 40% (2014), 34% (2019)
- Medication Provider who also Provides Patient Care: 25% (2009), 22% (2014), 25% (2019)
- Other Activity Pharmacist: 16% (2009), 18% (2014), 14% (2019)
- Patient Care Provider who also Provides Medication: 12% (2009), 13% (2014), 15% (2019)
- Patient Care Provider: 6% (2009), 7% (2014), 12% (2019)
Significant Patient Care Provision (Segments 2, 4, 5) - 2009: 43%, 2014: 42%, 2019: 52%

Primarily Devoted to Medication Provision (Segment 1) - 2009: 41%, 2014: 40%, 2019: 34%

Other Activity Pharmacist (Segment 3) - 2009: 16%, 2014: 18%, 2019: 14%
Proportion Holding PharmD Degree by Segment 2009, 2014, 2019

- Medication Provider: 17%, 43%, 57%
- Medication Provider who also Provides Patient Care: 17%, 48%, 59%
- Other Activity Pharmacist: 42%, 58%, 60%
- Patient Care Provider who alsoProvides Medication: 40%, 59%, 75%
- Patient Care Provider: 53%, 61%, 81%
Proportion Working in ‘Other Setting – Non-Pharmacy’ by Segment (2019)

- Medication Provider: 2%
- Medication Provider who Provides Patient Care: 2%
- Patient Care Provider who Provides Medications: 8%
- Patient Care Provider: 17%
- Other Activity Pharmacist: 50%
Year-of-Licensure Cohorts

- **Hold a PharmD**
  - 2005-2019 (49% of pharmacists): 97%
  - 1980-2004 (43% of pharmacists): 35%
  - Before 1980 (8% of pharmacists): 17%

- **Residency Training**
  - 2005-2019 (49% of pharmacists): 22%
  - 1980-2004 (43% of pharmacists): 9%
  - Before 1980 (8% of pharmacists): 6%
The Job Market: Pharmacists’ Point of View (POV)
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The Job Market: Pharmacists’ POV

• Ease of Finding Work & Job Security

• Available Positions & Intention to Leave their Job

• Demand for Pharmacists
Ease of Finding a Job

How has the following changed in the past year?

- Ease of pharmacists in your community finding work

![Chart showing the percentage of decrease and increase in the ease of finding a job in different sectors.](chart.png)
Job Security

How has the following changed in the past year?
  • Your feeling of job security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Merch</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb Care</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pt Care</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Prospects and Mobility

- I am aware of vacant openings that would be a good fit for me.
- How likely is it that you will search/actually leave in the next year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Aware of Jobs (%)</th>
<th>Likely to Search (%)</th>
<th>Likely to Leave (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner, Partner</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Mobility (by setting)

How likely is it that you will search/actually leave in the next year?

Overall Community Hospital Outpt/MD Clinic Other Pt Care Not Pt Care

Likely Search: 35.8 42.9 28.3 28.6 31.2 27.3 20.6
Likely Leave: 19.7 22.9 16.2 13.7 17.2

Overall, the likelihood of searching for a new job is highest in Community settings with 42.9%, followed by Other Pt Care with 31.2%. The lowest likelihood is in Not Pt Care with 20.6%.
Job Prospects and Mobility (by age)

- I am aware of vacant openings that would be a good fit for me.
- How likely is it that you will search/actually leave in the next year?
Demand for Pharmacists

How would you rate the demand for generalist/staff pharmacists in your local practice area?

5 = High demand: open positions difficult to fill
4 = Moderate demand: some difficulty filling open positions
3 = Demand in balance with supply
2 = Demand is less than the pharmacist supply available
1 = Demand is much less than the pharmacist supply available

Overall Average Rating: 1.95

Supply/demand balance rating scale used since 2000 to gather employer views in Pharmacy Workforce Center project.
Demand for Pharmacists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner, Partner</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outp/MD Clinic</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pt Care</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Pt Care</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Pharmacists recognize that the market is tightening with regard to opportunities and the demand for pharmacists.
  • There is awareness of diminished potential mobility and job security.
  • There is some likelihood to search for other employment, but less for actually leaving current employment.
  • Views on the market demand for pharmacists reveal perceptions that the supply is greater than demand.
Quality of Pharmacists’ Work Life
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Ratings of Workload* by Practice Setting 2009, 2014 & 2019

*% of Respondents Rating Workload High or Excessively High

- **Independent**
- **Chain**
- **Mass Merc**
- **Supermrt**
- **Hospital**
- **AmCare** (1st year for AmCare)
- **PatCare**
- **NPatCare**

- 2009
- 2014
- 2019
Ratings of Job Satisfaction* by Practice Setting 2004, 2014 & 2019

*% of Respondents Scoring Higher Than the Scale Midpoint

- Independent
- Chain
- Mass Merc
- Supermrt
- Hospital
- AmCare (1st year for AmCare)
- PatCare
- NPatCare

2004, 2014, 2019
Quality of Work Life Variables* by Gender 2004, 2014, 2019

*% of Respondents scoring higher than item or scale midpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Home Conflict</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control In Work Environment</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings of Workload by Gender
2009, 2014 & 2019

- 2009 WorkLoad has Increased or Greatly Increased Compared to A Year Ago
- 2009 Rated Workload High or Excessively High
- 2014 WorkLoad has Increased or Greatly Increased Compared to A Year Ago
- 2014 Rated Workload High or Excessively High
- 2019 WorkLoad has Increased or Greatly Increased Compared to A Year Ago
- 2019 Rated Workload High or Excessively High

Women
Men
Ratings of Highly Stressful Events by Gender 2019

- Possessing Inadequate Knowledge About Patient's Medical Condition
- Dealing with Difficult Patients
- Fearing a Patient Will Be Harmed by a Medication Error
- Working at Current Staffing Levels
- Having so Much Work to Do Can't Get Everything Done Well

Women: [Bars showing ratings]
Men: [Bars showing ratings]
Observations

• Pharmacists’ perceptions of their workload continues to increase in a number of settings

• Now that females make up the majority of pharmacists, they are experiencing higher levels of stress, lower levels of control and more fear that a patient may be harmed from a medication error as compared to male pharmacists

• Both males and females are experiencing increased levels of work-home conflict and decreased levels of organizational commitment

• Action must be taken at all levels (societal, system, legal and organizational) to address these issues
Burnout and Fulfillment for Employed Pharmacists
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Professional Fulfillment Index


- 16 items originally developed for physicians
  - Work exhaustion
  - Interpersonal disengagement
  - Professional fulfillment
- Correlates to Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) domains
- Correlates to self-reported medical errors
### Scores on Professional Fulfillment Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean by Setting</th>
<th>Work Exhaustion $^A$</th>
<th>Interpersonal Disengagement $^A$</th>
<th>Personal Fulfillment $^B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Community</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Care</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other patient care</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not patient care</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: All items rated on 5-point scales  A: Lower is better  B: Higher is better*
Are pharmacists having their needs met at work?

Hierarchy of needs

- Self fulfillment, Self actualization
- Esteem, accomplishment
- Love and belonging
- Safety and security
- Basic needs

## Physical and emotional needs of practicing pharmacists (selected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Exhaustion (N % reporting feeling a lot or totally)</th>
<th>Independent N=398</th>
<th>Chain N=1,009</th>
<th>Mass Merchandiser N=380</th>
<th>Supermarket N=320</th>
<th>Hospital N=1,220</th>
<th>Total N=3,327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physically exhausted at work</td>
<td>83 (20.9)</td>
<td>564 (55.9)</td>
<td>214 (56.3)</td>
<td>159 (49.7)</td>
<td>260 (21.3)</td>
<td>1,280 (38.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally exhausted at work</td>
<td>81 (20.4)</td>
<td>506 (50.1)</td>
<td>196 (51.6)</td>
<td>155 (48.4)</td>
<td>278 (22.8)</td>
<td>1,216 (36.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: All items rated on 5-point scales. Lower percent = Less exhaustion*
## Belonging needs of practicing pharmacists (selected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Disengagement (N % reporting feeling a lot or totally)</th>
<th>Independent N=398</th>
<th>Chain N=1,009</th>
<th>Mass Merchandiser N=380</th>
<th>Supermarket N=320</th>
<th>Hospital N=1,220</th>
<th>Total N=3,327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less empathetic with my patients</td>
<td>16 (4.0)</td>
<td>134 (13.3)</td>
<td>46 (12.1)</td>
<td>29 (9.1)</td>
<td>50 (4.1)</td>
<td>275 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less empathetic with my colleagues</td>
<td>27 (6.8)</td>
<td>152 (15.1)</td>
<td>65 (17.1)</td>
<td>43 (13.4)</td>
<td>142 (11.6)</td>
<td>429 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All items rated on 5-point scales.  Higher percent = Greater disengagement, disconnection
### Fulfillment, autonomy, and accomplishment needs (selected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Fulfillment (N % reporting very true or completely true)</th>
<th>Independent N=398</th>
<th>Chain N=1,009</th>
<th>Mass Merchandiser N=380</th>
<th>Supermarket N=320</th>
<th>Hospital N=1,220</th>
<th>Total N=3,327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I feel in control when dealing with difficult problems at work</strong></td>
<td>182 (45.7)</td>
<td>242 (24.0)</td>
<td>91 (23.9)</td>
<td>71 (22.2)</td>
<td>385 (31.6)</td>
<td>971 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My work is meaningful to me</strong></td>
<td>259 (65.1)</td>
<td>400 (39.6)</td>
<td>164 (43.2)</td>
<td>118 (36.9)</td>
<td>746 (61.1)</td>
<td>1,687 (50.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I’m contributing professionally in the ways I value most</strong></td>
<td>224 (56.3)</td>
<td>267 (26.5)</td>
<td>96 (25.3)</td>
<td>79 (24.7)</td>
<td>579 (47.5)</td>
<td>1,245 (37.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All items rated on 5-point scales.  Higher percent = Greater fulfillment at work.
Closing Remarks/Conclusions

Burnout in all domains was associated with greater likelihood to leave job $p < .001$

- ID R=0.22, WE R=0.29, PF R=-0.31

How and should larger pharmacies seek to boost fulfillment and lower exhaustion?

- Could there be confounding factors?

Interpersonal disengagement appears to be resilient, but could it be at risk?
Ambulatory Care Pharmacy
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Medical College of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy
bbakken@mcw.edu
Pharmacist Practice Settings

- Community: 50.3%
- Hospital/Health-System: 27.8%
- Managed Care/PBM: 3.0%
- Nursing Home/LTC: 3.9%
- Ambulatory Care: 6.0%
Practice Setting Changes 2000-2019
Ambulatory Care

Practice Setting Changes 2000-2019

Ambulatory Care, Nursing Home/LTC, Managed Care/PBM
### Year of First License

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year First License</th>
<th>Ambulatory Care</th>
<th>All Other Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1960</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 to 1970</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 to 1980</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 to 1990</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 to 2000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 to 2010</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 to 2019</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year First License</th>
<th>Ambulatory Care</th>
<th>All Other Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2000</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 to 2019</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top 10 Ambulatory Care Clinic Specialty Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Specialty Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticoagulation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hematology/Oncology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care/General Medicine</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatrics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry/Mental Health</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top 10 Services Provided By Ambulatory Care Pharmacists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Activities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medication education or counseling</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication reconciliation</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start, modify, or stop drug therapy</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic interchange</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive medication management</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease state management</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering laboratory tests</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Device education or training</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug level monitoring</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient medication assistance</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ambulatory Care Patient Visits

### How are you seeing patients?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How are you seeing patients</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone calls</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted during scheduled visit with provider</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled visits with the pharmacist</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit with patient on the inpatient unit/floor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehealth visits</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How many patients are you seeing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many patients are you seeing?</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average patient visits per day</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrimination & Harassment

Brianne K. Bakken, PharmD, MHA
Medical College of Wisconsin School of Pharmacy
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Background

• In 2018, the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) filed charges on behalf of:
  
  76,418 individuals for discrimination

  26,699 individuals for harassment

• According the the PEW Research Center, 42% of women and 22% of men have experienced some form of harassment at work

• No studies on discrimination and only two studies conducted in Illinois and Ohio on harassment could be identified in the recent US pharmacy literature

• These studies indicated that female pharmacists experienced harassment to a greater extent than males, and pharmacists were not quite sure what to do when it happened

Definitions

**Discrimination** – Unfair treatment related to employment because of race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy, gender identity, and sexual orientation), national origin, disability, age (age 40 or older), or genetic information

**Sexual Harassment** – Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2020
## Most Common Basis/Type

### Discrimination Basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>882 (31.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>823 (29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnicity</td>
<td>467 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>160 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>135 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>353 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (All Forms)</strong></td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing demeaning comments related to race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes 728 (15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing or observing offensive behavior of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Yes 634 (13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing demeaning comments related to gender identity</td>
<td>Yes 620 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted advances of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Yes 240 (5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted touching of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Yes 89 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrimination Reporting

84.1% Did **NOT** report discrimination to employer

15.9% Reported discrimination to employer

56.1% were **“Very Unsatisfied”** with the results of reporting
Harassment Reporting

- 82.8% Did NOT report harassment to employer
- 17.2% Reported harassment to employer
- 45.8% were “Very Unsatisfied” with the results of reporting
Reasons For Not Reporting

Reasons For Not Reporting Discrimination / Harassment

- Not familiar with the reporting procedures
- Concern about retaliation
- Concern about lack of privacy
- Didn’t think it would result in any action
- Prefer not to answer
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Discrimination (%)</th>
<th>Harassment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with the reporting</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about retaliation</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about lack of privacy</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t think it would result in any</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction With Reporting

Satisfaction With Results of Reporting Discrimination / Harassment

- Very unsatisfied
- Somewhat unsatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Very satisfied

Discrimination vs. Harassment
Conclusions

• With shifting demographics of pharmacy (more younger females and older males, slightly more racial/ethnic diversity), it is imperative that we address issues of discrimination and harassment.

• Education concerning the specific behaviors that constitute discrimination and harassment must be provided by pharmacy schools, continuing education and employers.

• Employers must have and enforce mechanisms that hold offenders accountable for their behavior and communicate processes to employees.

• Pharmacists can and should report incidents to their human resources office and/or local, state and federal agencies charged with investigation of these issues.
Naloxone in the Community Pharmacy Setting
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Naloxone Dispensing

- Among one of the activities reported by majority of practicing community pharmacists
  - Vaccines (90.0%)
  - Patient medication assistance (83.4%)
  - Dispensing naloxone (72.2%)
  - MTM services (66.7%)
  - Medication synchronization (66.5%)
### Naloxone Dispensing Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone based on a standing order</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone pursuant to a patient-specific prescription</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone without a prescription based on a collaborative practice agreement</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone based on a state rule (e.g. special waiver, provision)</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not dispense naloxone</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2,166

Pharmacists were able to mark all that applied; “Do not dispense” was exclusive.
## Naloxone Dispensing by Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naloxone Dispensing Activities</th>
<th>Independent n=401</th>
<th>Small Chain n = 63</th>
<th>Large Chain n = 944</th>
<th>Mass Merchandiser n = 381</th>
<th>Supermarket n = 321</th>
<th>Health System Retail n = 56</th>
<th>Total n = 2166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone without a prescription based on a collaborative practice agreement</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone based on a standing order</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone based on a state rule (e.g. special waiver, provision)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispense naloxone pursuant to a patient-specific prescription</td>
<td><strong>44.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.4</strong></td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td><strong>55.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not dispense naloxone*</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pharmacists were able to mark all that applied; “Do not dispense” was exclusive.
Naloxone Dispensing Frequencies

Frequency of Dispensing % \( (n = 2,166) \)

- Less than once a month: 52.1%
- At least once a month: 24.9%
- Never: 16.8%
- At least once a week: 6.2%
## Naloxone Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Overall n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>1,198 (55.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some support</td>
<td>438 (20.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>399 (18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some against</td>
<td>51 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong against</td>
<td>62 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support level for pharmacists or pharmacies dispensing naloxone without a prescription n = 2166
Naloxone Confidence Ratings

**RECOMMENDING Naloxone**

- **Total**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Health System Retail**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Supermarket**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Mass Merchandiser**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Large Chain**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Small Chain**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Independent**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

**ADMINISTERING Naloxone**

- **Total**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Health System Retail**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Supermarket**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Mass Merchandiser**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Large Chain**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Small Chain**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

- **Independent**
  - Not at all confident
  - Somewhat confident
  - Very confident

**Legend:**
- Not at all confident
- Somewhat confident
- Very confident
Observations

• Variable naloxone activity among pharmacists in general

• Some pharmacists need to use their judgment to recommend naloxone to patients, along with co-prescribing

• Administration of naloxone – More pharmacist training needed

• Pharmacists’ roles in public health are expanding
• Thank you to all pharmacists who participated in the 2019 National Pharmacist Workforce Study

• We depend on your involvement to be able to learn about pharmacy practice and your experiences at work

THANK YOU
Final Questions
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