2011-12
POSTGRADUATE YEAR
COMMUNITY PHARMACY RESIDENT EXIT SURVEY
121 Residents Surveyed  
Response Rate = 97 Residents Responded (80% response rate)

1. Degree(s) residents achieved:
   - 98% (95) received a PharmD
   - 8% (8) received other degree(s) prior to PharmD

2. Completion of the residency immediately after graduation:
   - 93.8% (91) of the residents completed a CPRP directly after graduation.
   - 6.1% (6) of the residents did not complete a CPRP directly after graduation.

3. New or ongoing Community Residency Program with school or community pharmacy:
   - 88.6% (86) programs are ongoing for both the school and community pharmacy.
   - 5.1% (5) programs were first year programs for both the school and community pharmacy.
   - 5.1% (5) programs were first year programs for the community pharmacy only.
   - 1% (1) program was a first year program for the school only.

4. Residency site accreditation status (n=95):
   - 85.2% (81) of the residents reported that their programs were accredited.
   - 8.4% (8) of the residents reported that their programs applied for accreditation.
   - 5.2% (5) of the residents reported that their programs are pursuing accreditation and already had a site-visit.
   - 1% (1) of the residents reported that their programs were not accredited and are not considering pursuing accreditation.

5. Years of residency program existence at community site (including current year) (n=95):
   - 9.4% - 1 year (9)
   - 11.5% - 2 years (11)
   - 18.9% - 3 years (18)
   - 6.3% - 4 years (6)
   - 1% - 5 years (1)
   - 21% - 6-9 years (20)
   - 31.5% - 10 years or more (30)

Reasons for Choosing a Community Pharmacy Residency

6. Factor most important in the decision to complete a CPRP over other types of residencies (n=93):
   - 49.4% (46) of the residents said they enjoy direct patient contact and interaction in community/ambulatory settings.
   - 15% (14) of the residents cited prior experience in community pharmacy practice and plan to pursue a career in this area.
   - 12.9% (12) of the residents felt this type of residency would provide an opportunity to develop innovative services.
   - 10.7% (10) of the residents said this setting is undergoing changes and would like to be involved in the process.
   - 6.4% (6) of the residents were advised by a faculty member, friend, or co-worker who felt it would be worthwhile.
   - 4.3% (4) of the residents selected “other”.

7. Factor most important in the decision to complete a CPRP over seeking employment after graduation (n=93):
   - 37.6% (35) of the residents desired additional training to expand clinical knowledge.
   - 35.4% (33) of the residents felt that residency training would open additional opportunities for employment.
   - 11.8% (11) of the residents wanted additional training to develop innovative services.
   - 9.6% (9) of the residents wanted additional training to expand management skills.
   - 3.2% (3) of the residents were advised by a faculty member, friend, or co-worker who felt it would be worthwhile to complete a CPRP.
   - 1% (1) of the residents had “other” reasons for completing a CPRP.
8. Attributes residents ranked overall as most important sought when selecting a community pharmacy residency program (n=91):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Attributes</th>
<th>Overall Average Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient Care Services/Activities Offered</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Innovation/Development of Pharmacy Services</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Practice Experiences</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director/Preceptor</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Component</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Reputation</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/School Affiliation</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Ownership Skills Development</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend/Benefit</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents ranked attributes below on a scale of 1 (Least Important) to 10 (Most Important). Listed below is the overall average for each attribute.

9. Overall satisfaction of residency experience to date (n=91):
- 29.6% (27) of residents felt the residency greatly exceeded their expectations.
- 37.3% (34) of residents felt the residency was above their expectations.
- 13.1% (12) of residents felt the residency met their expectations.
- 17.5% (16) of residents felt the residency met some expectations.
- 2.1% (2) of residents felt the residency did not meet their expectations.

10. Activities considered by residents to be within the definition of staffing (respondents could select more than one answer) (n=91):
- 94.5% (86) of the residents selected “collecting/entering prescription data into computers.”
- 90.1% (82) of the residents selected “preparing prescription products.”
- 89% (81) of the residents selected “complying with 3rd party requirements.”
- 80.2% (73) of the residents selected “taking inventory.”
- 78% (71) of the residents selected “supervising pharmacy staff.”
- 64.8% (59) of the residents selected “counseling the patient.”
- 62.6% (57) of the residents selected “screening medication problems.”
- 51.6% (47) of the residents selected “giving immunizations.”
- 41.7% (38) of the residents selected “assisting Medicare patients with Part D enrollment issues.”
- 26.3% (24) of the residents selected “precepting students.”
- 26.3% (24) of the residents selected “providing community based and health education.”
- 6.5% (6) of the residents selected “didactic teaching.”
- 4.3% (4) of the residents selected “other.”
11. Residents’ view of staffing (based on activities selected in question #10) (n=90):
   - 51.6% (47) of the residents viewed staffing as working independently as a staff pharmacist replacement.
   - 36.2% (33) of the residents viewed staffing as working in the selected activities, regardless of supervision.
   - 12% (11) of the residents viewed staffing as working in a supervised capacity in the selected activities.

12. Time engaged in “traditional” responsibilities such as dispensing/staffing (n=90):
   - 76.6% (69) of the residents felt they spent the right amount of time.
   - 14.4% (13) of the residents felt they spent too much time or too often on dispensing/staffing.
   - 8.8% (8) of the residents felt they did not have enough time.

13. Hours worked per week during the residency (n=90):
   - 1.1% (1) of the residents worked less than 40 hrs/wk.
   - 28.8% (26) of the residents worked 40-45 hrs/wk.
   - 23.3% (21) of the residents worked 46-50 hrs/wk.
   - 13.3% (12) of the residents worked 51-55 hrs/wk.
   - 22.2% (20) of the residents worked 56-60 hrs/wk.
   - 11.1% (10) of the residents worked 61+ hrs/wk.

14. Percentage of time spent on “staffing” (based on answer to question #13) (n=90):
   - 12% (11) of the residents spent 0-5% of their time on “staffing.”
   - 40% (36) of the residents spent 6-10% of their time on “staffing.”
   - 21% (19) of the residents spent 11-15% of their time on “staffing.”
   - 16% (14) of the residents spent 16-20% of their time on “staffing.”
   - 11% (10) of the residents spent > 21% of their time on “staffing.”

15. Weekend staffing required as part of the residency program (n=90):
   - 54.4% (49) of the residents stated that weekend staffing was not required.
   - 45.5% (41) of the residents stated that weekend staffing was required.

16. Provision of extra income opportunities working as a staff pharmacist on weekends or in the evenings (n=90):
   - 33.3% (30) of the residents were allowed to work at a pharmacy affiliated with their primary site.
   - 27.7% (25) of the residents could work for extra income at the primary site.
   - 17.7% (16) of the residents stated they were not allowed to work for extra income.
   - 12.2% (11) of the residents could work for extra income with a company NOT affiliated with their residency program.
   - 8.8% (8) of the residents chose not to work for extra income.

17. Residency site was not located in the original state where licensure was obtained (n=90):
   - 71.1% (64) of the residency sites were located in the same state where the resident obtained their original license.
   - 28.8% (26) of the residency sites were located in a different state than where the resident obtained their original license.

18. Licensing challenges encountered by residents within residency site’s state (n=90):
   Common responses from those who responded included: transferring hours between states; obtaining results from board of pharmacy (e.g. processing delays); challenges in scheduling exam(s); lost paperwork by board of pharmacy; unique state board requirements; board of pharmacy IT challenges; obtaining necessary information from college/university; multiple state exams; and government shutdown.

19. In which month after the residency started did resident become licensed (n=90)?
   - 23.3% (21) of the residents were licensed when they started the residency.
   - 2.2% (2) of the residents were licensed in March.
   - 1.1% (1) of the resident were licensed in April.
   - 5.5% (5) of the residents were licensed in June.
   - 35.5% (32) of the residents were licensed in July.
   - 20% (18) of the residents were licensed in August.
   - 7.7% (7) of the residents were licensed in September.
   - 2.2% (2) of the residents were licensed in October.
   - 2.2% (2) of the residents were licensed in November.
For more information, visit the APhA web site at www.pharmacist.com or contact James Owen at jowen@aphanet.org or Anne Burns at aburns@aphanet.org.

---

**Residency Project**

20. Did the resident participate in a residency project \( (n=90) \)?
- 100% (90) residents participated in a residency project.

21. Did the resident complete a residency project \( (n=90) \)?
- 95.5% (86) of the residents completed a residency project.
- 4.4% (4) of the residents did not complete a residency project.

22. Reasons for not completing the residency project within the timeframe \( \textit{multiple responses allowed} \) \( (n=4) \):
- 3 residents mentioned other reasons.
- 2 residents cited that the project was too long for one-year project.
- 2 resident cited other projects and/or activities took priority.
- 1 resident cited slow IRB approval.
- 1 resident cited enrollment lower than expected.

23. Presentation of residency projects \( (n=89) \):
- 71.9% (64) of residents presented both a poster and podium presentation.
- 14.6% (13) of residents presented only a poster.
- 12.3% (11) of residents presented only a podium.
- 1.1% (1) of residents did not present project.

24. Was the residency project published as an abstract \( (n=89) \)?
- 82% (73) of residents published their project as an abstract.
- 8.9% (8) of residents did not publish their project as an abstract, but intended to.
- 6.7% (6) of residents did not publish their project as an abstract and did not intend to.
- 1.1% (1) of residents submitted their project as an abstract but the abstract was not accepted.
- 1.1% (1) of residents submitted their project as an abstract and the abstract is pending review.

25. Was the residency project published as a manuscript \( (n=89) \)?
- 48.3% (43) of residents plan to publish their residency project as a manuscript, manuscript is currently in review.
- 30.3% (27) of residents plan to write up their residency project as a manuscript.
- 14.6% (13) of residents plan to write up their project but do not plan to publish their residency project as a manuscript.
- 4.4% (4) of residents do not plan to publish their residency project as a manuscript.
- 1.1% (1) of resident submitted a manuscript for publication and it was accepted.
- 1.1% (1) of residents submitted a manuscript for publication but it was not accepted.

26. Areas where residents would like to have seen more focus provided \( (n=88) \):
Answers from highest to lowest number of responses include: business management (e.g. collaborative agreements, marketing, business plans); disease state management including less common conditions & clinical skills; research time & opportunities; teaching & precepting student pharmacists; less supervision; direct patient care; more patient care training by preceptor/director than other healthcare providers (e.g. physicians); specialized/expert clinical preceptors; staffing; and variety of experiences (e.g. medication safety, compounding, informatics).

27. Residents who received individualized training plans at the start of their residency \( (n=88) \):
- 88.6% (78) of the residents did receive individualized training plans.
- 11.3% (10) of the residents did not receive individualized training plans.

28. Based on resident expectations going into residency program, were resident’s desired outcomes met for direct patient care activities \( (n=87) \)?
- 87.3% (76) of the residents believed their direct patient care activities were adequate.
- 12.6% (11) of the residents did not believe direct patient care activities were adequate.
29. Limitations in obtaining adequate direct patient care activities (N=87):

Answers from highest to lowest number of responses include: patient base low and variable (inconsistent) at community site; too much time spent on non-clinical activities; not enough time spent at community site; limited clinical opportunities/services at primary practice site; elimination of clinical programs; and lack of guidance/mentoring from specialized/expert preceptors.

30. Average number of patients seen by residents on a weekly basis (n=87):

- 23 % (20) of residents provided care to 0-10 patients on a weekly basis.
- 31 % (27) of residents provided care to 11-20 patients on a weekly basis.
- 46 % (40) of residents provided care to >20 patients on a weekly basis.

31. Percent of patient care time residents spent performing the following activities each week (n=87):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Care Activity</th>
<th>Number of Hours Per week</th>
<th>Percentage (%) Breakdown Per Week</th>
<th>Overall Percentage (%) Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disease State Management</td>
<td>0-10 hrs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 hrs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;21 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM</td>
<td>0-10 hrs</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 hrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;21 hrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization</td>
<td>0-10 hrs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 hrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;21 hrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>0-10 hrs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 hrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;21 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Clinical skills expectations met based upon expectations going into the residency program (n=87):

- 80.4% (70) residents reported clinical skills expectations were met.
- 19.5 % (17) residents reported clinical skills expectations were not met.

33. Most significant challenges in gaining clinical skills (n=87):

- Answers from highest to lowest number of responses include: lack of patient care services/activities at community sites; lack of preceptor feedback & guidance; time constraints; lack of self-confidence (e.g. clinical knowledge base); lack of patient understanding/utilization of clinical services; too much time spent on non-clinical activities; lack of specialized/expert preceptors; too much time devoted to dispensing; inability to manage patients independently; lack of communication between preceptors/director and management; lack of self-directed learning; licensure challenges; lack of feedback and guidance from residency director; lack of collaborative agreements; and lack of diversity of clinical opportunities.
34. Based upon expectations going into the residency program, were residents’ desired level of training and experience met for the following (n=87)?

- Practice management skills
  85% (74) of residents felt like practice management skills were met.
  14.9% (13) of residents felt like practice management skills were not met.

- Financial management skills
  66.6% (58) of residents felt like financial management skills were met.
  33.3% (29) of residents felt like financial management skills were not met.

- Training and education in ownership principles
  65.5% (57) of residents felt like training and education in ownership principles were met.
  34.4% (30) of residents felt like training and education in ownership principles were not met.

- Corporate strategic management
  62% (54) of residents felt like corporate strategic management were met.
  37.9% (33) of residents felt like corporate strategic management were not met.

- Participation in teaching/precepting activities
  96.5% (84) of residents felt like participation in teaching/precepting activities were met.
  3.4% (3) of residents felt like participation in teaching/precepting activities were not met.

35. Opportunity to create a business plan for a new service during the residency (n=87):

- 74.7% (65) of residents created a business plan.
- 25.2% (22) of residents did not create a business plan.

36. Residents with on-site responsibilities at the school or college of pharmacy affiliated with the residency program (n=87):

- 88.5% (77) of residents had responsibilities at the school of pharmacy.
- 9.1% (8) of residents did not have responsibilities at the school of pharmacy.
- 2.2% (2) of residents’ programs were not affiliated with a school of pharmacy.

37. Adequate feedback/monitoring/mentoring from the primary preceptor (n=86):

- 77.9% (67) of the residents felt that they received adequate feedback, monitoring, and mentoring from their primary preceptor.
- 22% (19) of the residents did not feel that their primary preceptors provided adequate feedback, monitoring, and mentoring.

38. Appropriate oversight received from the residency director (n=86):

- 86% (74) of the residents felt adequately guided by their residency director.
- 13.9% (12) of the residents did not feel adequately guided by their residency director.

39. Evaluation of residents by preceptor(s) - frequency of evaluations post orientation (n=86):

- 8.1% (7) of residents were evaluated at least once monthly by their preceptor.
- 80.2% (69) of residents were evaluated at least once every 3 months by their preceptor.
- 6.9% (6) of residents were evaluated at least once every 6 months by their preceptor.
- 1.1% (1) of residents were evaluated at least once during the year by their preceptor.
- 2.3% (2) of residents were evaluated at the beginning and once at the end of the residency by their preceptor.
- 1.1% (1) of residents were never evaluated formally by their preceptor.

40. Methods of delivering residents’ evaluations (respondents could select more than one answer) (n=86):

- 91.8% (79) residents were provided verbal feedback.
- 91.8% (79) residents were provided a formal evaluation form.
- 39.5% (34) residents were provided a written narrative.
- 1.1% (1) residents selected “other”.

41. Evaluation of preceptor by resident - frequency of evaluations (n=86):

- 6.9% (6) of residents evaluated their preceptor at least monthly.
- 77.9% (67) of residents evaluated their preceptor at least once every 3 months.
- 8.1% (7) of residents evaluated their preceptor at least once every 6 months.
- 2.3% (2) of residents evaluated their preceptor at least once during the year.
- 3.4% (3) of residents evaluated their preceptor at the beginning and once at the end of the residency.
- 1.1% (1) of resident never evaluated their primary preceptor.
42. Self evaluation by resident – frequency of evaluations (n=86):
- 6.9 % (6) of residents conducted a self evaluation at least monthly.
- 77.9 % (67) of residents conducted a self evaluation at least once every 3 months.
- 8.1 % (7) of residents conducted a self evaluation at least once every 6 months.
- 2.3% (2) of residents conducted a self evaluation at least once during the year.
- 3.4 % (3) of residents conducted a self evaluation at the beginning and once at the end of the residency.
- 1.1 % (1) of residents never conducted a self evaluation.

43. Method(s) used to review evaluations (n=86):
- 68.6 % (59) of residents met face-to-face with their primary preceptor and residency director.
- 12.7 % (11) of residents met face-to-face with their residency director only.
- 10.4 % (9) of residents did not meet face-to-face to review evaluations.
- 8.1 % (7) of residents met face-to-face with their primary preceptor only.

44. Residents whose patient care experiences were supplemented by off-site ambulatory care activities (n=86):
- 69.7 % (60) of the residents participated in off-site ambulatory care activities.
- 30.2 % (26) of the residents did not participate in off-site ambulatory care activities.

45. Residency site’s intention to have a resident next year (n=86):
- 91.8 % (79) of the residency sites had recruited a resident for the next residency cycle.
- 8.1 % (7) of the residency sites had not recruited a resident for the next residency cycle.

46. Residents’ involvement in the recruiting of next year’s resident (n=79):
- 96.2 % (76) of the residents participated in recruitment of the next year’s resident.
- 3.7 % (3) of the residents did not participate in recruitment of next year’s resident.

47. Methods of involvement in recruiting (respondents could select more than one answer)(n=76):
- 90.7 % (69) residents were involved in the on-site interview process.
- 84.2 % (64) residents were involved at the ASHP Midyear Meeting
- 65.7 % (50) residents were involved at the APhA Annual Meeting.
- 61.8 % (47) residents were involved at a residency fair.
- 39.4 % (30) residents were involved in local/regional meetings.
- 9.2 % (7) residents were involved at the NCPA Annual Convention.
- 3.9% (3) residents selected “other”.

Post-Residency Information

48. Post-residency position secured (n=86):
- 68 % (68) of the residents had secured a post-residency position.
- 18 % (18) of the residents had not secured a post-residency position.

49. Post-residency title/position (n=67):
- 37.3 % (25) of the residents selected “Staff Pharmacist, with some clinical services development responsibilities”.
- 17.9 % (12) of the residents selected “Clinical Pharmacist/Clinical Coordinator”.
- 10.4 % (7) of the residents selected “Other”.
- 7.4 % (5) of the residents selected “Clinical Assistant Professor” (position fully funded by the school).
- 7.4 % (5) of the residents selected “PGY2 Resident”.
- 7.4 % (5) of the residents selected “Staff Pharmacist”.
- 5.9 % (4) of the residents selected “Assistant Pharmacy Manager or Manager”.
- 1.4 % (1) of the residents selected “Shared Faculty Position” (position funded by school and practice site).
50. Areas of most interest ranked by residents if a post-residency position was not accepted (n=18):

Residents ranked areas of practice below on a scale of 1 (Areas of most interest) to 10 (Area of least interest). Listed below is the overall average for each area of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Practice</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Care</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pharmacy</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Care</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specified</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Value of the community pharmacy residency experience in securing a job (n=85):

- 90.5% (77) of the residents felt that their residency was valuable in obtaining a job.
- 9.4% (8) of the residents did not feel that their residency was valuable in obtaining a job.

52. Community pharmacy’s greatest challenges:

Residents ranked perceived areas of greatest challenge on a scale of 1 (Areas of greatest challenge) to 5 (Area of least challenge). Listed below is the overall average for each perceived challenge (n=84).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Areas of Challenge</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of payment for patient care services</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispensing activities do not allow time for the provision of advanced patient care</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and support from other healthcare professionals</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients are not interested in decline to participate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management does not support provision of services outside of dispensing</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Recommendations to enhance the overall experience for future residents:

- A few residents were satisfied with their residency program and recommended no changes.
- Other residents suggested changes including (answers from highest to lowest number of responses): optimizing learning experiences (e.g. time allocated, diversity); more feedback from preceptors/directors; increase communications between residency director and practice site management; greater acceptance & consideration of constructive feedback by preceptors/director from residents; increase leadership & advocacy activities; increase time spent at college/university (e.g. teaching); increase financial support/stipend for residency related activities (e.g. travel); increase direct patient contact; greater autonomy; better time management; increase time spent at the community site; increase number/variety of specialized preceptors; increase patient care services at community sites; decrease staffing time; consider adding back the drug information requirement.