

Pharmacist Demand Indicator Summary Report Third Quarter (September) 2016

Overall Results

PDI ratings reported by panelist respondents are summarized in Table 1. The number of respondents vary for different categories of pharmacist demand since not all employers hire all types of pharmacists regularly; some organizations recruit managers internally and specialized pharmacists are not always sought or employed by all panelists' organizations.

Table 1: Pharmacist Demand Indicator (PDI) Aggregate Results

Overall	Generalist/ Staff	Managers	Specialized Pharmacists^a
PDI (Unweighted) ^b	3.00	3.11	3.13
Response weighted PDI ^c	2.97	3.15	3.23
Population-adjusted PDI ^d	2.97	3.18	3.34
Regional/Divisional			
Northeast	2.68	2.99	3.12
Mid-Atlantic	2.77	3.00	3.24
New England	2.42	2.95	2.80
Midwest	2.84	3.19	2.81
East North Central	2.76	3.24	2.77
West North Central	3.03	3.07	2.90
South	2.94	3.17	3.63
East South Central	3.06	3.38	3.14
South Atlantic	2.71	3.19	3.53
West South Central	3.26	3.04	4.04
West	3.37	3.35	3.52
Mountain	2.73	3.14	3.14
Pacific	3.65	3.44	3.68

^a Specialized Pharmacists categorization is based on panelists' interpretations as types of pharmacists that have advanced or specialized qualifications and/or duties that are sought in recruiting or hiring (e.g., MTM, anticoagulation, oncology, informatics, etc.).

^b The unweighted value is the average of the state-level average ratings across the states.

^c The response weighted value reflects the average when the number of responses across the states varied.

^d The population-adjusted (weighted) value is adjusted to reflect the State populations based on the 2011 Census.

^e The Regional and Divisional values are population-adjusted (weighted) averages. The response-weighted values are very similar to the population-adjusted values.

<u>Region/Division</u>	<u>States</u>
Midwest	
East North Central	IL, IN, MI, OH, WI
West North Central	IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD
Northeast	
Middle Atlantic	NJ, NY, PA
New England	CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT
South	
East South Central	AL, KY, MS, TN
South Atlantic	DE, DC, FL, GA, MD, NC, SC, VA, WV
West South Central	AR, LA, OK, TX
West	
Mountain	AZ, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, UT, WY
Pacific	AK, CA, HI, OR, WA

State-Level Ratings

State level ratings for Generalist/Staff pharmacist demand are shown in Table 2. These demand ratings are the most inclusive; all panelists reported demand ratings for this category of pharmacists. These ratings are indicative of demand for pharmacists that is most consistent with the data that were reported previously in the Pharmacy Aggregate Demand Index (ADI).

Ratings provided by respondents spanned the range of rating levels (1 to 5). The most common rating was 3, representing balance in supply and demand. The distribution of ratings followed a classic normal distribution; a bell-shaped curve, with approximately equal numbers of extreme demand and supply ratings (5 and 1) and also nearly equal numbers of moderate demand and supply ratings (4 and 2).

Rating Scale:

- 5 = High demand: difficult to fill open positions
- 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

Table 2: States with Ratings for Generalist/Staff Pharmacists in Different Rating Ranges

Rating Range	Number of States	States
4.50	1	AK
4.00	1	MT
3.51 - 3.99	5	CA, HI, KY, SD, WA
3.50	4	MS, NE, OK, WY
3.01 - 3.49	9	AL, AR, ID, LA, ME, ND, OR, TX, WV
3.00	9	AZ, DC, KS, MN, MO, NY, OH, SC, WI
2.51 - 2.99	11	FL, GA, IL, IA, MD, MI, NJ, NM, NC, VT, VA
2.50	3	NH, RI, UT
2.01 - 2.49	7	CO, CT, DE, IN, MA, PA, TN
2.00	1	NV

Practice Setting Demand Ratings

Ratings for generalist/staff pharmacists were categorized by practice setting. Based on broad categorization of the type of organization that the panelist represented, the averages for typical, traditional primary practice settings are shown below.

Type of Practice Site	Average PDI Rating
Community	3.20
Institutional	2.88

These average ratings are weighted by the number of responses. Other setting categories represented by respondents were diverse and not numerous for additional detailed categorizations.