



**California State Board of Pharmacy**  
1625 N. Market Blvd, Suite N 219, Sacramento, CA 95834  
Phone (916) 574-7900  
Fax (916) 574-8618  
www.pharmacy.ca.gov

STATE AND CONSUMERS AFFAIRS AGENCY  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR

**ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Chairperson's Report to the Board and**  
**Meeting Summary of the July 17, 2007 Meeting**  
**(a non-public meeting)**  
**via teleconference**  
**8:30 - 9:45 a.m.**

**Attendees:** Ruth Conroy, Board Vice President and Chair  
Bill Powers, Board President  
Virginia Herold, Executive Officer  
Karen Cates, Assistant Executive Officer

**ITEM 1: Statistical Review of the Board of Pharmacy's Workload: 2001-2007**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

Graphic displays of licensing workload, staffing and complaints received and closed over the last six years are provided in **Attachment 1**.

**ITEM 2: Recognition of Pharmacists Who Have Been Licensed 50 Years**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

Since July 2005, the board has acknowledged 674 pharmacists with 50 or more years of licensure. Fifty-eight pharmacists reached this milestone between May and August 2007, and were sent a certificate and invited to a future board meeting for public recognition.

The board will commemorate pharmacists who have been licensed 50 years following the Organizational Development Committee's report.

**ITEM 3: Board Member Committee Roster**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

President Powers has appointed board members to the board's committees for the next year. A copy of the 2007-08 committee roster is provided in **Attachment 2**.

**ITEM 4: Personnel Update and Training Report**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

## 1. Staff Changes

The board has four inspector and one supervising inspector vacancies.

The board has two office staff vacancies – one is the public information specialist. Tracy Shintaku formerly occupied this position, and she recently returned to the Personnel Office of her prior employer, who had continued to entice her back since she came to the board. Interviews were held last week to find a replacement analyst for this important function.

The second vacant position is a board cashier. Currently, this position is being performed by Linda Alderman, a retired annuitant. Once the crush of June exam applicants is over, the board will transfer Amber Crosby (who processes pharmacist exam apps) to the cashier position, and recruit for a new application processor. This job transfer should occur in August or September.

The board will gain three positions in 2007-08 that were lost during the years of hiring freezes:

- Licensing unit expediter, to resolve problems with delayed applications and work to eliminate backlogs within the unit. This position will be filled with a temporary employee already working for the board.
- A second receptionist, to restore a very much needed position. Recruitment is underway for this position.
- Enforcement technician, which will be filled as a clerical position to aid in office duties in the enforcement unit.

## 2. AEO Reclassification

The board's request to reclassify the assistant executive officer's position to a more appropriate level, commensurate with the duties, was submitted late in June to the Department of Consumer Affairs. The department indicates that the review process will take about three months. The proposal must be approved by the DCA, Department of Personnel Administration and voted upon by the State Personnel Board.

## 3. Inspector and Supervising Inspector Examinations

From July 9-17, interviews with 70 plus applicants for the inspector civil service examination were scheduled. Although the executive officer sent letters to each applicant indicating that the \$2,000 monthly retention and recruitment differential looked likely, about 50 percent of the scheduled applicants did not appear for the interviews. This has been disappointing and frustrating to what we had hoped would be a very vigorous and competitive skills assessment process.

Supervising inspector interviews will be scheduled for August.

Employment interviews for both classes are planned for September.

#### 4. Required Sexual Harassment Prevention Training for Board Members

Board members are required to attend sexual harassment prevention training every two years. For most board members, this means he or she will need to complete a course before December 31, 2007. Executive Officer Herold will be sending lists of course providers for this training after the board meeting. The training course must be at least two hours.

If your employer offers a training course, it may comply with this requirement.

#### 5. Director's Executive Retreat

DCA Director Carrie Lopez is holding an executive retreat July 31 – August 2. The director's retreat will focus on team building exercises and strategic planning for the future five years, based on demographic projections.

Unfortunately, the board's executive officer is unable to go as the Competency Committee is holding its annual planning meeting in San Diego at the same time. The exam committee has undergone a great deal of change, and no board member will be able to attend the Competency Committee Meeting.

Executive Officer Herold has completed a worksheet about the board's operations and strategic planning processes that will be somehow used during the retreat.

### **ITEM 5: Budget Update and Report**

#### **FOR INFORMATION:**

##### 1. Prior Year's Budget 2006/07

The fiscal year ended June 30, 2007. However, final revenue and expenditures will not be available until August, so a final budget report to the board will be provided in October.

- *Revenue Projected: \$9,747,988*

Revenue for the last fiscal year was estimated to be comprised of \$5,791,000 in fees and \$157,000 in interest on money in the board's

contingency fund.

The board received the final repayment of \$3 million from the 2001 loan of \$6 million from the board's fund to the state's General Fund during a period of California's budget crisis. There is also an additional \$233,000 (estimated) in interest that was paid that was linked to the loan.

Final revenue for the year also includes additional amounts for cost recovery and citations and fines. During the fiscal year, the board collected \$436,711 in citations and fines and \$130,277 in cost recovery.

- *Expenditures Projected: \$8,522,000*

## 2. 2007-08 Budget

- *Revenue Projected: \$6,044,000 (assumes fee increase 1/1/08)*
- *Expenditures Projected: \$9,383,000 (includes budget change proposals listed below)*
- *Budget Change Proposals in Governor's Budget*

The Governor's Budget that was released on January 10, 2007 for 2007-08 contains two augments to the board's budget, both have been approved by the Senate and Assembly budget subcommittees:

- \$576,000 increase for a recruitment and retention differential for board inspectors.
- restoration of 3 positions (licensing expediter, enforcement analyst, receptionist); the positions are being restored without an increase in the board's expenditure authority. This means that the board will have to find funding for the positions within its budget. The Department of Finance would not approve an increase in funding for these positions because the board lacks sufficient money in its fund to sustain an increase in expenditures in the future (again, why the board needs to increase fees).

The total budget for the state has not been approved by the Legislature or Governor.

## 3. Fund Condition Report

According to a fund condition report prepared by the department: if the board increases fees to the statutory maximum on January 1, 2008 and the inspector recruitment and retention differential, the board will have the following fund conditions at the end of the identified fiscal years (**Attachment 3**):

2006/07	\$8,077,000	10.3 months in reserve
2007/08	\$4,732,000	5.9 months in reserve
2008/09	\$2,552,000	3.1 months in reserve
2009/10	\$ 134,000	0.2 months in reserve
2010/11	\$(2,438,000)	-3.0 months in reserve

Recognize that these estimates are built upon a conservative estimate of revenue (typically we collect about 10 percent more revenue from licensing fees than we estimate), and revenue does not include cost recovery or cite and fine revenue that we collect during the year.

Nevertheless, in addition to the regulation fee increase we propose to take effect in January 2008, we will need to seek a statutory increase in fees to take effect about January 2010, perhaps as late as July 2010.

#### 4. Cashiering Update

The Department of Consumer Affairs has hired a consultant team to review how the department's cashiering unit operates. The evaluation will look at all processes, all training, the classification of staff used and improvements needed.

The department's renewal process is broken. The cashiering unit has been understaffed and certainly under-performing for several years, to the point where there is now a renewal crisis. It is taking three weeks or more for checks to be cashed, and if there is any correction to be made as part of the renewal, it can be six or eight weeks or even longer before the information is provided to the board for resolution. In the interim, the status of the renewal is in suspense (although the check may have been cashed). The licensee then must mail overnight a second check to the board so the board itself can renew the license. Then when the duplicate fee appears, the board refunds the extra fee. This is extremely labor-intensive on the board's part (telephone calls, e-mails, mail handling, cashiering, refunding). But other significant cashiering irregularities have surfaced too – for example, recently the board received uncashed checks from this unit, some as old as three months. This would indicate the checks were simply sitting downstairs, awaiting someone to process or route them to the board.

The good news is that the department's cashiering unit has recently been augmented by five temporary staff, borrowed from another agency. The unit is working to eliminate some of the backlog, cashiering renewals more timely and sending the batch work to agencies on a more regular basis.

However, any serious change may not be in place for months, if not a year or longer.

5. I-Licensing Project Update

The department's I-Licensing project will offer online application and renewal of licenses (a much needed relief from mail-in renewals). A feasibility study report has been approved by the Department of Finance, and the board is in the first tier of new agencies that may be able to offer this service in the future.

The board spent \$50,000 last fiscal year on programming specifications needed for its programs. In the next two years, the board will spend \$143,000 (2007-08) and \$199,000 (2008-09) as its share of costs to implement this system department-wide.

Delays in securing vendors and new staff overseeing the project at the Department of Consumer Affairs have probably delayed the project six to nine months, so we are about 2 years away from implementing I-Licensing at the board.

6. Reimbursement to Board Members

The quarterly report on reimbursement to board members will be provided during the board meeting.

**ITEM 6: CURES Feasibility Study**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

California Health and Safety Code section 11165.5 requires the board to contract for a feasibility study report to evaluate the feasibility of real time reporting and access to data on prescriptions submitted to CURES. (New California law requires this data to be reported weekly, before 2007, the data was required to be reported monthly.)

The law requires the board to work with DOJ and the Medical Board to contract with a vendor to develop the feasibility study report, using money voluntarily contributed to the board specifically for this purpose. Since November, there has been a small group working to develop the proposed scope of work needed for the feasibility study report (FSR).

The most recent version relies upon a web-based access to data, that can be accomplished with data already reported to CURES (which now must be done weekly).

The board's executive officer has been working with the DCA's Divisions Administration and Information Technology and Department of Justice to assure the board's interests are represented.

A proposed legislative amendment the Department of Justice was going to sponsor to modify the definition of real time in section 11165.5 has apparently has been dropped by that agency.

**ITEM 7: Meeting Summary of the Organizational Development Committee  
Meeting of July 17, 2007**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

In addition to the items discussed above, the committee discussed the following items:

1. *Board Recognition of Notable California-Licensed Pharmacists*

In the July 2007 *The Script*, there is an article seeking nominations from pharmacists to recognize exceptional California preceptors.

The committee suggested that the board also contact the schools of pharmacy to identify who the schools have recognized as being outstanding preceptors. Ms. Herold will contact the schools.

2. *Strategic Plan 2007-08*

At the April Board Meeting, the board approved the 2007-08 modified strategic plan. A copy of the plan will be mailed to each board member and employee after this Board Meeting. Additionally, a copy will be placed on the board's Web site.

3. *Monthly Report to the Director*

Since June 2006, the board has been directed to provide a monthly report to the DCA director in a prescribed format.

The committee reviewed the recent monthly reports to the director.

4. *NABP Annual Meeting*

Executive Officer Herold and Board Member Schell attended the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy Meeting May 19-22 in Portland, Oregon. Also in attendance were Susan Ravnar and Ruth Conroy.

The NABP invited Supervising Inspector Judi Nurse to provide information about California's electronic pedigree requirements for prescription drugs. Other state boards are interested in the board's legislation requiring electronic

pedigrees as a way to prevent counterfeit medicine from entering the supply chain.

Other sessions held at the NABP meeting included medication errors and error reporting, and inspecting sterile compounding pharmacies.

5. NAPB Salary Survey

Earlier this year, the NABP did a salary survey of executive officers, chief inspectors, and inspectors. The results are in **Attachment 4**. The board's salaries are in the top tier.

6. Department of Personnel Administration Salary Survey

The committee reviewed a Department of Personnel Administration salary. The executive summary and key findings are provided in **Attachment 5**. The board was not included in this survey.

**ITEM 8: Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from January 31 and February 1, 2007**

**FOR ACTION:**

The minutes from the Board meeting of January 31 and February 1, 2007 are provided in **Attachment 6**. A motion is needed to approve these minutes.

**ITEM 9: Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from April 18 and 19, 2007**

**FOR ACTION:**

The minutes from the Board Meeting of April 18 and 19, 2007 are provided in **Attachment 7**. A motion is needed to approve these minutes.

# Attachment 1

*Graphic Displays of  
Workload  
2001-2007*

# Attachment 2

*Board of Pharmacy  
Committee Membership*

## Committee Assignments 2007-08

Communication & Public Ed: Ken Schell (chair)

Andrea Zinder

Hank Hough

Susan Ravnar

Enforcement Committee: Stan Goldenberg (chair)

Bill Powers

Ruth Conroy

Rob Swart

Tim Dazé

Licensing Committee: Ruth Conroy (chair)

Clarence Hiura

Susan Ravnar

Hank Hough

Bob Graul

Leg & Reg. Committee: Andrea Zinder (chair)

Ken Schell

Tim Dazé

Bob Graul

Organizational Development: Ruth Conroy (chair)

Bill Powers

Competency Committee: Rob Swart

Ruth Conroy

Subcommittee on Medicare Drug Plans:

Stan Goldenberg (chair)

Andrea Zinder

# Attachment 3

*Fund Condition*

# 0767 - State Board of Pharmacy Analysis of Fund Condition

(Dollars in Thousands)

Maximum Fees eff 7/1/08  
Includes Pay Differential (\$576,000 in FY 07-08 and ongoing)

## 2007-08 Governor's Budget

	ACTUAL 2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>BEGINNING BALANCE*</b>	\$ 4,111	\$ 7,285	\$ 8,077	\$ 4,732	\$ 2,552	\$ 134
Prior Year Adjustment	\$ 278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$ 4,389	\$ 7,285	\$ 8,077	\$ 4,732	\$ 2,552	\$ 134
<b>REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>						
Revenues:						
125600 Other regulatory fees	\$ 426	\$ 36	\$ 35	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50
125700 Other regulatory licenses and permits	\$ 1,618	\$ 1,277	\$ 1,283	\$ 1,505	\$ 1,505	\$ 1,505
125800 Renewal fees	\$ 4,591	\$ 4,462	\$ 4,529	\$ 5,696	\$ 5,696	\$ 5,696
125900 Delinquent fees	\$ 89	\$ 78	\$ 78	\$ 96	\$ 96	\$ 96
131700 Misc. revenue from local agencies	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
141200 Sales of documents	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
142500 Miscellaneous services to the public	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
150300 Income from surplus money investments	\$ 262	\$ 158	\$ 119	\$ 50	\$ 3	\$ -
150500 Interest Income From Interfund Loans	\$ 233	\$ 303	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
160400 Sale of fixed assets	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
161000 Escheat of unclaimed checks and warrants	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
161400 Miscellaneous revenues	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals, Revenues	\$ 7,231	\$ 6,314	\$ 6,044	\$ 7,397	\$ 7,350	\$ 7,347
Transfers from Other Funds						
F00001 GF loan per Item 1490-011-0767, BA of 2002	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000				
F00683 Teale Data Center (CS 15.00, Bud Act of 2005)						
Transfers to Other Funds						
T00001 GF loan per Item 1490-011-0767, BA of 2002	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals, Revenues and Transfers	\$ 10,231	\$ 9,314	\$ 6,044	\$ 7,397	\$ 7,350	\$ 7,347
Totals, Resources	\$ 14,620	\$ 16,599	\$ 14,121	\$ 12,129	\$ 9,902	\$ 7,481
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
Disbursements:						
0840 State Controller (State Operations) <u>Budget Act of 2006</u>	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
1110 Program Expenditures (State Operations) - Galley 2	\$ 7,335	\$ 8,517	\$ 9,383	\$ 9,577	\$ 9,768	\$ 9,964
9670 Equity Claims / Board of Control (State Operations)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Disbursements	\$ 7,335	\$ 8,522	\$ 9,389	\$ 9,577	\$ 9,768	\$ 9,964
<b>FUND BALANCE</b>						
Reserve for economic uncertainties	\$ 7,285	\$ 8,077	\$ 4,732	\$ 2,552	\$ 134	\$ (2,483)
Months in Reserve	10.3	10.3	5.9	3.1	0.2	-3.0

### NOTES:

- A. ASSUMES WORKLOAD AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS ARE REALIZED
- B. EXPENDITURE GROWTH PROJECTED AT 2% BEGINNING FY 2008-09

# Attachment 4

## *NABP Salary Surveys Of State Boards of Pharmacy*

CEO Salary Composite By District

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>District 1</i>	<i>District 2</i>	<i>District 3</i>	<i>District 4</i>	<i>District 5</i>	<i>District 6</i>	<i>District 7</i>	<i>District 8</i>	<i>Totals</i>
\$40,000-49,000				1					1
\$50,000-59,000	1		1	1					3
\$60,000-69,000	1	1							2
\$70,000-79,000	1	1	1		1	3	1		8
\$80,000-89,000			2		1		4		7
\$90,000-99,999		1			1		1	2	5
\$100,000 and over		2	1	1	1	3	2	2	12
<b>Totals</b>	3	5	5	3	4	6	8	4	38
%	7.89%	13.16%	13.16%	7.89%	10.53%	15.79%	21.05%	10.53%	100.00%

CEO Salary Composite By State Board Type

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>Autonomous</i>	<i>Centralized</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Totals</i>	<i>%</i>
\$40,000-49,000			1	1	2.86%
\$50,000-59,000			3	3	8.57%
\$60,000-69,000	1	1		2	5.71%
\$70,000-79,000	6		2	8	22.86%
\$80,000-89,000	3		3	6	17.14%
\$90,000-99,999	3		2	5	14.29%
\$100,000 and over	9		1	10	28.57%
<b>Totals</b>	22	1	12	35	100.00%

**Chief Inspector Salary Composite By District**

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>District 1</i>	<i>District 2</i>	<i>District 3</i>	<i>District 4</i>	<i>District 5</i>	<i>District 6</i>	<i>District 7</i>	<i>District 8</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Under \$30,000									0
\$30,000-39,000	1			1					2
\$40,000-49,000									0
\$50,000-59,000						1			1
\$60,000-69,000	1				1		1		3
\$70,000-79,000	1	3	1		1		3		9
\$80,000-89,999	1		2	1		3	2	1	10
\$90,000-99,999		1						1	2
\$100,000 and over			2					1	3
<b>Totals</b>	4	4	5	2	2	4	6	3	30
%	13.33%	13.33%	16.67%	6.67%	6.67%	13.33%	20.00%	10.00%	100.00%

Chief Inspector Salary Composite By State Board Type

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>Autonomous</i>	<i>Centralized</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Totals</i>	<i>%</i>
\$30,000-39,000			2	2	6.67%
\$40,000-49,000				0	0.00%
\$50,000-59,000	1			1	3.33%
\$60,000-69,000	2		1	3	10.00%
\$70,000-79,000	7		2	9	30.00%
\$80,000-89,000	6		4	10	33%
\$90,000-99,999	1		1	2	6.67%
\$100,000 and over	3			3	10.00%
<b>Totals</b>	20	0	10	30	100.00%

**Staff Inspector Salary Composite By District**

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>District 1</i>	<i>District 2</i>	<i>District 3</i>	<i>District 4</i>	<i>District 5</i>	<i>District 6</i>	<i>District 7</i>	<i>District 8</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Under \$30,000				1					1
\$31,000-39,000	1		1	1	1	2	1		7
\$40,000-49,000	1		1				1		3
\$50,000-59,000		1	1				1		3
\$60,000-69,000	1		1		1	3			6
\$70,000-79,000			1	1		2	1		5
\$80,000-89,000		1	1		1	1	2	2	8
\$90,000-99,000			1					1	2
\$100,000 and over				1	1				2
<b>Totals</b>	3	2	7	4	4	8	6	3	37
%	8.11%	5.41%	18.92%	10.81%	10.81%	21.62%	16.22%	8.11%	100.00%

Staff Inspector Salary Composite By State Board Type

<i>Salary Ranges</i>	<i>Autonomous</i>	<i>Centralized</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Totals</i>	<i>%</i>
Under \$30,000			1	1	2.86%
\$30,000-39,000	3		3	6	17.14%
\$40,000-49,000			3	3	8.57%
\$50,000-59,000	1		2	3	8.57%
\$60,000-69,000	4		1	5	14.29%
\$70,000-79,000	4		1	5	14.29%
\$80,000-89,000	5		3	8	23%
\$90,000-99,000	2			2	5.71%
\$100,000 and over	2			2	5.71%
<b>Totals</b>	21		14	35	100.00%

# Attachment 5

*Department of Personnel  
Administration  
State Salary Survey*

**OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES**

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite N-321, Sacramento, CA. 95834  
Telephone (916) 574-8300 FAX (916) 574-8308 www.dca.ca.gov

ORG DEVELOP



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** June 5, 2007

**TO:** ALL Executive Officers  
Bureau and Division Chiefs

**FROM:** Alyson Cooney, Assistant Personnel Officer  
Office of Human Resources

**SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION SALARY SURVEY**

The Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) has published a compensation survey, which was completed on specific benchmark classifications. The purpose of the compensation survey of these classifications was to aid DPA in determining the salary increases and "Labor Market Adjustments" that were not tied to salary changes authorized via the collective bargaining process.<sup>1</sup>

In an effort to obtain comparisons with the more common functions performed within state service, the DPA survey was conducted on benchmark classifications in the general occupational areas of:

- Administrative and Office
- Medical and Related
- Engineering and Scientific
- Trades and Support Services
- Safety
- Executive
- Managerial

While the benchmark classifications may not be an exact match to some of the more specific or specialized State classifications, DPA used these classes for general comparison in the minimum qualifications for education, license, etc. The survey of these benchmark classifications examined the *total compensation*, which DPA defined as including the following factors:

- Base monthly salary
- Employer contributions to employee health, dental, and vision benefits
- Employer pickup of employee retirement contribution
- Employer deferred compensation contributions
- Longevity pay, education pay, incentive/bonus pay, recruitment and retention pay
- Employer Social Security contributions

---

<sup>1</sup> The survey and a listing of the specific classifications studied are available for viewing on the DPA website located at [DPA - Total Compensation Survey - Contents](#).

## **DCA Classifications and Future Requests for Salary Changes**

DCA has asked DPA about other classifications which may be studied. DPA has no plans to conduct specific studies on any other specialized functions/classifications at this time; however, we have been advised that this does not preclude DCA from commissioning studies on our own behalf.

There is no argument from DPA that there are many civil service classes that lag behind the private sector in salary; however, DPA's position is that the State's financial status is not at a point where salaries can be raised across the board. DPA will continue to attempt to address salary problems on a class-by-class basis with departments (e.g., pay differentials) as needs arise (typically recruitment and retention problems) and as departments can provide the necessary documentation to support the request.

## **Salary Term Definition**

In the past, DPA has used the term, "special salary adjustment" to broadly describe different kinds of salary increases. DPA has now broken down these different kinds of salary increases to two specific types:

Labor Market Adjustments - based on external comparisons

Equity Adjustments - based on internal comparisons

To further assist Departments with the definition to these two specific types of salary adjustments, DPA has issued a more detailed definition of the different types of salary adjustments. (Attachment A – Types of Salary Adjustments)

## **Future Compensation Proposals**

DPA will be developing prioritization criteria for compensation proposals in the near future. These compensation proposals will be submitted to the Governor's Office and Cabinet for approval. Once DPA receives approval from the Governor's Office and Cabinet, DPA will issue an instruction memorandum that will assist Departments in prioritizing compensation proposals. **DPA has advised DCA that it is not urgent at this time to assert time and cost into finalizing a compensation proposal to DPA until after DPA issues the instruction memorandum that describes the prioritization criteria.**

After DPA has issued the prioritization criteria, the DCA Office of Human Resources will issue a memorandum to all DCA Boards, Bureaus, Committees, Commissions, and Divisions advising them of the criteria DPA has provided. These prioritization criteria will give DCA an idea of which compensation proposals will receive priority consideration.

## **CURRENT DPA Criteria for Requesting Pay Differentials**

The current criteria DPA requires when requesting a Pay Differential includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Description of reasons which support the establishment, revision, abolishment, or continuation of a Pay Differential.

- Description of the purpose, specific conditions, or circumstances that warrant the type of Pay Differential requested (e.g., special license or certificate, bilingual skills, work location, etc.)
- Identify existing or related Pay Differentials. Discuss the historical or current classification relationships. Discuss potential impact on other classes if the requested Pay Differential is approved.
- Prepare a draft Pay Differential summary sheet or Pay Differential proposal. If necessary, provide an explanation and/or justification for the criteria and applicable conditions regarding the Pay Differential.
- Discuss how the Pay Differential will address/resolve the problem.
- Discuss alternatives considered.
- Summary of findings/conclusions (Provide comments elicited from Labor Relations, Department, or other entities as deemed appropriate.)

### Recruitment Statistics

When requesting a Pay Differential from DPA, it is helpful to provide statistics which may include, but are not limited to the following:

- How many vacancies currently exist? To determine the vacancy rate, divide the number of vacant positions by the number of total budgeted positions.
- How long do positions remain vacant?
- What is the examination plan? For the last three years, provide data on how often the exam was given, what types of recruitment efforts were made, how many applicants applied, the number of candidates on certification list, etc.
- What is the vacancy rate over the last three years? Provide examination data for the time period.

### Retention/Turnover Statistics

- What is the turnover rate? To determine the turnover rate, divide the number of employees who have left during the last 12 months by the total number of employees in the class. Wherever possible, exclude separations or turnover due to retirements, promotions, or dismissals.
- Vacancy and/or turnover rates of 10% or less are generally considered normal and not a cause for concern unless the class is one that performs such a critical function that a vacancy or turnover rate of even 10% jeopardizes the maintenance of the critical function.
- Vacancy and/or turnover rates of 15 to 20% begin to be a problem and could be a cause for concern depending on the particular circumstances and the functions performed by the class.
- Compaction of salary differentials due to the impact of negotiated increases for rank-and-file classes.
- Salary inequities between classes of comparable responsibility and/or value.
- Change in the duties or concept of a class.
- Other management concerns, e.g., maintenance of labor peace, lack of upward mobility opportunities.
- Identify any special skills unique to the class that would justify a higher level than other similar classes.

## Other Contributing Reasons Besides Salary Statistics Contributing to the Recruitment/Retention Problem

Identify other reasons besides salary that may be contributing to the recruitment and/or retention problem; for example:

- Lack of upward mobility.
- Lack of educational or other incentives.
- Poor morale or working conditions.

## What Has The Department Done To Abate These Recruitment/Retention Problems?

- Focused recruitment.
- Improved examination planning.
- Creation of upward mobility paths.
- Flexible work hours/schedules.
- Improved reimbursement for educational expenses.
- Establishment of alternate ranges for acquisition of additional education and/or experience.

## Possible Sample Criteria Documentation

The DCA Office of Human Resources requests that managers/supervisors review the Personnel Procedures Handbook Chapter 800, "Separations," Section 800-7, "Exit Interviews" for possible supporting documentation that may be used in the compensation proposals in the future. Sample exit interview questions that may assist in developing supporting documentation for compensation proposals are:

- Where is staff going (to what department and to what classification)?
- Why is staff leaving (is there an underlying reason for the transfer or separation, e.g. salary, promotion, retirement, location of work site, lack of advancement, not suited to the work performed, dislike of or poor working conditions, etc)?

## Questions

Questions concerning DCA classifications and future requests for salary changes should be addressed to your Classification and Pay Analyst.

# Executive Summary

For several years, human resources professionals have recognized that because employers offer multi-faceted compensation programs, salary comparisons alone no longer provide valid measures of competitiveness in the labor market nor do such measures adequately track employer costs. Accordingly, DPA undertook the State's first comprehensive survey in over 20 years to learn about the "total compensation" packages provided by other employers with whom we compete for employees.

Our effort to gather this information goes hand in hand with a recommendation by the California Performance Review, which in 2004 recommended the State of California take a more business-oriented approach to its compensation policies. CPR recommended that we use objective labor market data to guide policy makers in allocating compensation dollars. Although CPR cited salary surveys to collect this data, DPA expanded the focus to also include other compensation items.

This preliminary report of our findings comes with some caveats. First, our analysis of the data is by no means complete. However, rather than delay its release, we believe it serves the public interest to make the data and our initial findings available while we continue our review. We also invite others to review this data, which is why we've posted it on our Web site.

Another caveat concerns the private sector comparisons included in this preliminary report. Although our primary focus is total compensation (i.e., salary and benefits), the job-by-job comparisons we've reported for the private sector include only salaries. The private sector benefit information we used was less detailed than the public sector information, a shortcoming we hope to correct in future surveys.

We also must acknowledge that other factors contribute to decisions on the allocation of compensation dollars, such as working conditions and vacancy and turnover rates. These factors require further study.

Finally, we recognize that compensation lags alone, while significant, will not be the only driver in the discussion over how the State allocates limited resources. Inevitably, the State's decision makers must balance a wide range of competing priorities which together with our human resources affect public satisfaction with our delivery of public services.

This survey marks our first step to developing a comprehensive database that the State employer can rely upon to make fiscally sound business decisions about its employee compensation policies. Assuredly, improvements and adjustments to the survey will be needed for future surveys – but this is a good beginning.

Revised April 24, 2006.  
© 2006 State of California.

## Key Findings

This preliminary report provides the results of an actual survey of public sector classifications conducted by Cooperative Personnel Services under contract to DPA.

For the private sector data, DPA purchased several licensed reports from reputable professional survey organizations that gather private sector compensation data under conditions of strict confidentiality. However, these private sector sources are limited when it comes to making job-by-job comparisons of total compensation. Despite the limitations, we opted to report this private sector data rather than limit our comparisons to other public sector employers.

Additional study is needed to fill in data gaps and provide a more accurate picture of “total compensation,” as well as vacancy and turnover rates for benchmark classes. In the meantime, we can report the following preliminary findings:

- State salaries and total compensation lead the private sector for clerical jobs, accountants, custodians, and trade classes such as electricians, stationary engineers, but lag behind similar jobs in the public sector.
- The State leads the private sector in its general analyst classifications (such as personnel and budget analyst) and lags other similar jobs in the public sector.
- The State lags in all medical and related occupations. The greatest private sector lag is for occupational therapists, where the lag is 39 percent.
- In the auditor and registered nurse classifications, the State salaries lag behind other employers – public and private. For auditors, the lag is 7 – 8 percent; for RNs, it’s 3 – 5 percent. (These lags do not reflect recent pay increases for RNs resulting from a federal court order.)
- State compensation generally lags the public sector employers surveyed in all benchmark classifications. In most cases, the lag was between 15 and 30 percent.
- The State offers similar health benefits to those of other large private sector employers (1000 or more employees), but exceeds 33 percent of the labor market which offers no health benefits.
- A State retiree eligible for the full employer health contribution in retirement secures an additional \$494,000 in compensation over 20 years.
- In information technology, State salaries lag the other public employers in the survey. Comparisons with the private sector are limited given that only one State benchmark class could be matched to a comparable private sector job; in that case, the State salary lag is less than the public sector lag.

Revised May 11, 2006.  
© 2006 State of California.

**TYPES OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS  
(PBX – Triage Chart 03-09-07)**

**Issued By:**

**Department of Personnel Administration (DPA)**

**1. Pay Differential (PD)**

- State agency presents compelling need to provide additional compensation for a class beyond its base salary
- Based on continuing recruitment and/or retention difficulties in specific positions of the class, such as by location, and/or to recognize specific skills acquired and used in the performance of duties as a result of employees' possession of specific licenses, certifications, etc. that are not required as a condition for appointment to the class (e.g., the Recruitment and Retention Differentials, Bilingual Pay Differential, Training Officer Differential, etc.)
- May be established during the renegotiation of an expiring labor contract or mid term of a labor contract
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department(s)/DPA/Finance/Labor Unions/Excluded Employee Organization

**2. Classification Changes**

**A. Establishment of a New Classification:**

- State agency presents compelling evidence of the need to create a new classification
- If DPA concurs with request, union notice occurs and after union agreement, submits request for new class to State Personnel Board (SPB)
- After SPB establishes the new class, DPA establishes salary/compensation for the new class with union, considering the relationship of the new class to existing classes within State service within the same occupational group and/or to other employment jurisdictions, as appropriate
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department(s)/DPA/SPB/ Finance/Labor Unions/Excluded Employee Organization

**B. Revision to Existing Classification:**

- State agency presents compelling evidence that significant changes to the class concept of an existing class has occurred warranting a change to the salary for the class
- Usually occurs as a result of programmatic changes that change the nature of the duties of the class
- Class changes are submitted to SPB when required to modify class specification
- After SPB's approval, when required, DPA adjusts the salary of the class with union as required
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department(s)/DPA/SPB/ Finance/Labor Unions/Excluded Employee Organization

**3. Equity Adjustment (EA)**

- Data demonstrates disparity in the salary relationship between two or more classes performing comparable duties within State service; the internal relationship of classes and compaction issues may be addressed
- These generally occur during the renegotiation of expiring labor contracts, may occur mid term of a labor contract
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department(s)/DPA/Finance/Labor Unions

## TYPES OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS (PBX – Triage Chart 03-09-07)

Issued By:  
Department of Personnel Administration (DPA)

### 4. Labor Market Adjustment (LMA)

- Labor market survey demonstrates lag in State compensation compared to other public employers and/or the private sector
- Typically results in a base salary adjustment
- For rank and file employees, occurs during renegotiation of expiring labor contract
- Agencies Involved: DPA/Finance/Labor Unions/ Excluded Employee Organization

### 4. General Salary Increase (GSI)

- GSI recognizes the reduction in buying power of salaries as a result increased costs of living
- Occurs only during renegotiation of expiring labor contract
- Agencies Involved: DPA/Finance/Labor Unions/Excluded Employee Organization

### 5. Career Executive Assignment (CEA) Salary Change

- There are two CEA salary ranges, each with specific maximum rates:
  - Attorney/Engineer/Physician CEA: \$12,941
  - Non Attorney/Non Engineer/Non Physician CEA: \$10,174
- Exceptions to exceed the maximum salary rate (\$10,174) for Non Attorney/Non Engineer/Non Physician must involve extraordinary operational impact, such as severe salary compaction, and require approval of DPA before the exceptional rate may be assigned to the CEA
- The total of salary increases for a specific CEA appointment within a fiscal year may not exceed 10%; requests to exceed 10% requires DPA approval before such increase may be assigned to the CEA
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department/DPA

### 6. Exempt Position Salary Changes

- Exempt positions are established by Level: Exempt Level "A" through "0" for management positions and Exempt Level "P1" through "Q3" for non-management positions
- Each Exempt Level has an established salary range
- DPA and the Governor's Office must approve:
  - ✓ All exempt appointments
  - ✓ Salary increases beyond the maximum of the salary range of the Exempt Level of the appointee
  - ✓ An increase to the Exempt Level of the exempt position
  - ✓ A decrease to the Exempt Level of the exempt position
  - ✓ Salary increases that exceed 10% within a 12 month period
- Agencies involved: Requesting Department/DPA/Governor's Office

# Attachment 6

*Minutes of the Board Meeting  
of  
January 31 and February 2, 2007*

# Attachment 7

*Minutes of the Board Meeting  
of  
April 25 and 26, 2007*

# ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Goal 5: Achieve the board's mission and goals.

Outcome: An effective organization.

Objective 5.1	Obtain 100 percent approval for identified program needs by June 30, 2011.
Measure:	Percentage approved for identified program needs.
Tasks:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review workload and resources to streamline operations, target backlogs and maximize services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1st Qtr 06/07: Monthly statistics of workload reviewed to identify backlogs.</i></li> <li><i>Sept. 2006: Supervising Inspector Meeting where management reviews all cases under investigation.</i></li> <li><i>Dec. 2006: Licensing processes converted to department's applicant tracking system (ATS).</i></li> <li><i>2nd Qtr 06/07: Monthly statistics of workload reviewed to identify backlogs.</i></li> <li><i>Feb. 2007: Inspectors Meeting convened to prioritize investigation cases.</i></li> <li><i>April 2007: Inspectors Meeting convened to prioritize investigation cases.</i></li> <li><i>3rd Qtr 06/07: Licensing and Enforcement office staff meet with Supervisors to reduce emerging workload issues.</i></li> <li><i>June 2007: Inspectors Meeting convened to prioritize investigation cases.</i></li> <li><i>4th Qtr 06/07: Licensing and Enforcement office staff meet with Supervisors to reduce emerging workload issues.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Develop budget change proposals to secure funding for needed resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>July 2006: Budget Change Proposals submitted for Administration review.</i></li> <li><i>Jan. 2007: Governor's proposed budget for 2007/08 contains two BCPs:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>(1) \$576,000 for recruitment and retention differential of \$2,000 per month for each board inspector/pharmacist.</i></li> <li><i>(2) restoration of three positions lost during the hiring freezes of the early 2000s (receptionist, complaint analyst, licensing technician).</i></li> </ul> </li> <li><i>Mar. &amp; Apr. 07: Legislature begins review of Governor's 2007/08 proposed budget.</i></li> <li><i>July 2007: Board-submitted proposals still in Governor's budget for 2007/08.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Perform strategic management of the board through all committees and board activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Aug. 2006: Strategic plan approved at July 2006 Board Meeting. Staff redesigns quarterly reporting format for committee reports to the board.</i></li> <li><i>Oct. 2006: Quarterly report of each committee's progress toward strategic goals reported to board.</i></li> <li><i>Jan. 2007: Quarterly report of each committee's progress toward strategic goals reported to board.</i></li> <li><i>Mar.-Apr. 2007: Each board committee reviews strategic plan for 2007/08. Board acts on 2007/08 Strategic Plan.</i></li> <li><i>April 2007: Quarterly report of each committee's progress toward strategic goals made during board meeting.</i></li> <li><i>July 2007: Quarterly report of each committee's progress toward strategic goals made during board meeting.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<p><b>4. Manage the board's financial resources to ensure fiscal viability and program integrity.</b></p> <p><i>Oct. 2006: Committee and board review budget figures for revenue and expenditures for 2005/06 and 2006/07. A fund condition report is also reviewed; possible fee increase is possibly needed to take effect July 1, 2008.</i></p> <p><i>Oct. 2006: Committee and board review budget figures for revenue and expenditures for 2005/06 and 2006/07. New BCPs and salary adjustments for all staff continue to increase annual expenditures. A fund condition report is also reviewed; possible fee increase is possibly needed to take effect July 1, 2008.</i></p> <p><i>Jan. 2007: Board reviews, revenue, expenditures, and budget forecast for 2007/08 and future years. Fee increase may be needed by January 2008 if inspector salary differential is approved.</i></p> <p><i>April 2007: Committee recommends board act to increase fees to statutory maximum levels effective January 1, 2008 to secure board operations and staffing.</i></p> <p><i>May 2007: Staff release proposed fee increase regulations for 45-day comment period.</i></p>
<p><b>Objective 5.2</b></p> <p><b>Measure:</b></p>	<p><b>Maintain 100 percent staffing of all board positions.</b></p> <p><b>Percentage staffing of board positions.</b></p>
<p><b>Tasks:</b></p>	<p><b>1. Continue active recruitment of pharmacists for inspector positions.</b></p> <p><i>Oct. 2006: Board has four inspectors and one supervising inspector vacancies. Staff is working with DCA on new civil service exams, and job analyses for both classifications have been done by incumbent board staff. Efforts to secure a \$2,000 monthly recruitment and retention differential for inspectors is required before release of examination announcement. Meetings held with the Department of Finance, DCA and Department of Personnel Administration to secure the differential, which will provide parity with salaries paid to other state-employed pharmacists.</i></p> <p><i>Jan. 2007: Board has four inspector and one supervising inspector vacancies. Exam announcement for inspector and supervising inspector classes, results in more than 60 applicants for the inspector classification and 18 for supervising inspector, which are record numbers of applicants for both classifications. Efforts continue to secure \$2,000 monthly salary differential for inspectors before 2007/08.</i></p> <p><i>April 2007: Board has four inspector and one supervising inspector vacancies. Exam announcement for inspector and supervising inspector classes, results in more than 60 applicants for the inspector classification and 18 for supervising inspector, which are record numbers of applicants for both classifications. Efforts continue to secure \$2,000 monthly salary differential for inspectors before 2007/08.</i></p> <p><i>July 2007: Inspector civil service exam conducted of approximately 70 applicants.</i></p>

	<p>2. <b>Vigorously recruit for any vacant positions.</b>  <i>July-Oct. 2006: Board vacancies filled for: Enforcement Technician, Office Technician, Filing Clerk, and Public Records Request Analyst.</i>  <i>Jan. 2007: Board vacancies filled for: Receptionist, Enforcement Technician, Enforcement Analyst, Budget Analyst, Cashier, Executive Office Technician, Business Services Analyst, Public Outreach Analyst.</i>  <i>April 2007: All Board staff positions filled except for inspector, supervising inspector and assistant executive officer (where a reclassification request is underway).</i>  <i>July 2007: All Board staff positions filled except for public information analyst, inspector, supervising inspector and assistant executive officer (where a reclassification request is underway).</i></p> <p>3. <b>Perform annual performance and training assessments of all staff.</b>  <i>2nd Qtr 06/07: All probationary employees receive assessments.</i></p>
--	---

--	--

Objective 5.3	Implement 10 strategic initiatives to automate board processes by June 30, 2011.
Measure:	Number of strategic initiatives implemented to automate board processes.
Tasks:	<p>1. <b>Implement automated applicant tracking (ATS).</b>  <i>Oct. 2006: Progress continues on reviewing scenarios and pilot testing the system. DCA staff assigned to project leave and momentum is slowed. Anticipated completion date remains as December 2006.</i>  <i>Jan. 2007: ATS activated for all board licensing programs.</i></p> <p>2. <b>Implement online license renewal and application submission features (I-Licensing).</b>  <i>July 2006: Interim Executive Officer Herold put on DCA's executive sponsor committee for this project.</i>  <i>Oct. 2006: The board meets with design staff to assure necessary program components are part of system specifications. The state's budget allocates \$50,000 this year for development activities.</i>  <i>Jan. 2007: Board executive officer continues as a member of the department's Executive Steering Committee as an executive sponsor. Work is focused on securing vendors for the project.</i>  <i>April 2007: Board executive officer continues as a member of the department's Executive Steering Committee as an executive sponsor. Work is focused on securing vendors for the project. Project delayed due to contracting issues for service vendors six to nine months.</i>  <i>July 2007: Board executive officer continues as a member of the department's Executive Steering Committee as an executive sponsor. Work is focused on securing vendors for the project. Project delayed due to contracting issues for service vendors six to nine months.</i></p> <p>3. <b>Integrate telephone features to improve board services without adding staff resources.</b>  <i>July 2006: Phone system modified to allow "zeroing out" early in telephone message so consumers can reach a live operator more quickly.</i></p> <p>4. <b>Use the department's newly created "ad hoc" system to generate data for reports.</b>  <i>July 2007: Two staff trained in using enforcement or licensing reports.</i></p> <p>5. <b>Deployed upgraded all-in-one printer/scanner/fax/copiers to all inspectors, along with Lotus Notes e-mail upgrades. (December 2006)</b></p> <p>6. <b>Inspectors get upgraded Blackberries to allow Internet connection through their laptop computers. (April 2007)</b></p>

Objective 5.4	Provide for communication venues to communicate within the board by June 30, 2011.
Measure:	Number of communication venues to communicate within the board.
Tasks:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="357 194 1485 292">1. Continue the Communication Team to improve communication among staff and host quarterly staff meetings. <i>Dec. 2006: TCT hosts staff meeting.</i></li> <li data-bbox="357 302 1453 478">2. Continue Enforcement Team meetings with board members and enforcement staff. <i>Dec. 2006: Inspector meeting convened to discuss new laws for 2007 and to review workload statistics.</i> <i>Jan. 2007: Inspector meeting convened to discuss workload.</i> <i>June 2007: Inspector workload and case management discussed.</i></li> <li data-bbox="357 488 1493 741">3. Convene annual inspector meetings to ensure standardized investigation and inspection processes, law and practice updates and earn continuing education credit. <i>Dec. 2006: Inspectors have day-long meeting with pharmaceutical consultants of the Department of Health Services Licensing and Certification staff; first such joint meeting of these pharmacists who perform similar duties. Also, board inspectors receive new equipment and software upgrades.</i> <i>June 2007: Inspectors have day-long meeting to discuss pharmacy laws and policies.</i></li> </ol>

Objective 5.5	Annually conduct at least 2 outreach programs where public policy issues on health care are being discussed.
Measure:	Number of outreach programs conducted in one year.
Tasks:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="360 229 1492 555"> <p>1. Convene the Subcommittee on Medicare Part D Implementation.</p> <p><i>Nov. 2006: Subcommittee meets, discusses on going problems impeding patient care.</i></p> <p><i>Feb. 2007: Public forum held in conjunction with Board Meeting with stakeholders, policymakers and patient advocates to problem solve issues impeding patient care.</i></p> <p><i>March 2007: Board holds second forum on Medicare Prescription Plans, a six-hour session following February's meeting, which was too short.</i></p> <p><i>May 2007: Planning begins for a public meeting with California Congressional representation.</i></p> </li> <li data-bbox="360 565 1492 1332"> <p>2. Convene the Workgroup to Implement the e-pedigree.</p> <p><i>Sept. 28 2006: Meeting convened in Sacramento, about 80 people attend. Presentations by EPCglobal, Supervising Inspector Nurse, McKesson and Johnson &amp; Johnson.</i></p> <p><i>Dec. 2006: Meeting convened in Sacramento at least 80 people attended. Presentations made by EPCglobal, AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal Health and a technology vendor. Pilots now conducted or underway at largest 3 wholesalers testing electronic pedigrees from manufacturers through wholesalers.</i></p> <p><i>Jan. 2007: EPCglobal completes work on electronic messaging standards for electronic pedigrees.</i></p> <p><i>Feb. 2007: Attend EPCglobal's regional summit on hospital implementation issues involving electronic pedigrees.</i></p> <p><i>March 2007: EPCglobal meets with two board members and executive staff to walk through messaging standards and scenarios to ensure the standard meets California's requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Public Meeting convened in Sacramento at least 80 people attend. Presentations are made by EPCglobal, AmerisourceBergen and SupplyScape.</i></p> <p><i>June 2007: Public meeting convened in Sacramento; well over 120 attend. Presentations made by EPCglobal, Pfizer, Walgreens, and PhRMA. Hospital pharmacies begin attending.</i></p> </li> <li data-bbox="360 1342 1492 1446"> <p>3. Host the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy District 7 and 8 Meeting in California.</p> <p><i>Oct. 2006: Meeting hosted by the board; nearly 100 individuals attended.</i></p> </li> </ol>

**4. Attend outreach programs.**

*1st Qtr 06/07: Presented information on e-pedigree requirements in California at the LogiPharma National Conference in Austin, Texas. Staffed a booth at the San Mateo Senior Fest where approximately 600 people attended.*

*2nd Qtr 06/07: Provided information about California's pending changes to electronic pedigree requirements at the National EPCglobal conference in Los Angeles. Attended and presented information at the California Association of Health Facilities Convention in Palm Springs. Hosted an information booth at a AARP event for Seniors in Sacramento. Provided information about California's electronic pedigree requirements at Secure Pharma 2007, a national pharmaceutical supply chain security conference in Philadelphia.*

*3rd Qtr 06/07: Provided information about the board and its priorities to pharmacists at CPhA's annual meeting. The board provided information about California's electronic pedigree requirements at the Generic Manufacturers Association Annual Meeting. The board staffed two booths, one for pharmacists at CPhA's annual meeting and one for the public at the 2007 Consumer Protection Day Forum in San Diego.*

*4th Qtr 06/07: Presentation made at National Association of Boards of Pharmacy Annual Meeting on California's e-pedigree requirements. Also hosted a poster session.*

**5. Provide outreach programs.**

*1st Qtr 06/07: Provided five CE presentations to pharmacist groups and associations statewide.*

*2nd Qtr 06/07: Provided four CE presentations to pharmacist groups and associations statewide.*

*3rd Qtr 06/07: Provided six presentations to pharmacist groups and associations statewide.*

*4th Qtr 06/07: Provided five CE presentations to pharmacist groups and associations statewide and two presentations to schools of pharmacy.*

Objective 5.6

Respond to all public record requests within 10 days.

Measure:

Percentage response to public record requests within 10 days.

Tasks:

1. Respond to public records requests within 10 days (e.g., license verifications, investigative/disciplinary information, licensing information).

	Qtr 1		Qtr 2		Qtr 3		Qtr 4	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a) License Verifications								
≤ 10 days	91	45%	170	51%	178	90%	199	93%
11-30 days	76	37%	139	42%	17	8%	16	7%
31 + days	38	18%	25	7%	4	2%	0	0%
b) Disciplinary Information								
≤ 10 days	14	54%	49	73%	105	97%	45	98%
11-30 days	6	23%	7	11%	3	3%	1	2%
31 + days	6	23%	11	16%	0	0%	0	0%
c) Licensing Information								
≤ 10 days	52	70%	4	33%	84	50%	41	63%
11-30 days	12	16%	5	42%	62	37%	16	25%
31 + days	10	14%	3	25%	21	13%	8	12%

2. Respond to subpoenas within the timeline specified.

	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4
Subpoenas Received	1	6	2	2
Responded within required time	1	4	1	1
Not responded to within required time	0	2	1	1

3. Respond to specific requests for data reports list.

*1st Qtr 06/07: Submit agency statistical profile summarizing data for 2005-2006.*

*Submit monthly report to director's office that highlights major activities of board licensing and enforcement statistics.*

*Sept. 2006: Submitted the Board's emergency response disaster recovery and business continuity plans to the Department of Consumer Affairs as required annually by Executive order May 4, 2006.*

*2nd Qtr 06/07: Submit monthly report to director's office that highlights major activities of board licensing and enforcement statistics.*

*3rd Qtr 06/07: Submit monthly report to director's office that highlights major activities of board licensing and enforcement statistics.*

*Dec. 2006: Submitted revised software management plan and compliance certification to the Department of Consumer Affairs.*

*4th Qtr 06/07: Submit monthly report to director's office that highlights major activities of board licensing and enforcement statistics.*