



Organizational Development Committee

Victor Law, Licensee Member, Board President
 Gregory Lippe, Public Member, Board Vice President

a. Budget Report/Update

Fiscal Year 2017/2018

The Chief of Fiscal Operations for DCA recently released a memo regarding the FI\$CAL system and the delay in the final 2017/18 budget information. As indicated in the memo, due to challenges in the reconciliation and closing of fiscal year 2017/18 the year-end statistics will not be available until after June 30, 2019. **Attachment 1** contains a copy of the memo.

Fiscal Year 2018/2019

On June 28, 2018, the Governor signed the budget for FY 2018/19. The new budget year began July 1, 2018. The board’s spending authorization for the year is \$26,007,000, which is an 11.3% increase from the prior year.

As previously noted there continues to be a delay in receiving budget information due to the problems with the FI\$CAL accounting system. Based on the preliminary reporting the board believes it has received \$19,638,700 in revenue originating from the following:

Revenue Sources Table

Source	Amount	Percentage
Licensing	\$18,145,200	92%
Citation Fines	\$778,500	4%
Cost Recovery	\$596,100	3%
Interest	\$118,900	1%

Further, the board has expended \$13,831,705 through February 2019. The largest expenditure categories are detailed below.

Expenditures Table

Source	Amount	Percentage
Personnel	\$10,726,324	78%
Enforcement	\$2,096,597	15%
Travel	\$202,479	2%

Below is a summary of the fund condition report prepared by the department with the available budget reports. The fund condition assumes that the new fees will be in place no later than July 1, 2020.

Fund Condition Table

Fiscal Year	Fund Balance	Months in Reserve
2017/2018	\$8,614,000	3.7
2018/2019	\$4,444,000	1.9
2019/2020	\$829,000	0.4
2020/2021	\$5,513,000	2.3
2021/2022	9,728,000	4.0

Attachment 1 includes detailed budget charts as well as the fund condition prepared by the department.

b. Board Member Attendance Information

Attachment 2 includes a summary of board member attendance at committee and board meetings this fiscal year.

c. Discussion and Consideration of Consolidation of Committee Meetings and Board Meetings

The Organization Development Committee is requesting the board’s consideration of a proposal to streamline committee and board meetings. Specifically, the committee requests members consideration of modifying the meeting structure.

Specifically, the proposal would include annual basis each committee would meet independent of a board meeting to establish the policy goals for the committee for the upcoming year. The policy goals should directly link to the board’s strategic plan and could

coincide with the management of the plan. Following the annual meeting, committee members would be advised of updates on progress of the policy goals through committee meetings that coincide with the full board meeting. This will allow committees to provide additional guidance to staff and address any unexpected issues. Staff notes that there are some committee where this revised model may provide a challenge, e.g. the compounding committee where the amount of work and limited period of time to complete the work creates challenges.

The full board would continue to meet quarterly, however the first day of meeting would transition to committee meeting updates, with the second day focusing on consideration of issues for the full board.

A similar process is currently in use for the Legislation and Regulation Committee, which typically meets the morning of the first day of the board meeting, preceding the start of the full board meeting. This process allows for public comment during the committee meeting that is summarized for members the following day during the committee chair's report to the full board.

Such an approach would reduce some of the challenges members face with balance board work with other priorities. Further, it would streamline the development of meeting materials.

d. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt as a Board Precedential Decision Under Government Code Section 11425.6 - ESI Mail Pharmacy Services, Inc. DBA Express Scripts; Board of Pharmacy Case 44657

Staff recommends the board's action to adopt as a precedential decision the ESI Mail Pharmacy Services matter.

As indicated in the memo, the board issued a citation to ESI Mail Pharmacy Services, Inc., (ESI) for violations of California pharmacy law. ESI is licensed with the board as a nonresident pharmacy.

On appeal of the citation, ESI argued that the board lacked the jurisdiction to cite for a violation of California law. Rather ESI asserted that the board could only cite for violations of the resident state's law.

The board was successful on the appeal.

Provided in **Attachment 3** is a memo from DCA counsel Kelsey Pruden providing more detail on the matter as well as the decision.

e. Update on Implementation of the Acceptance of Credit Cards for Renewal Payments

On December 17, 2018, the board implemented the online credit card renewal payment process for pharmacy technicians. Between December 17, 2018 and March 31, 2019, the board received 2,218 pharmacy technician renewal payments through the credit card process.

On February 27, 2019, the board implemented the online credit card renewal payment process for pharmacists (including advanced practice pharmacists). Between February 27 and March 31, 2019, the board received 193 pharmacist renewal payments through the credit card process.

This process will be implemented for designated representatives in May 2019.

f. Discussion Assembly Bill 434 Related to Accessibility Standards

Assembly Bill 434 states that before July 1, 2019, and biennially thereafter, the director of each state agency is required to post on the home page of their website a signed certification that the agency's website is in compliance with specified accessibility standards.

The department's Office of Information Services has developed standards that each board and bureau must meet to ensure that all DCA websites are ADA compliant on July 1, 2019.

Meeting compliance guidelines is proving challenging in some areas and has resulted in delays in posting materials. In addition, current elements of the webpage will need to be eliminated. For example, the board's webpage currently uses a google translate function. Regrettably this functionality will no longer be supported in a manner that is consistent with ADA guidelines. Further, the board's calendar of events will need to be removed as well. Staff is exploring different options to reestablish some of the capabilities.

Board staff is striving to maintain as much of the current functionality and posting and will keep the board apprised. Long term we are hopeful to reassess the functionality and enhance the websites utility where possible.

g. Sunset Report Update

About every four years the board undergoes the Sunset Review Process. As a precursor to the process, the board is typically asked to prepare a report. Although the board has not received its formal notice requesting preparation of the report, staff believes it will be forthcoming. It is anticipated that the report will be due the end of the year.

The preparation of the report takes several months and is an opportunity to provide information for the legislative oversight committees to learn about the board's

achievements related to its mission.

Currently board staff is preparing various datasets that it believes will be required as part of the reporting elements of the report. The data will also provide some of the context from which the board can highlight its achievement.

As the board prepares to undergo the process the board's strategic committees may wish to consider possible issues to highlight during the sunset process. Further, the board may wish to designate one or two board members that can provide guidance to staff on elements of the report.

Once completed, the report will be provided to all board members for review and approval, which is expected late in 2019.

h. Personnel Update

The board currently has 11 vacant positions detailed below.

- Executive Officer
- Three inspector positions
- Two Licensing positions
- Four Enforcement positions
- One Administrative position

i. Update on the Relocation of Board Office

The relocation of the board's office is still underway and is now projected to occur in late July or early August. Board staff is working on a communication plan to advise stakeholders of the move and is working with the Department of General Services to ensure requested items are included in the new space.

j. Update on the Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES)

Provided in **Attachment 4** are tables outlining the CURES data released from the Department of Justice for January through March 2019, including registration numbers, usage data and prescription volume information. Over 9,690,000 controlled substances prescriptions were reported to CURES in the first three months of 2019.

k. Biannual Report of the California Practice Standards and Jurisprudence Examination for Pharmacists (CPJE) Examination Statistics and the North American Pharmacist Licensure Examination (NAPLEX)

Examination scores for the California Practice Standards and Jurisprudence Examination for Pharmacists (CPJE) and North American Pharmacist Licensure Examination (NAPLEX) are

released twice a year, generally in spring and fall. The CPJE and NAPLEX statistics for the period of October 2018 to March 2019 are provided in Attachment 5. Typically, candidates that have taken the examination during this period are retaking the CPJE or graduated later in a calendar year.

The Semi-Annual CPJE statistical report for October 2018 through March 2019 reflects that the overall pass rate for the CPJE is 48.9 percent. The pass rate for graduates from the California schools of pharmacy is 54.5 percent. The overall pass rate for the NAPLEX is 91.4 percent. A copy of the Semi-Annual CPJE Statistical Report is provided in **Attachment 5**.

CPJE Overall Pass Rate

	Frequency	Percent
Fail	473	51.1
Pass	452	48.9

NAPLEX Overall Pass Rate

	Frequency	Percent
Fail	75	8.6
Pass	801	91.4

The pass rates for the CPJE are slightly lower when compared to the same period last year when the passing rate was 51.8 percent.

I. Discussion and Consideration of a Staff Request to Award Continuing Education to Pharmacists Who Complete the Job Analysis Questionnaire

Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 139, the board is required to complete an occupational analysis periodically which serves as the basis for the California Practice Standards and Jurisprudence Examination for Pharmacists (CPJE). The Competency Committee, in concert with the board’s contracted psychometric firm, has initiated development of job analysis questionnaire used to complete the occupational analysis with the board’s contracted psychometric firm. (The job analysis questionnaire consists of duties a licensed pharmacist is authorized to perform in California.) Board staff anticipates releasing this questionnaire to pharmacists in the next few months.

As part of the process participants will assess the importance of each duty as well as the frequency the duty is performed. The information obtained will serve as the basis for developing a new content outline from which future iterations of the CPJE will be based upon.

Pharmacists who complete the job analysis questionnaire have historically been awarded three hours of CE credit through an action of the board. Staff requests that the board again approve this award to acknowledge both the importance of the questionnaire as well as the time commitment necessary to complete the questionnaire.

Should the board agree with the staff recommendation, the following motion could be used to approve the hours of CE credit for pharmacists completing the job analysis questionnaire.

Motion: Approve three hours of CE credit to pharmacists who complete the job analysis questionnaire.

Attachment 1

Date: April 18, 2019

To: ALL Board Executive Officers / Bureau Chiefs

From: Janice Shintaku-Enkoji, Chief Fiscal Operations

Subject: DCA FI\$Cal Status Update (April 2019)

This memo provides an update on DCA's efforts implementing the FI\$Cal system, the new statewide system for budgets, accounting, and procurement that the State of California has implemented for all state departments.

DCA transitioned to FI\$Cal in July 2017. While DCA has experienced one full fiscal year using the system and is fast approaching the end of a second year, the transition continues to pose challenges in the reconciliation and closing of fiscal year 2017-18.

In DCA's previous FI\$Cal update memo from last February, it was projected that year-end financial statements would start being produced in March 2019. Since that time, DCA has learned of additional reconciliation requirements that have impacted the previous estimated timeline. Specifically, while DCA has completed its fund reconciliation between FI\$Cal and the State Controller's Office, additional reconciliation steps must occur within submodules of the FI\$Cal system itself.

A significant number of issues between the modules within FI\$Cal have been uncovered as DCA has progressed in this additional reconciliation effort. Each item requires extensive research to diagnose, and individual tickets must be submitted to FI\$Cal staff for correction. The final year-end reconciling process in FI\$Cal is considerably more complex than originally anticipated and DCA now projects the preparation of final financial reports for FY 2017-18 after June 30, 2019.

DCA acknowledges this setback in the budget process and is working diligently in partnership with the Department of Finance and FI\$Cal to complete the reconciliation and year-end process as quickly as possible.

We appreciate your continued patience and understanding as we work to complete these additional technical and workload challenges.

Attachment 1: Budget Charts and Fund Condition

A hardcopy of these documents will be made available at the meeting or upon request. Requests may be emailed to laura.hendricks@dca.ca.gov.

Attachment 2

Full Board Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	7/ 24/18	7/25/18	9/7/2018	9/26/2018	10/23/18	10/24/18	12/14/18	1/30/19	1/31/19	3/22/19
Brooks			X		X	X		X	X	
Butler	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Khan			X							
Kim	X	X			X	X	X			X
Law	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lippe	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Munoz				X		X				
Sanchez	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Schaad	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	
Serpa	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Veale	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Weisser	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Wong	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Enforcement Committee Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	September 14, 2018	December 20, 2018	March 14, 2019
Law	X	X	X
Lippe	X		X
Sanchez	X	X	X
Schaad	X	X	X
Weisser	X	X	X
Wong	X	X	X

Compounding Committee Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	February 20, 2019	March 13, 2019	April 16, 2019
Kim			
Law	X	X	X
Schaad	X	X	X
Serpa	X	X	X
Weisser		X	X

Legislation and Regulation Committee Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	July 24, 2018	October 23, 2018	January 30, 2019
Brooks		X	X
Butler	X	X	X
Khan			
Lippe	X	X	X
Serpa	X	X	X

Licensing Committee Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	September 26, 2018	December 19, 2018	April 3, 2019
Butler	X	X	X
Khan			
Schaad		X	X
Veale	X	X	X
Weisser	X	X	
Wong	X	X	X

Communication and Public Education Committee Meetings – FY 2018/2019

	October 11, 2018	January 8, 2019
Brooks		X
Kim		X
Munoz	X	
Sanchez	X	X
Veale	X	X

Attachment 3

LEGAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-309, Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone (916) 574-8220 Fax (916) 574-8623 www.dca.ca.gov



MEMORANDUM

DATE	May 2, 2019
TO	Members, Board of Pharmacy
FROM	Kelsey Pruden, Attorney Legal Affairs Division
SUBJECT	Designating all or portions of the decision, <i>In the matter of the Citation Against: ESI Mail Pharmacy, Inc. dba Express Scripts</i> , (Case No. CI 2009 44657; OAH Case No. 2011060384) as Precedential pursuant to Government Code section 11425.60 (Agenda Item XII. (d))

The California State Board of Pharmacy (board) can designate and rely on decisions as precedential. In other words, once the board has publicly selected a decision or parts thereof as precedential, that decision or part of that decision, must be applied and followed. The statute that governs this process states,

- (a) A decision may not be expressly relied on as precedent unless it is designated as a precedent decision by the agency.
- (b) An agency may designate as a precedent decision a decision or part of a decision that contains a significant legal or policy determination of general application that is likely to recur. Designation of a decision or part of a decision as a precedent decision is not rulemaking and need not be done under Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340). An agency's designation of a decision or part of a decision, or failure to designate a decision or part of a decision, as a precedent decision is not subject to judicial review.
- (c) An agency shall maintain an index of significant legal and policy determinations made in precedent decisions. The index shall be updated not less frequently than annually, unless no precedent decision has been designated since the last preceding update. The index shall be made available to the public by subscription, and its availability shall be publicized annually in the California Regulatory Notice Register.
- (d) This section applies to decisions issued on or after July 1, 1997. Nothing in this section precludes an agency from designating and indexing as a precedent decision a decision issued before July 1, 1997.
(Gov. Code, § 11425.60).

Board staff, in consultation with the board's liaisons from the Office of the Attorney General and the Department of Consumer Affairs board counsel, is recommending that a portion of the above-captioned decision be designated as precedential.

CASE SUMMARY

In the matter of the Citation Against: ESI Mail Pharmacy, Inc. dba Express Scripts, Board of Pharmacy Case No. CI 2009 44657; OAH No. 2011060384

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 30, 2003, the board issued ESI Mail Pharmacy Services, INC. dba Express Scripts (respondent) nonresident pharmacy permit number NRP 531. Respondent was issued a citation on November 16, 2010. After an office conference, the citation was appealed. The matter was heard before Administrative Law Judge Carla Nasoff and a proposed decision was submitted to the board on June 19, 2012. The board rejected the proposed decision and decided the case upon the record, including the transcript and written arguments submitted by both parties. On November 20, 2012, the board adopted the Decision After Nonadoption in this matter. That decision changed the ruling on the issue of whether or not a delay is considered an obstruction for purposes of Business and Professions Code section 733 (labeled as, "*Issue Number Two (Delay or Obstruction) and Ruling*" in both decisions). The Decision After Nonadoption also changed the Order. However, the Decision After Nonadoption adopted the Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judge Carla Nasoff on the issue of the board's regulatory authority (labeled as, "*Issue Number One (Regulatory Ruling) and Ruling*" in both decisions).

FACTS/FINDINGS OF THE DECISION

The citation alleged that respondent's procedures for filling mail order prescriptions obstructed a patient from obtaining medication. Specifically, one patient's medication was backordered, which resulted in her not obtaining her prescriptions for an additional five (5) days. Further, because of the respondent's policies and procedures, the patient was not made aware that her medication was on backorder and was not able to speak to a pharmacist to find out exactly what the issue with her prescriptions was or when she would receive her medication. The citation was issued pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 4005, 4301, and 733(a), and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1775 et seq.

Pertinent to this recommendation, the respondent argued that the board did not have the authority to discipline or issue a citation against a nonresident pharmacy because there was no law in the nonresident pharmacy's home state that allowed for discipline based on delay or obstruction of a patient's legally prescribed medication. However, the

Board of Pharmacy: *In the matter of the Citation Against: ESI Mail Pharmacy, Inc. dba Express Scripts*

administrative law judge ruled that the board did have jurisdiction and the authority to bring a citation or disciplinary action against a nonresident pharmacy.

PORTIONS OF THE DECISION TO BE DESIGNATED AS PRECEDENTIAL

1. Factual Finding: 8 (“*Issue Number One (Regulatory Authority) and Ruling*”); and
2. Legal Conclusion: The first sentence of Legal Conclusion 8.

RATIONALE

As cited above, Government Code section 11425.60 authorizes the board to designate part of a decision as precedential when it, “contains a significant legal or policy determination of general application that is likely to recur.”

The board licenses nonresident pharmacies regularly. This precedential decision would clarify that nonresident pharmacies are bound by California laws because of doing business in California pursuant to a California license. The board may issue a citation or discipline a non-resident licensee when the state’s laws, where the licensee is permanently located, allow for administrative action based on a violation of California law pertaining to the practice of pharmacy. This issue is likely to recur frequently, and the portions of the decision to be designated as precedential contain legal determinations that are significant and would clarify the board’s authority as it applies to nonresident pharmacy permit holders. This would provide guidance to nonresident pharmacy permit holders and California consumers who may be patients of a nonresident pharmacy permit holder.

Attachment 3: Express Scripts; Board of Pharmacy Case 44657

A hardcopy of these documents will be made available at the meeting or upon request.
Requests may be emailed to laura.hendricks@dca.ca.gov.

Attachment 4

CURES Registrants

Pharmacists	43,211
Total Number of Individuals Registered	204,339
Percentage of Pharmacists Registrants	21%

Patient Activity Reports Generated

	January 2019	February 2019	March 2019
By Pharmacists	829,784	757,112	823,612
Total Number of Reports Generated	2,133,236	1,907,609	2,021,483
Percentage Reports Generated by Pharmacists	38%	40%	41%

Number of Times CURES Accessed

	January 2019	February 2019	March 2019
Accessed by Pharmacists	395,789	358,277	388,766
Total Times Accessed by Anyone	1,084,492	970,507	1,027,561
Percentage of Time Pharmacists Accessed CURES	36%	37%	38%

Number of Prescriptions Filled by Schedule

	January 2019	February 2019	March 2019
Schedule II	1,467,634	1,344,108	1,449,313
Schedule III	286,327	255,881	275,130
Schedule IV	1,509,022	1,348,856	1,457,355
Schedule V	58,987	49,378	53,202
Total	3,321,970	2,998,223	3,235,000

Attachment 5



**California State Board of Pharmacy CPJE Statistics
 October 2018 – March 2019**

The charts below display data for all candidates who took the CPJE examination between October 2018 to March 2019, inclusive.

The board also displays NAPLEX scores associated with any candidate who took the CPJE during this six-month period and was reported to the board, regardless of when the NAPLEX may have been taken (it could have occurred outside the six-month reporting period noted above). Typically, the board reports CPJE performance data at six-month intervals.

CPJE Overall Pass Rates

Pass/Fail	Frequency	Percent
Fail	473	51.1
Pass	452	48.9
Total	925	100.0

NAPLEX Overall Pass Rates

Pass/Fail	Frequency	Percent
Fail	75	8.6
Pass	801	91.4
Total	876	100.0

CPJE Pass Rates – Location by Number

Location	Fail	Pass	Total
California	107	128	235
Other US	312	276	588
Foreign	54	48	102
Total	473	452	925

CPJE Pass Rates – Location by Percent

Location	Fail	Pass
California	45.5	54.5
Other US	53.1	46.9
Foreign	52.9	47.1

NAPLEX Pass Rates – Location by Number

Location	Fail	Pass	Total
California	26	199	225
Other US	36	516	552
Foreign	13	86	99
Total	75	801	876

NAPLEX Pass Rates – Location by Percent

Location	Fail	Pass
California	11.6	88.4
Other US	6.5	93.5
Foreign	13.1	86.9

CPJE Pass Rates – Gender by Number

Location	Fail	Pass	Total
Female	271	284	555
Male	202	168	370
Total	473	452	925

CPJE Pass Rates – Gender by Percent

Location	Fail	Pass
Female	48.8	51.2
Male	54.6	45.4

NAPLEX Pass Rates – Gender by Number

Location	Fail	Pass	Total
Female	46	478	524
Male	29	323	352
Total	75	801	876

NAPLEX Pass Rates – Gender by Percent

Location	Fail	Pass
Female	8.8	91.2
Male	8.2	91.8

CPJE Pass Rates – California School of Pharmacy by Number

CA School	Fail	Pass	Total
UCSF	8	11	19
UOP	24	18	42
USC	4	9	13
Western	11	17	28
Loma Linda	6	15	21
UCSD	3	7	10
Touro	11	8	19
Cal Northstate	6	5	11
Keck	6	7	13
West Coast	4	7	11
Chapman	13	10	23
CA Health Sciences	11	14	25
Total	107	128	235

CPJE Pass Rates – California School of Pharmacy by Percent

CA School	Fail	Pass
UCSF	42.1	57.9
UOP	57.1	42.9
USC	30.8	69.2
Western	39.3	60.7
Loma Linda	28.6	71.4
UCSD	30.0	70.0
Touro	57.9	42.1
Cal Northstate	54.5	45.5
Keck	46.2	53.8
West Coast	36.4	63.6
Chapman	56.5	43.5
CA Health Sciences	44.0	56.0

NAPLEX Pass Rates – California School of Pharmacy by Number

CA School	Fail	Pass	Total
UCSF	2	15	17
UOP	3	39	42
USC	0	12	12
Western	3	25	28
Loma Linda	3	18	21
UCSD	0	10	10
Touro	2	17	19
Cal Northstate	3	7	10
Keck	2	7	9
West Coast	0	10	10
Chapman	6	17	23
CA Health Sciences	2	22	24
Total	26	199	225

NAPLEX Pass Rates – California School of Pharmacy by Percent

CA School	Fail	Pass
UCSF	11.8	88.2
UOP	7.1	92.9
USC	0.0	100.0
Western	10.7	89.3
Loma Linda	14.3	85.7
UCSD	0.0	100.0
Touro	10.5	89.5
Cal Northstate	30.0	70.0
Keck	22.2	77.8
West Coast	0.0	100.0
Chapman	26.1	73.9
CA Health Sciences	8.3	91.7

CPJE Pass Rates –School of Pharmacy by Number

School	Fail	Pass	Total
Auburn	0	1	1
U of AZ	4	1	5
U of AR	0	1	1
UCSF	8	11	19
UOP	24	18	42
USC	4	9	13
U of CO	7	5	12
U of CT	0	1	1

School	Fail	Pass	Total
Howard DC	3	1	4
FL A&M	0	2	2
U of FL	2	2	4
Mercer	3	0	3
U of GA	1	2	3
ID SU	0	1	1
U of IL Chicago	5	3	8
Butler U	3	2	5
Purdue	3	3	6
Drake	1	0	1
U of IA	2	2	4
U of KS	1	0	1
U of KY	1	2	3
Xavier	2	2	4
U of MD	6	4	10
MA Col of Pharm	14	10	24
NE-MA	2	4	6
Ferris	0	2	2
U of MI	3	4	7
Wayne SU	2	1	3
U of MN	1	3	4
U of MS	0	1	1
St. Louis Col of Pharm	5	1	6
UMKC	2	1	3
Creighton	8	4	12
U of NE	0	1	1
Rutgers	2	2	4
U of NM	1	2	3
Western	11	17	28
Midwestern U Chicago	10	9	19
A&M Schwartz	1	5	6
St. Johns	5	3	8
SUNNY-Buffalo	1	3	4
Union U	7	3	10
UNC	1	2	3
OH Northern U	0	1	1
OH State U	2	1	3
U of Cinn	1	1	2
U of Toledo	2	3	5
SW OK State	1	1	2
U of OK	1	1	2
OR State U	4	7	11
Duquesne	1	1	2

School	Fail	Pass	Total
Phil Col of Pharmacy	5	5	10
Temple	3	2	5
U of Pitt	1	2	3
U of PR	0	1	1
U of RI	0	2	2
Med U of SC	1	1	2
U of SC	1	2	3
U of TN	0	1	1
TX SO U	5	0	5
U of Houston	1	2	3
U of TX	3	1	4
U of UT	5	4	9
Med C of VA	0	1	1
U of WA	3	4	7
WA State U	5	5	10
WV U	2	2	4
U of WI-Madison	0	3	3
U of WY	2	0	2
Campbell U	0	1	1
Nova Southeastern	6	2	8
TX Tech	0	3	3
Bernard J Dunn	3	3	6
Midwestern AZ	12	12	24
NV Col of Pharm	16	25	41
Loma Linda U	6	15	21
UCSD	3	7	10
MA School of Pharm – Worcester	18	13	31
Palm Beach Atlantic U	3	0	3
Lake Erie Col	9	10	19
Touro U	11	8	19
U of Charleston	4	4	8
South U School of Pharm	2	1	3
Pac U of OR	8	10	18
U of Findlay	2	0	2
U of Incarnate Word	1	0	1
Sullivan U	3	1	4
Cal Northstate	6	5	11
Other/FG	54	48	102
U of HI – Hilo	9	6	15
NE OH U	0	1	1
TX A&M	1	0	1

School	Fail	Pass	Total
Belmont U	0	1	1
Harding U	2	0	2
Appalachian Col of Pharm	0	1	1
Lipscomb U	1	0	1
Chicago St U	6	4	10
U of New England	3	1	4
Regis U	2	5	7
Notre Dame of MD	3	1	4
St. John Fischer	1	2	3
Concordia U Col of Pharm	4	3	7
Rosalind Franklin U	4	4	8
Western NE U	2	0	2
U of Saint Joseph	2	0	2
Roosevelt U	2	3	5
Presbyterian	1	0	1
D'Youville	2	1	3
Touro New York	4	3	7
South College	6	1	7
Manchester U	3	1	4
SIUE	0	1	1
Marshal U School of Pharm	3	0	3
Keck	6	7	13
CA Health Sciences U	11	14	25
Cedarville U	1	0	1
U of the Sciences	5	2	7
West Coast U	4	7	11
Chapman U	13	10	23
Total	473	452	925

CPJE Pass Rates –Country by Number

Country	Fail	Pass	Total
Armenia	1	1	2
Brazil	1	0	1
Canada	2	1	3
China	0	1	1
Costa Rica	1	0	1
Germany	2	1	3
Egypt	10	12	22

Country	Fail	Pass	Total
France	0	1	1
United Kingdom	1	2	3
India	4	5	9
Iraq	0	7	7
Iran	2	2	4
Italy	1	0	1
Jordan	5	6	11
Lebanon	0	1	1
Morocco	0	1	1
Nigeria/New Guinea	5	1	6
Peru	1	0	1
Philippines	11	3	14
Pakistan	2	1	3
Poland	1	0	1
Syria	3	2	5
United Arab Emirates	1	0	1
USA	419	404	823
Total	473	452	925