

Special Report on Pharmacy Faculty Workplace Issues: Findings from the 2009-2010 COD-

COF Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce

Shane P. Desselle, RPh, PhD, FAPhA*
Associate Dean for Tulsa Programs, Professor, and Chair
Department of Pharmacy: Clinical & Administrative Sciences—Tulsa
University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy
Tulsa, OK 74137

Gretchen L. Peirce, PharmD, MS
Graduate Assistant
University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy
Tulsa, OK 74137

Brian L. Crabtree, PharmD, BCPP
Associate Professor of Pharmacy Practice
University of Mississippi School of Pharmacy
Jackson, MS 39216-4500

Daniel Acosta, Jr., PhD
Dean and Carl Chair of Pharmacy
Winkle College of Pharmacy
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45267

Johnnie L. Early, Jr., PhD
Dean and Professor
College of Pharmacy
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

Donald T. Kishi, PharmD
Associate Dean for Students and Curricular Affairs
Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Pharmacy
University of California, San Francisco
School of Pharmacy
San Francisco, CA 94143-0622

Dolores Nobles-Knight, PharmD, MPH
Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Pharmacy Practice
College of Pharmacy
Chicago State University
Chicago, IL 60628-1598

Andrew A. Webster, PhD
Professor and Chair, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Belmont University School of Pharmacy
Nashville, TN 37212—3757

*Corresponding author.
4502 E. 41st St.
Tulsa, OK 74137
shane-desselle@ouhsc.edu
918-660-3575 (ph.)
918-660-3009 (fax)

ABSTRACT

There are myriad factors contributing to an individual faculty member's, a department's, and an entire academic organization's vitality. Some of the relationships among these factors are well understood, but many questions remain unanswered. The current iteration of the Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce examined a sizeable portion of the extant literature on faculty workforce issues, including the work of previous task forces charged by AACP. The result was a focus on four unique, but interrelated concepts: organizational culture/climate, role of the department chair, faculty recruitment, and faculty retention. Among all four resides the need to consider issues of intergenerational, intercultural, and gender dynamics. This paper reports on the findings of the Task Force and proffers specific recommendations to AACP and to colleges/schools of pharmacy.

Special Report on Pharmacy Faculty Workplace Issues: Findings from the 2009-2010 COD-COF Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce

INTRODUCTION

The 2009-2010 American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) Council of Deans-Council of Faculties Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce was assigned two primary charges. This paper reports the findings from execution of one of those charges, which was to identify mechanisms, resources, and policies that could be developed and implemented within school/colleges of pharmacy that would enhance quality of work life of faculty. Previous studies and Task Force reports^{1,2} proffer seemingly reasonable and prudent ideas in this area; however, many questions remain unanswered, and there is a critical need for further study in this area, especially in pharmacy, but even in the broader arena of higher education.

There are myriad ways to approach the multidimensional constructs governing faculty quality of work life. Much has been written on it and related concepts, such as work satisfaction, stress, burnout, work-home balance, commitment, collegiality, organizational citizenship behaviors, and turnover, to name but a few. The swath of available literature is both a boon and a hurdle to researchers and to administrators looking for guidance. It is relatively easy to find solutions to very specific questions, but difficult to approach larger problems whose interdependence still has not been fully comprehended. Nonetheless, members of the Task Force examined a sizeable portion of the extant literature to identify four areas in which to focus its recommendations: organizational climate/culture, role of the department chair, faculty recruitment, and faculty mentoring. Additionally, it was recognized that within all four areas there exist critical themes related to faculty gender, cultural issues, and generational dynamics,³ which are thus highlighted and interwoven throughout discussion of the four central themes of this report.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE/CLIMATE

Poor relationships with administrators and/or colleagues have been repeatedly cited as reasons to leave an academic organization or leave academia, altogether.⁴⁻⁷ The climate and culture of an

organization also has implications for its faculty's demonstration of good organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), general outlook, role strain, stress, creativity, vitality, and commitment.⁸⁻¹⁰ The terms "culture" and "climate" often are used interchangeably; however, they have different meanings. The most basic definition of culture offered and frequently cited simply is "the way we do things around here."¹¹ More formally, culture has been defined as "a set of cognitions that are shared by all or many members of a social unit and which are acquired through social learning and socialization processes, and they include values, common understandings and patterns of beliefs and expectations."¹² . On the other hand, climate has been described as a relatively enduring characteristic of an organization distinguishing it from other organizations that (a) embodies members' collective perceptions about the organization, (b) is produced by member interactions, (c) serves as a basis for interpreting interactions, (d) reflects the norms and values of the organization's culture; and (e) acts as a source of influence for shaping behavior.¹³ Thus, that climate and culture are said to emanate from one another. Perhaps Verbeke, Volgering, and Hessels outlined the difference between the two concepts most succinctly, arguing that culture reflects the way things are done in an organization, while climate is a reflection of the way people perceive and come to describe the characteristics of their environment.¹⁴ So, while the two concepts are unique, they are highly related, and this paper treats the two not as undifferentiated, but rather, two components of an organization that can be addressed simultaneously with proper study and action taken by colleagues and administrators.

One of the challenges in discerning the extant literature and describing implications and potential actions is that even the "organizational" component of organizational culture/climate is difficult to delineate. A department may have a subculture existing within a school/college's subculture that exists in an entire university or academic health center's culture. Still, no matter the level of the organization that studies were conducted, there is much helpful information available.

Froh described how a college climate can help maximize faculty effectiveness, making use of intrinsic rewards of academic work to improve its quality and reach new levels of understanding.¹⁵ This would appear in sync with contemporary views of faculty as "knowledge workers". As

knowledge workers, faculty often choose a career in academia based at least in part on the desire to become engaged in challenging, yet rewarding aspects of the job,¹⁶ which intersects their need to make important contributions and see the value in their work. Drucker explained that workers in the 1950s were told what to contribute to an organization.¹⁶ This was followed by radical change in the 1960s when young professionals began to ask, “What do *I* want to do in the organization?”. Drucker goes on to explain that in contemporary environments, neither question is the correct basis with which to establish culture. He argues that knowledge workers should be directed to ask “What **should** my contribution be to the organization?”. To answer it, they must address what the situation requires; how they can make the greatest contribution, given their own strengths and values; and what results are needed to make a difference. Creating an environment wherein faculty feel safe to ask those questions will result in more engagement and will help align their activities more consistently with the organization’s core mission and values.

Building a sense of community among faculty is critical for organizational effectiveness.

Community, in and of itself, can be taken to mean different things, but what is shared in many descriptions infers a sense of belonging, togetherness, collegiality, and trust.¹⁷ One concept that continues to gain momentum is “communities of scholars.” These are patterned after “communities of learners” committed to continuous improvement and a spirit of inquiry. These take on various forms, but in many cases faculty self-align with groups that have been formed, department-wide, or even college- or institution-wide to address a particular area of interest. Another take on the concept has proffered communities of practice in academia, involving practice scholars facing the unique challenge of satisfying constituencies in their academic home and in their practice environment.¹⁸ These types of programs may be especially beneficial at academic health centers, wherein faculty must transcend the outdated view that the roles of scholar, scientist, and healer are in opposition to one another.¹⁹ This reinforces the contention among many that the “best” faculty are those who do not view these concepts as diametrically opposing forces vying for limited time.²⁰

Critical to the success of a community of scholars or similar such program is its alignment with the organization's basic principles, or ethos. Mission and values are important and may be used to ignite passion and imbue a sense of quality. Freed, Klugman, and Fife argued for 8 characteristics of effective academic organizations in attempting to actuate a culture of quality, including: (1) vision, mission, and outcomes-driven; (2) systems dependent; (3) systematic individual development; (4) decisions based on fact; (5) delegation of decision-making; (6) collaboration; (7) planning for change; and (8) creative and supportive leadership.²¹

Planning for change in academia has received considerable attention during the past several decades, as academia began to adopt certain business practices.²²⁻²⁴ Due to changing demographics of students and faculty, more rapid diffusion of technology, heightened expectations for accreditation, and tightening budgets, academic organizations must be more flexible and adaptable than ever before, and it is incumbent upon them not only to prepare for change but to be well versed in having its faculty and staff constituents prepare for change, as well. This might be difficult for faculty in tenured positions or with a wealth of institutional knowledge filled with decades of "doing things the way we've always done them."

Change planning is especially important as academic organizations begin to adopt more of an entrepreneurial culture. The need for innovation lies psychosocially in part due to discomfort with the status quo, but especially in response to emerging market trends and financial constraints for resources.²⁵ The emergence of entrepreneurial cultures in academia perhaps has been written about more frequently in countries outside the US;²⁶ however, the need to diversify revenue streams and unleash the talent of faculty permeates the entire Academy. Colleges/schools of pharmacy have become more entrepreneurial, with some even owning pharmacies and other businesses that generate revenue, others creating collaborative contracts among faculty to develop and share the yields from the creation of patents and other intellectual property, and creating dual-degree programs to share revenue and other fruits from borne from collaboration. Even so, Wessell pointed out that there is still much for academia to learn from the corporate environment.²⁷ Kezar and Eckel argued that an academic institution, like a business organization,

should evaluate its organizational culture before beginning change planning.²⁸ They describe unique differences between a collegial culture, managerial culture, developmental culture, and negotiating culture based upon Berquist's original cultural archetypes and describe how each culture interacts with a change process.²⁹ Sporn observed that administrators will have greater success and easier implementation of policy when they are cognizant of and consider the organization's culture during decision-making.³⁰ Rhoads and Tierney also suggest that solutions to many problems plaguing academic organizations are best developed when administrators closely examine the values, beliefs, traditions, and histories that organization members hold.³¹

Austin, Rice, and Splete examined ten so-called "exemplary colleges" identified in part through their reports of high morale.³² They observed four common characteristics among these institutions: a distinctive organizational culture, faculty identification with the institution, participatory leadership, and organizational momentum. The components of a distinctive organizational culture were characterized by having a rich tradition upon which to build; coherence and transparency; openness and respect for differences; and intellectualism that guides all that they do. Other factors included recognition of a broader definition of scholarship, formal and entrenched faculty development, balance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, tie to the local community, and collegiality that results in faculty taking pride in their institutional affiliation.

Cultures and climates in higher education often appear problematic. Meskill and McTague cited negative language used among faculty and even administrators regarding new ideas, along with poor strategic organizational direction when discussing quality improvement initiatives.²⁵

Anderson, Louis, and Earle described the climate of many institutions of higher learning as "disturbing".³³ Willson found that unresolved conflicts about organizational culture impedes agreement on a planning process and creates scholarly anomie among constituent faculty.³⁴

Allen examined the "organizational insecurity" existing in many academic organizations, whose antecedents include lack of predictability, lack of openness, lack of participation, and whether decisions are implemented by use of persuasive power or coercive power.³⁵

Among the issues that require attention by pharmacy and other programs is that of the tension between teaching and research. While it has been argued here that the best academicians are those who understand its synergy, administrators must grapple with battling scholarship and teaching cultures that permeate some institutions. Wolfgang, Gupchup, and Plake observed that many pharmacy faculty believe more weight should be afforded to teaching effectiveness in tenure and promotion decisions, but at the same time prefer a more holistic approach to teaching evaluation than only student evaluations.³⁶ Austin argued for the need to institutionalize a culture of teaching by making reward systems more equitable, strengthening administrative leadership, encouraging teaching networks within the institution, and implementing more favorable policies and practices to promote effective teaching.³⁷ A peer review system of teaching in one college of pharmacy has been reportedly used for both formative and summative purposes, with the faculty reporting high levels of satisfaction from its implementation.³⁸ Still, few if any in the Academy would disagree that scholarship is necessary for advancement of knowledge and the profession, discoveries that help patients, and even for the evaluation and creation of best practices in teaching.³⁹ This has been corroborated time and again when institutions benchmark growth and maturation, with evidence suggesting that departments with a balanced orientation toward research and teaching have the most favorable impact on students' intellectual growth.⁴⁰⁻⁴²

A unique challenge for professional programs, especially in colleges/schools of pharmacy is the fact that pharmacy is made up of a number of "subdisciplines". AACP recognizes 8, unique subdisciplines composing pharmacy education, and these disciplines originated from basic fields of study very unique in their mores, beliefs, and maturation with respect to paradigmatic development.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ Becher argued that differences in disciplines are often ignored in policy decisions, which are problematic for the entire organization.⁴⁶ Studies on a concept called intradisciplinary consensus suggests that faculty in so-called "hard" disciplines in pharmacy (eg, medicinal chemistry and pharmacology) differ from those in "softer" disciplines (eg, pharmacy practice, social/administrative sciences, library sciences) in many ways, such as how they approach teaching and scholarship, their outlook on academic life, their productivity, degree of collaboration, perceived equity, and preferences for governance styles.^{47,48} Evidence suggests

that the disparity between pharmacy subdisciplines is not as great as it might be in basic fields of study,^{49,50} however, administrators must be careful in setting expectations among faculty and should be mindful of general productivity rates among the disciplines when setting policy and allocating rewards, while still maintaining equitable expectations and evoking a sense of fairness wherein some departments are not perceived to have to produce more or work harder than others. It is essential that buy-in be obtained from key personnel in each discipline and that committees with considerable decision-making authority or that have powerful influences, be populated appropriately with those of various viewpoints and levels of experience.

The responsibility for navigating through and impacting the culture of an academic pharmacy organization are not all borne by administrators, but must be shared by faculty. It has been suggested that faculty must discern expectations of them by the department, strengths and weaknesses of compatriots, and key persons whose support is necessary to success.⁵¹ It is suggested further that faculty seek to answer several questions, including “What is the real power structure in the department?”, “Who are the informal leaders in the department, and what is their source of power?”, “Can I assume that my responsibilities are consonant with the understanding of the faculty members who ultimately will evaluate me?”, and “What policies and standard operating procedures exist to help me?”. Schoenfeld and Magnus warn of signals that a department may be coming apart at the seams, such as election of a weak chair who cannot lead the faculty, loss of several of the most productive colleagues, assignment of the most important courses to weakest instructors, and denouncing of one another to the dean or provost.⁵¹

Issues of faculty age, gender, and ethnicity are extremely poignant in any discussion of organizational culture. Advice for new faculty has been offered throughout this section. Women faculty have identified organizational culture and gender issues that affect work attitudes. Gibson suggested the need for human resource and organization development initiatives to facilitate the provision of mentoring for women faculty as an important part of transformation and change in academic organizations.⁵² This is especially important when women faculty have historically reported sexism and greater likelihood of denial of tenure due to gender issues.⁵³

Considering the previous literature and evidence, the Task Force identified a number of ideas for imbuing a positive and productive workplace. This is meant to be a helpful and relatively extensive list, but certainly not an exhaustive one. The Task Force also recognizes the need for future study evaluating the antecedents and implications of various workplace cultures and climates for faculty productivity and quality of work life. Many of the more rigorous studies on this issue were undertaken over a decade ago, and few have examined these issues within the context of organizations aimed at the training of professional students. These ideas include:

- Create a Shared Vision
 - Faculty, staff, students and alumni want to know and have a voice in where the organization is headed.
 - Utilize resources to provide an environmental scan that will inform the development of the organization's mission, vision and core values,
 - Faculty, staff and students want to have a voice in where and how the mission and vision are going to become reality.
 - Actions should be governed by a strategic plan.
 - Facilitate and utilize faculty, staff, students and alumni to develop the strategic plan. .
 - Maintain the plan's visibility and monitor progress toward the organization's achievement of mission and vision.
 - Demonstrate the linkage of the college's plan to that of the university
- Create a Sense of Community/Family Atmosphere
 - Faculty and staff need to have an identity
 - Welcoming receptions for new faculty and staff
 - Self-introductions of faculty including formal and informal information to PharmD students, residents, fellows, and graduate students.
 - College-wide social events to engage staff and faculty, and select guests
 - New faculty and staff need to know how to function efficiently within the organization

- Orientation program for new faculty and staff to include:
 - Vision, mission statement, core values and strategic plan
 - Current school/campus issues
 - Organizational structures – departments, committees, etc.
 - Curriculum
 - Human resources-related information, including reference to appropriate materials and key contact persons
 - Merit and promotion process
 - HIPAA, human research, state professional licenses.
 - A guide to contact persons and facts involving day-to-day operations, eg, phone, computer support, photocopying, etc.
- Orientation program/information/resources for new faculty and staff on life outside of the organization. Examples include
 - Health care providers for themselves and family
 - Childcare
 - Transportation systems
 - Exercise facilities
 - Entertainment
 - Directory of religious organizations and houses of worship
 - Information on area school systems
- Inclusion of students in the organizational community
 - Alumni phone call to welcome new students
 - Alumni reception for new students
- Support for student activities
- Student orientation programs
 - Student officers should be briefed on major issues and provide administrators with student perspectives of the issues/changes.
 - Fall mixers for first professional year health science majors

- Small group discussions involving faculty facilitator and students to provide a forum for idea exchange
- Upper classmen mentoring program for students entering the professional program
- Faculty and staff development and collaboration
 - Career mentoring program for junior and new faculty
 - Educational programming with internal and external speakers, e.g. grand rounds for faculty and/or staff
 - Identification of research and teaching silos and working toward collaboration
 - Common break areas in research facilities
 - Annual departmental poster session
 - Clinical correlate sessions in science courses and science correlate sessions in clinical didactic courses
 - Faculty accomplishments highlighted
 - Opportunities for collaboration between faculty across disciplines and across health professions schools
 - Contributions and recognition of faculty and staff for activities and achievements in meeting the organization's goals
- Keeping faculty, staff, students and alumni in the information loop
 - Dean's newsletter to faculty, staff, students and alumni
 - Posting of news and events on school website
 - Promotions, elected/appointed offices and awards received by faculty, staff, students and alumni
 - Interdepartmental, interdisciplinary inter-school collaborations and grants received.
 - Community service activities in which faculty, staff students, and/or alumni are involved.

These and other findings from the literature can be summarized in the following suggestions to colleges/schools of pharmacy:

SUGGESTION 1. Create a culture that is respectful to contemporary knowledge workers.

SUGGESTION 2. Communicate in a very transparent way to all faculty and staff the mission, vision, values, and expectations for productivity. Elicit their input on these and other important decisions.

SUGGESTION 3. Assess your organization's current climate for strengths and weaknesses. Be mindful of the climate as you engage in strategic and/or change planning.

SUGGESTION 4. Inspire collegiality among faculty and staff by communicating expected behaviors, rewarding expected behaviors, deterring unwanted behaviors, and creating opportunities for social and scholarly exchange.

SUGGESTION 5. Create communities of scholars or similar such program to facilitate faculty camaraderie and those with like-minded interests to share ideas that might generate productivity in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Additionally, recommendations are made to AACP:

RECOMMENDATION 1. Support the additional study of the climates and cultures in colleges/schools of pharmacy, including their antecedents and resultant implications.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Given the importance of this topic and the paucity of current knowledge, identify a funding mechanism to support a competitive request-for-proposal process to incentivize study in culture/climate and related faculty quality of work life issues.

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR (AND OTHER ADMINISTRATORS)

Research has shown consistently that faculty quality of work life is highly dependent upon their relationship with the chair, who is instrumental in establishing climate and ethos within the department. Support from the department chair has been shown to buffer the deleterious effects of role conflict/ambiguity and is instrumental in the success of mentoring programs, and thus,

faculty productivity.^{7,54} Much of the same things can be said of other administrators in the organizational hierarchy, but this review will focus on chairs; however, some of the recommendations and suggestions will include those other administrators.

Chairs typically assume the role without much if any specific preparation for the job.^{55,56} The position often of misunderstood and has been characterized as one of the more stressful professional jobs, not only within, but even outside of academia.^{57,58} The department chair position has been referred to in many ways, including “the hot seat”⁵⁹ and “the disenfranchised outsider.”⁶⁰ Evidence suggests that faculty experience moderate to severe difficulty in transitioning to their new roles as chair.⁵⁶ The transition often is accompanied by high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity, as the chair sets policy within a department but serves as the liaison between the faculty and the remainder of the administrative team. Gmelch and Parkay characterized problematic role changes from faculty to chair, including (1) from solitary to social, (2) from focused to fragmented, (3) from autonomy to accountability, (4) from manuscripts to memoranda, (5) from stability to mobility, and (6) from client to custodian.⁶¹ Chairs often “leave behind” time for research and writing, ability to keep up with one’s field, teaching, and leisure.⁶²

Bowman argued that the real work of chairs is to manage conversational inquiry that engages others in creating possibilities and a sustainable future.⁶³ He described necessary leadership capabilities for doing so, including well-honed communication skills, problem-solving, coaching, transition management, and cultural management skills. As alluded to previously, chairs’ ideals for culture and governance differ among disciplines.⁶⁴⁻⁶⁶ Chairs in the “hard” disciplines have been evidenced to demonstrate a greater task orientation and to emphasize research productivity, whereas chairs in “soft” or low-consensus disciplines are reportedly more concerned with shaping collegial cultures.⁶⁵ As such, chairs in pharmacy academia governing faculty in various disciplines may face even more daunting responsibilities in assuaging faculty with unique preferences, needs, and perceptions of what the chair’s role should be.

At a more basic level, the roles and responsibilities of academic chair fall under one of two dimensions: academic or administrative.⁶⁷ The academic dimension includes those duties

involved with teaching, advising, research, student and faculty development, and curriculum planning. The administration dimension includes organization of the department, setting short- and long-term goals, chairing faculty meetings, managing the budget, attending to record-keeping, communicating the institution's mission and goals to faculty, identifying external resources, managing space needs, and recruiting for department positions. Many faculty remain unconvinced that the chair role and other administrative roles in academia are worth doing.⁶⁸ This is why in addition to development of current chairs and administrators, the Academy and individual institutions must consider ways of making these jobs more attractive and spending some effort not only in developing faculty to be effective teacher-scholars, but also put careful thought into succession planning and developing potential leaders into future administrators.⁶⁹

Among the desired capabilities of a chair is the effectiveness to lead change. Leftwich found that departments chairs who have led successful, innovative changes in culture and productivity: (1) are perceived as being highly ethical; (2) possess good people skills and use them to influence and empower faculty; (3) have confidence in their leadership abilities; (4) develop individual relationship with their faculty to carry out work of the department; and (5) pay particular attention to the organizational dynamics that can affect leadership.⁷⁰ Garcia underscored the necessity for chairs to be accessible, dependable, and very effective and shrewd managers of time.⁷¹

Time management is critical, due to the myriad pressures facing the chair and the responsiveness required of the position. Stress of the academic chair has been examined in a number of contexts. Wolverton and Ackerman identified a five-factor model common to explain chair stress, including administrative relationship stress, academic role stress, academic tasks stress, human relations stress, and external time stress.⁷² Similarly, Hoffman examined the conflicting roles of the department chair and proffered several strategies for coping and effectiveness, including: develop chair networks for support; elicit department faculty input; perform and share with faculty serious constructive evaluations; avoid feeling that all decisions must be made "on the spot"; use time wisely; and leave problems at the office.⁷³ Gmelch and Gates observed that chairs who rated their institutions highly reported lower levels of stress as

did those who took on the position more for intrinsic, rather than extrinsic reasons.⁷⁴ Seedorf found 3 main “surprises” challenging most chairs are: dealing with people, coping with the bureaucracy of the university, and the negative effect that being department chair has on one’s own research productivity.⁵⁷

Among the critical elements to the success of the chair is the establishment of trust, not only among fellow administrators, but particularly among the composite department faculty. Trust in the chair has been implicated in the amelioration of burnout, stress, and turnover among faculty.⁷⁵ Department chairs can gain trust among faculty in many ways, including, but not limited to, transparency, fairness in distribution of organizational rewards, real praise used appropriately, assisting colleagues to develop networks, giving proper credit, and avoidance of competitiveness with department members.⁷⁶ It has been observed that faculty who report significant autonomy and significant influence over their own work environment perceive higher levels of interpersonal trust with their chairs.⁷⁶ Many chairs, particularly those less seasoned, may be tempted to rely overly on appeasement of department faculty as a means of maintaining a positive climate and eliciting trust. However, appeasement is often problematic, as “squeaky wheels getting more grease” will eventually engender animosity among remaining faculty, and trust among other administrators is eventually lost, particularly when the chair has to lobby for resources and exceptions to rules/policies for department faculty due to promises that were made.⁷⁷

The responsibilities of department chairs and other administrators become even more complex in the distance environment. Keaster argues that it is difficult to accomplish anything structurally unless the person holding the power [the academic chair] either takes charge or at least supports the efforts of those doing the work on two or more campuses.⁷⁸ Department chairs are seen as key to acquiring the necessary buy-in for the change to distance environments and use of appropriate technology. A unique challenge is having faculty reports/subordinates on more than one campus. This requires careful planning to avoid turf issues in the assignment of teaching responsibilities and allocation of organizational rewards, in addition to facilitating opportunities among department faculty for scholarship across the campuses, and getting the department to

work as a cohesive unit. Franklin and Hart offer assistance to chairs for allocating teaching responsibilities and rewarding faculty for distance education.⁷⁹

As with other major themes outlined in this paper, generational, gender, and race/ethnicity issues come into play. Chairs must be sensitive to work-home issues of women faculty and potential marginalization and ineffective mentoring for female and minority faculty. At the same time, the chair cannot provide what is perceived to be special treatment to women and minority faculty, as this could be both insulting to them, personally, and could result in loss of trust by other department members. There are additional challenges for women chairs. Women chairs are often the victim of various stereotyping, such as irrational behavior, overly emotional responses, favoritism toward other women, and accusations of political correctness for having been named to the job. One study found that the most effective strategies for women chairs are when they successfully pair stereotypic male (agentic, ie, assertive, ambitious, forceful, and independent) with stereotypic female (communal, ie, kind, sympathetic, nurturing, and gentle) behaviors.⁸⁰

The Task Force identified the following considerations for department chairs to be effective,^{81,82} although this list is not intended to be exhaustive:

- Gather information and dissemination information, appropriately
- Sharpen decision-making skills
- Use the power of influence wisely and more frequently than the power of authority
- Seek consultation for effective strategies to conduct faculty reviews and assess performance
- Get to know your faculty well and understand their motivations
- Employ participatory governance and situational leadership
- Delegate effectively as a means of getting things done and developing faculty
- Learn leadership strategies valued by faculty in your discipline and in your organization
- Stay abreast of policies, rules, and procedures at your institution, as well as general knowledge of pertinent human resources management regulations
- Role model important behaviors

- Connect your faculty to important others within and outside the organization
- Create opportunities for faculty to flourish as teachers and scholars
- Effectively liaise between internal and external (outside the department) environments
- Manage the impressions that others develop of you
- Orient new faculty to the organization's and department's ethos
- Carve out some time to maintain some level of involvement in scholarship
- Do more listening than talking
- Listen to others' personal concerns and feelings, but triage certain individuals to professional counseling or other services, as needed
- Strive for quality and continuous improvement, but help to make the work of others in doing so fun and exciting
- Create development plans for your faculty and for yourself
- Transmit respect for each individual in your department
- Capitalize on the strengths of individual faculty
- Build pride in each person's accomplishments
- Give feedback as soon as possible
- Promote independence and responsibility
- Pay attention to areas of dissatisfaction and solicit faculty suggestions for improvement
- Stress quality rather than quantity

Other professional organizations are developing various leadership programs, some of which are geared toward chair development and/or aspiring chairs. The American College of Clinical Pharmacy has a Leadership and Management Certificate Program⁸³ that targets mentoring and management skills. The American Society of Health-Systems Pharmacy administers its Pharmacy Leadership Academy and Pharmacy Leadership Institute programs.⁸⁴ AACP administers the Academic Leadership Fellows Program,⁸⁵ which affords each participant considerable autonomy in their goals for learning. AACP has implemented some programming for department chairs. The Task Force identified a wide array of resources and programs available

that current and aspiring chairs may utilize to improve communication and effectiveness, including several modules, resources, and web-based programs that should be helpful to current and aspiring chairs, including the CHAIR 101 Series modular program⁸⁶ whose goals include to increase the chair's knowledge of university policies, personnel, financial systems and general university resources; clarify the role of the department chair and what is necessary to function in this position; gain practical skills in the day-to-day management of departmental affairs; build a network of contacts within the university for ongoing problem-solving, support, and information sharing; develop a network of contacts external to the university for support and information-sharing; develop and implement a budget; strategic planning; making appropriate personnel decisions; using data to guide planning and development, and guiding difficult conversations. Additionally there are programs hosted by the American Council on Education that can be linked or hosted onto AACP's website.⁸⁷ Programs highlight diverse areas including legal issues, evaluation of teaching, systems thinking, using data to guide department planning and decision-making, working with the dean, conflict management, and transformational leadership. The Task Force also identified several other publications that could be helpful (brief descriptions of each are available on the Task Force's 2009-2010 report on the AACP website).⁸⁸ Finally, while there is a wealth of literature on how department chairs can optimize their performance, there is little information available to faculty on how to cultivate effective relationships with chairs and how to utilize the chair's best talents and wisdom for their own success.

The Task Force suggests the following to colleges/schools of pharmacy:

SUGGESTION 1. Offer comprehensive development to chairs and other administrators, perhaps in conjunction with other programs in the institution. Identify and develop future chairs as part of a cogent succession planning strategy.

SUGGESTION 2. Consider mechanisms to make chair and other administrative positions more attractive.

SUGGESTION 3. Carefully delineate and communicate a clear set of expectations for chairs, including personal productivity levels, in addition to their administrative responsibilities.

SUGGESTION 4. Consider the nature of various disciplines within pharmacy when constructing departments for best fit and delineating responsibilities of the chair and his/her constituent faculty.

The following are recommended to AACP:

RECOMMENDATION 1. Continue with programming specifically targeted toward chair development. Consider all aspects of the chair's work responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Offer programming for faculty aspiring to be chairs, specifically, and more broadly for all faculty to acquire skills in developing rapport with chairs and understanding organizational dynamics in academic organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 3. Post links to various resources and create a clearinghouse of information that can be hosted on AACP's website that will be useful to chairs and faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 4. Support additional studies evaluating effective chair behaviors and the resultant implications for faculty quality of work life, productivity, and organizational function through a request-for-proposal or similar process.

FACULTY RECRUITMENT

Recruitment of future faculty is important to ameliorate current and future faculty shortages. Such shortages create a more stressful environment for existing faculty and diminish their vitality and productivity. Moreover, evidence suggests that careful planning in faculty recruitment is commensurate with and helpful toward imbuing organizational commitment to an institution's mission and vision.⁸⁹ Evidence abounds that faculty are the crucial factor in determining the quality of education and research contributed by universities.⁹⁰ Faculty recruitment practices connote certain values to the entire department/organization and can affect morale.

AACP has long considered faculty recruitment critical to the advancement of the Academy and profession of pharmacy.^{91,92} The current iteration of consecutive years for this Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce was initially appointed in 2005. A 2008 special article reported the findings from the Task Force, which had culled much of the available literature at the time.⁹³ Their recommendations included exposing students, fellows, and residents to the attractive aspects of the Academy by building more flexibility into these programs, creating dual-degree programs; expanding recruitment initiatives, such as the Wal-Mart Scholars Program; expanding clinical scientists programs; developing innovative professional practice and research incentive programs; and assessing barriers to academic careers. The Task Force recommended a number of retention strategies as well, whose putative success in enhancing faculty quality of work life also would assist in recruitment, such as revision of the tenure process, greater transparency in continuing contracts, creation of novel benefit packages, creation of networks of scholars and active mentoring programs with rewards for exemplary participation in these programs, and development of programs that recognize excellence. That Task Force further identified several areas for study, including the impact of changes of tenure policy and procedures, various works/projects of the Academic Leadership Fellows cohorts, and the impact of part-time faculty.

The recommendations were further corroborated by another Task Force (on Faculty Recruitment and Retention).⁹¹ Many of the recommendations were focused on extrinsic components of job satisfaction aimed at the changing demographic and recognition of the evolving values of Generation Y and Millennial faculty, such as job-sharing, especially for female faculty, provision of day care programs for faculty with young children, tenure stop-clocks, and more creative salary packages. These are logical and prudent suggestions. Extrinsic components of job satisfaction are not unimportant. Some success has even been reported with the use of signing bonuses for new faculty; however, this has to be considered in light of the possibility of alienating existing faculty.⁹⁴ Further, the implications of these policies have not been tested.

Conklin and Desselle examined domains governing pharmacy faculty work satisfaction including institutional support, resources for scholarship, unambiguous requirements for promotion and

tenure, availability of graduate assistants, collegiality, and teaching environment.⁹⁵ Faculty were most satisfied with the courses they are assigned to teach and the freedom to design courses as they see fit; however, they were least satisfied with the availability of time to pursue scholarship, the availability of competent graduate teaching assistants, and institutional support for research. Latif and Grillo also found that junior pharmacy faculty were most satisfied with their teaching roles.⁹⁶ Maintaining high levels of satisfaction with role functions is important, however, there has been little guidance on effective strategies for ameliorating the sources or effects dissatisfaction, which are not necessarily the mirror opposite to sources of satisfaction. Desselle and Conklin examined the importance of self-efficacy with other aspects of quality of work life; however, it is not known how fostering research self-efficacy can improve the quality of work life of faculty and even how promoting self-efficacy (through mentoring or development processes) can be used to recruit junior faculty.⁹⁷ Many faculty when attempting to recruit a prospective student into post-graduate education have heard something like, "I just don't know. I'm scared of research, and I don't see how I could ever write a dissertation, even if I completed the research." It might be worthwhile to examine our collective effectiveness at promoting the scholarship of teaching, educational research, and clinical research that may be of great appeal to current pharmacy students, residents, and fellows. It also may be worthwhile to study the impact of various mechanisms for promoting self-efficacy and attracting talented individuals into the Academy.

Faculty have reported several mechanisms to promote academia as a career, including the completion of a project for a PharmD student culminating in a paper submitted for peer review,⁹⁸ an academic rotation,⁹⁹ and certificate programs.¹⁰⁰ These appear to have garnered at least some success. The Task Force reiterates its support for best practices in recruitment strategies, which include exposure during experiential training, teaching certificates and academic rotations for students and residents, student mentoring programs, and outreach/education to graduate students. It has been argued that there is considerable variation in exposure of residents to teaching and to opportunities in academia.¹⁰¹ The same can be said of the state of doctoral and post-doctoral training programs. AACP should conduct a call for best practices in recruitment/

retention efforts and for preparation of potential future faculty to enter academia. Additionally, AACP might recommend to ASHP, a collaborative effort to encourage academic pharmacy as a career, including PGY2 experiences that combine academic pharmacy and specialty practice, development of academic fellowship experiences with ACCP, and other novel approaches.

Additional strategies requiring further exploration include the following:

- Academic pharmacy APPE rotations: Little is known about which pharmacy programs offer them, what components are included, and how many students participate. Example syllabi would be helpful for inclusion into a faculty recruitment “toolkit”.
- Academic pharmacy rotations for post-graduate residents and research fellows.
- Graduate students’ orientation to academia: AACP might consider recommending to ACPE that faculty, graduate students, and post-doctoral students receive some sort of orientation to the profession of pharmacy.
- Broad visibility and communications: The AACP communications initiative on National Pharmacy Educator Week is an excellent means to expose students to careers in academic life. Best practices successful programming during National Pharmacy Educator Week may be sought. AACP also might consider partnering with the American Pharmacists Association (APhA) for broader visibility during National Pharmacy Week.
- Career fair participation.
- Grow our own: Some colleges have a program to “grow our own” to attract pharmacy students into academia and mentoring these students throughout PharmD and post-graduate programs, although over-reliance on “inbreeding” should be monitored.
- Development of preceptors: Development programs offered to APPE and IPPE preceptors, which might not only improve quality in teaching and precepting, but also stimulate interest for practitioners to pursue faculty positions.
- Recruitment into BS programs in pharmaceutical sciences: These programs may serve as rich resources for recruitment into pharmacy PhD programs and into academia.
- Organizations can examine promotion expectations between research-based and practitioner faculty, as the latter are more susceptible to earnings discrepancies between

academia and other career options. Further, they may find it more difficult to earn salary adjustments if current policies are more favorable to research productivity.

As previously mentioned, other areas integral to faculty recruitment [and retention] have not been explored thoroughly enough. For example, there are very few faculty from Hispanic/Latino or from African-American ethnic backgrounds. It has been reported that minority faculty suffer unintended consequences of low expectations, which fosters their anxiety and insecurity.¹⁰² At the same time, these faculty are more likely to be perceived as being defiant to authority when others might regard similar statements and assertions from white males as their being “typically academic.”¹⁰³

It would appear obvious that among the first solutions to address this need is to recruit more pharmacy students from various ethnic backgrounds into our academic programs. Capomacchia and Garmer point out that among the few ethnic minority faculty in academia, many are at historically black colleges and universities.¹⁰² They demonstrated some success with the Coach Model to recruit minority graduate students at the University of Georgia; however, questions remain unanswered. How applicable is this model to other pharmacy programs? What are the best practices in recruiting minority students into pharmacy programs? Have effective methods of recruiting such students been studied? Since there are few graduate programs at pharmacy schools within historically black universities, have cross-recruiting, cross-mentoring, and/or cross-programming options between colleges at historically black universities with other colleges of pharmacy been studied or explored? It is generally agreed that faculty participation is critical to the success of a diversity strategy in hiring; however, there is no consensus among academicians on the best way to achieve diversity at an institutional, or even departmental level,¹⁰⁴ as many efforts appear overly “contrived” or “mechanical” in nature.¹⁰⁵ Even so, literature from medicine, law, and other fields, in addition to information on corporate diversity initiatives, may be helpful.

The latter considerations also are important in the recruitment of junior faculty talent (ie, “Millennials”) who demand frankness and sincerity during the interview process, but prefer that organizational members refrain from comparing today with the glories of yesterday during

interviews or even during development programs.¹⁰⁶ In recruiting younger, female faculty efforts should focus on quality of academic life, accommodating family members' needs, and job security through either a clear tenure process or other creative contracting mechanisms.¹⁰⁷

Other factors, such as collegiality and institutional support have been evaluated in various contexts, but not explicitly for their roles in recruitment. Collegiality has been identified as a driving force of faculty's intention to remain with an organization.¹⁰⁸ Draugalis underscored this when she added "respect" as a fourth "R" to recruitment, retention, and renewal.¹⁰⁹ What has yet to be explored are the implications for respect and collegiality on the effectiveness of an institution for recruiting students, fellows, and residents into faculty careers and how unique organizational citizenship behaviors by faculty make a job in academia more appealing.

Leslie argued that the Academy has solutions to offer to increase the number and quality of candidates for the next generation of pharmacy faculty; however, the effectiveness of these solutions has not been studied.¹¹⁰ He argued for colleges/schools of pharmacy to work together more closely, assess the current faculty workforce, and perform a roles analysis of schools, thus establishing the potential for synergy and cross-programming or partnering with other institutions for post-graduate education. Similarly, Proto and Dzurec stress more inter-organizational collaboration, leveraging local networks, aligning stakeholder priorities, and acting persistently as important strategies for successful recruitment.¹¹¹ Matier found that the most influential factors in for faculty when choosing an organization are institutional and/or department reputation, research opportunities; teaching assignments; career advancement opportunities, congeniality of associates, and rapport with departmental leaders.¹¹²

Aspects of recruitment that often are overlooked are the processes of advertising and interviewing. Vardaman found that found that national advertisements of faculty vacancies often are conducted with little forethought into probable success.¹¹³ Evidence suggests little correlation between a person's performance on an interview with their future job performance.¹¹⁴ Three

errors often made during the recruitment process are: 1) making a judgment about a candidate within 5 minutes of meeting them then spending the remaining time confirming that judgment; 2) systematically overrating a response construed as negative; and 3) generalizing from particulars to make global judgments about the overall qualifications of a candidate. Search committees are advised to take a “person-environmental” approach to evaluating prospective candidates.¹¹⁵

Colleges/schools of pharmacy must examine effectiveness in hiring, not just recruitment strategies. Maine offered excellent suggestions for programs to advertise positions, conduct interviews of candidates, “close the sale,” and allocate appropriate start-up funds during a clear and transparent initial negotiation and contracting process.¹¹⁶ Candidates have suggested that opportunities for research, teaching, and career advancement, along with department goals are most important, yet this information is not made readily available or is unclear. Faculty have suggested that involvement with research, knowledge of the discipline, attitudes toward students, and problem-solving ability are the most information to glean from candidates; however, these may not be gathered adequately during a dysfunctional interview process.¹¹⁶

Overall, much has been written on faculty recruitment, and it is hoped that the information offered in this paper is helpful; however, there is still much to be learned, and there must be additional study of these issues. There is active and important ongoing debate on the preparation of clinical scientists, with implications for recruitment, vitality, strength, and yield of scientific discovery.¹¹⁷ Yanchick argued for culture change in our professional and post-graduate programming.¹¹⁸ The Task Force certainly agrees with him that when approaching faculty recruitment, we have to “think off the map” to create positive philosophies and successful experiences.

The Task Force reiterates some critical recommendations and suggestions on faculty recruitment to colleges/schools of pharmacy.

SUGGESTION 1. Encourage development of various training opportunities in teaching and scholarship, and foster exposure by PharmD students, residents, and graduate students to the benefits of academic worklife.

SUGGESTION 2. Examine best practices in all aspects of the faculty recruitment process, which includes developing worthwhile positions, creating effective and accurate job descriptions, implementing effective advertising strategies, executing successful interview practices, and making effective hire decisions. Be systematic in evaluating past successes and failures.

SUGGESTION 3. Implement policies that consider the needs of contemporary faculty that will not only engender retention and productivity, but also will lead to successful recruitment efforts.

SUGGESTION 4. To increase the diversity and the quality of your applicant pool, examine and corroborate current policies to increase the diversity of professional students, residents, and graduate students.

The Task Force similarly reiterates recommendations to AACP:

RECOMMENDATION 1. Collect and disseminate best practices for faculty recruitment within and outside of pharmacy.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Collect information on colleges/schools' practices for job design, salary incentives, and organizational rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic) systems that enhance the attractiveness of pharmacy academic careers.

RECOMMENDATION 3. Work with other organizations to identify opportunities for exposure for professional and post-graduate students to teaching, scholarship, and service activities.

MENTORSHIP

Mentorship and mentoring relationships have seemingly grown in recognition for their importance across a considerable spectrum of activities and outcomes. Mentoring partnerships are widely recognized and utilized in business, youth development, prevention of recidivism, leadership development, and substance abuse rehabilitation, to name but a few. The literature is replete with demonstrations reporting the benefits of both informal mentoring and formal mentoring

programs. Formal mentoring programs have been associated with faculty job satisfaction, commitment, reductions in turnover, and productivity.¹¹⁹ The detractors of formal mentoring programs argue that informal, “self-germinating,” or “organic” mentoring relationships are more likely to last; however, when structured appropriately, the evidence is overwhelmingly supportive of formal mentoring programs. Further, the existence of formal mentoring programs and the inevitable informal mentoring that occurs among colleagues are not mutually exclusive.

Much of the mentoring literature addresses appropriate behaviors by the mentor to facilitate successful mentor-mentee relationships. Mount and Barrick¹²⁰ described the five-factor model of strong mentorship, elicited from the “big five” personality dimensions labeled in Digman’s¹²¹ landmark work. These five, emotional stability, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, are the quintessential goods in a mentor’s toolbox. Johnson proposed a framework for conceptualizing competence of a mentor.¹²² His triangular model includes character virtues (eg, integrity and prudence), intellectual/emotional abilities (eg, communication skills, emotional balance), and knowledge and skills (eg, competencies, self-awareness). Johnson points out that there should be consideration for mentoring potential not only among senior faculty, but even for junior faculty hires. He adds that mentoring requires a faculty mentor to engage in a dynamic, emotionally connected, and reciprocal relationship with the mentee that includes frequent interaction, successful collaboration, social activities, and increasing collegiality as the mentee develops. The two elements identified as fundamental and distinguishing from superior-subordinate relationships are reciprocity/mutuality and accomplishment of an identity transformation, as the mentee advances from neophyte to equal. This view is underscored by McCauley¹²³ in a discussion of transference and countertransference in mentoring. Transference occurs when an individual, usually subconsciously, treats a current relationship as though it were an important relationship from the past, or an “unwitting recreation and repetition of earlier family relationships.”¹²³ From the mentor’s perspective, functional transference occurs when there is respect for the mentor’s expertise and skills (positive) and assertion of personal identity (negative transference, but still functional and appropriate) by the

mentee. Dysfunction occurs when the mentee becomes over-awed by the mentor or when the mentee saps the life out of the mentor. Functional countertransference occurs with a benevolent desire to develop the mentee, but also (negative, but functional) when the mentor expresses negative emotions and lets go of the mentee in a reliable manner. Dysfunction occurs when the mentor colludes with the mentee or victimizes him/her in the organization.

The description of appropriate transference and countertransference behaviors segues into a discussion of rational mentoring. Johnson, Huwe, and Lucas point out 20 rational behaviors by mentors for productive relationships, but also some irrational beliefs of mentors, which include: "I must be successful with all of my mentees all of the time," "I must reap tremendous benefit from mentoring and thoroughly enjoy it all of the time," and "My mentee must never leave or disappoint me."¹²⁴ Busch points out a number of potential pitfalls in mentor-mentee relationships, including attempts at cloning, taking credit for the mentee's work; not keeping commitments; becoming possessive of the mentee's time; mentor believes that each mentee must be equally hard-working and high-achieving; mentee does not take feedback seriously; mentee "plays" mentor against others; and mentee becomes envious and resentful of the mentor's accomplishments.¹²⁵

Tepper, Shaffer, and Tepper identified the latent structure of 16 putative mentoring activities, identifying a two-factor oblique model consisting of psychosocial and career-related mentoring functions.¹²⁶ The psychosocial mentoring domain consisted of items such as encouraging the mentee to try new ways of behaving on the job, serving as a role model, sharing personal experiences, and conveying feelings of respect toward the mentee. The career-related mentoring functions domain included items such as encouraging preparation for advancement, giving assignments that increase contacts with higher level administrators, helping the mentee to meet new colleagues, helping the mentee to learn new skills, and collaboration on a teaching or research project. Certain individuals will naturally be stronger in some aspects of mentoring than others. An analysis of mentor behaviors by Erkut and Mokros revealed that individuals are strongest in providing feedback on the quality of the mentee's work and showing interest in the

mentee's personal growth.¹²⁷ In descending order, they showed mentors' lower proclivity to provide technical expertise, provide moral support, and help the mentee establish connections.

In addition to the many challenges faced by faculty of all stripes, junior faculty have an especially difficult time adjusting to their new careers.¹²⁸ Part of this may be generational, as new faculty may have different conceptualizations and expectations from a relationship than the faculty who mentor them. The literature provides relatively little guidance in this specific area, and it appears as though studies evaluating the effect of generational dynamics on mentoring effectiveness are warranted. The challenges are especially problematic for female faculty. Evidence suggests that women receive mentoring less frequently and less effectively than their male counterparts, and thus are left to rely on less effective power bases.¹²⁹ This may be attributable to nagging attitudes about women who are misjudged to be less career-focused and the fact that higher education's cohort of faculty is predominately male. These same problems may be heightened even further for African-American and Hispanic faculty, who are even rarer in pharmacy academia.¹³⁰ The design of formal mentoring programs should consider additional barriers faced by these faculty, with special attention afforded to the need for these faculty to find formal or informal mentors who share common characteristics and interests but also to their need to make important connections and be assigned team-oriented responsibilities with persons composing important power bases, who frequently will be white males. There also should be study dedicated to the effectiveness of various mentoring program structures and relationships for faculty from ethnic minorities.

The Task Force has identified certain characteristics that best suit an individual for a role as mentor. It should be noted that while the department chair should inherently be providing mentoring and guidance, it is best to avoid appointment of the chair or other person as a formal mentor for various reasons, including the potential for conflict of interest in what might be best for the mentee versus that of the department. Positive qualities for good mentors have been described, including, but not limited to:¹³¹⁻¹³³

- Commitment to mentoring and to commitment to the organization

- Professional competence (research, teaching, practice, service)
- Excellent communication, interpersonal, and listening skills
- Institutionally savvy
- Has interests that align with the mentee (not just or necessarily research interests, alone)
- Demonstrates willing to learn and reciprocate in the mentor-mentee relationship
- Protects confidentiality
- Conscientiousness
- Accessibility, sincerity, and honesty
- Even-keeled emotionally
- Sets reasonably high standards for self and for others
- Experienced
- Enthusiastic about his/her discipline
- Appreciates diversity in perspective
- Open-minded and culturally sensitive
- Is a voracious learner
- Good knowledge of the profession and the academy
- Patience
- Reflective, particularly as what it means to be a scholar
- Inspires confidence in others
- Non-manipulative and unselfish
- Self-confident and assertive, but not arrogant

The Task Force also recognizes characteristics among prospective mentees that will facilitate their likelihood of success in a mentoring program and upon embarking upon an academic career, which include but are not limited to:

- Willingness to participate in development opportunities
- Recognizes the need for self-growth

- Self-awareness and the ability to self-assess strengths/weaknesses
- Receptiveness to feedback and coaching
- A record of seeking and accepting challenging assignments
- Ability to perform in more than one major skill area and buys into the multi-faceted nature of the academy and employing institution
- Is cautious but trustful of mentor and others aiming to provide help

A review of the literature and an examination of well-documented successful efforts in mentorship programs at multiple institutions also enabled the Task Force to offer the following best practices in structuring a formal mentoring program:

- Input should be sought from a wide variety of sources when developing a mentoring program, including but not limited to administrators, faculty, colleagues from other departments/programs within the institution, and experienced persons at other institutions involved with successful mentoring programs.
- Mentoring programs should be holistic and involve mentoring faculty on a career-level, as opposed to focusing only on one area, such as research productivity. The mentee can develop other focused mentoring relationships to meet specific developmental needs (eg, research, teaching, practice), which may be facilitated by the career mentor.
- Mentoring programs should identify specific goals for mentors, mentees, and the department/school/college/institution as a whole.
- The institution should identify specific eligibility criteria for all participants, including but not limited to mentees, career mentors, facilitators, and advisors. Participation as a mentee may be an expectation for junior faculty; however, even well-seasoned faculty might benefit from mentoring. It is even possible that a faculty member be mentored in one area, and provide mentoring in another area.

- Each participant in the process should have a clearly defined set of expectations, roles, and responsibilities for their participation in the program.
- Mentors should be trained on various aspects of mentoring, including but not limited to, career networking, developing rapport/collegiality, ethical research standards, teaching pedagogy, and avoiding mentoring pitfalls.
- There should be recognition for those faculty participating in mentorship activities. The time and effort should be recognized formally in workload allocation, in guidelines for tenure and promotion and for consideration in other organizational rewards. Institutions might consider inclusion of awards for effective mentoring in much the same way they award meritorious teaching and scholarship.
- The organization should institutionalize mentoring as part of its culture, making it a pillar upon which development and other activities are constructed.
- Assignment of mentors can be handled using any of a variety of approaches, such as mentor-mentee dyads or small mentoring committees. Consideration must be given to selecting appropriate individuals to be matched with one another. Some programs have prospective mentors and mentees complete inventories to match their needs, goals, and interests. There should be flexibility in the program to allow mentors and mentees to be switched, or reallocated, if a dyad or team is not functioning or if such is requested.
- There should be occasional programs dedicated to mentor and mentee participants, both professional (eg, grantsmanship, teaching strategies) and social in nature.

Best practices for mentoring programs suggest that there be specific goals in mind for the institution, mentor, and mentee. The goals are best designed by key stakeholders in the department/institution and should be periodically updated and revised with input from junior faculty. Examples of goals include:

- Orient new faculty members to the administrative structure and organizational culture of the Department, College/School, and University.
- Promote and encourage faculty development in teaching, scholarship, service
- Provide counsel on academic career development
- Align resources to support and promote faculty development
- Develop role-modeling behaviors among senior and junior faculty, alike
- Facilitate self-awareness, self-confidence, and self-esteem among faculty
- Alleviate stress that arises from confusion, ambiguity, overload, and social isolationism
- Provide an opportunity for mutually beneficial and personally rewarding relationships
- Provide resources for women faculty and faculty from various racial/ethnic minorities in dealing with additional challenges and stressors they are known to face
- Facilitate potentially life-long, productive and socially rewarding relationships among faculty
- Facilitate communities of learning by helping bring together persons with similar needs and interests
- Improve productivity and career satisfaction among faculty

A mentorship program, like any other program, should be routinely evaluated for its effectiveness.

Indicators of success should be identified by the appropriate stakeholders at each institution.

Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Teaching effectiveness of mentees
- Research productivity of mentees and mentors
- Clinical service creativity and productivity
- Mentees' contributions in school, university, professional, and civic service
- Participation in self-development and mentoring activities
- Collaborative mentor/mentee efforts in teaching, scholarship, and/or service
- Self-report survey eliciting mentors and mentees satisfaction with the relationship, the meeting of program objectives, mentee development

- Tenure, promotion, and recognition (local & national) of participants
- Retention and work satisfaction of faculty

The Task Force identified a number of resources and websites that might be helpful for the development of mentorship programs.¹³⁴⁻¹⁴⁴ These are not meant to be all-inclusive nor necessarily indicative that these are all the “best” sites and programs, as there have not been any attempts to evaluate or benchmark one program against another.

The Task Force suggests the following for colleges/schools of pharmacy:

SUGGESTION 1. Consider development of a formal mentoring program for faculty; consult available resources for strategies that will be most effective at your institution.

SUGGESTION 2. Train faculty to be effective mentors and mentees.

The following are recommended to AACP:

RECOMMENDATION 1. Implement programming on best practices for structuring a successful mentoring program, with special consideration given to issues of gender, race/ethnicity, and intergenerational dynamics in mentoring.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Develop a toolkit for junior faculty that would be broadly applicable to those of various types of academic institutions.

SUMMARY

The Task Force recognizes the difficulty and interconnectedness of various issues facing pharmacy academia and higher education, in general. The 4 major areas identified have considerable overlap yet each contribute uniquely to challenges and opportunities for present and future pharmacy faculty. It is hoped that this report and the resources provided within can assist administrators and faculty at all levels of seniority and across all disciplines and types of institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Annual Meeting Report to the Council of Faculties and Council of Deans AACP Task Force on Faculty Workforce July 2009.
<http://www.aacp.org/governance/councilfaculties/Documents/AACP%20Task%20Force%20on%20Faculty%20Workforce.pdf>. Accessed July 30, 2010.
2. Reports of the 2006/2007 COF/COD Task Force on Faculty Workforce.
http://www.aacp.org/governance/councilfaculties/Documents/COF_FacultyWorkforce2007.pdf. Accessed July 30, 2010.
3. Morell-Thon C. *Job satisfaction of Hispanic Faculty in Higher Education*. [doctoral dissertation]. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1998.
4. Johnsrud LK, Rosser VJ. Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *J Higher Educ.* 2002;73:518-542.
5. Smart JC. A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Res Higher Educ.* 1990;31:405-24.
6. Matier MW. Retain faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Res Higher Educ.* 1990;31:39-60.
7. Conklin MH, Desselle SP. Job turnover intentions among pharmacy faculty. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2007;71:Article 62.
8. Piscopo B. Organizational climate, communication, and role strain in clinical nursing faculty. *J Prof Nurs.* 1994;10:113-119.
9. Guzley RM. Organizational climate and communication climate: Predictors of commitment to the organization. *Manage Communication Quar.* 1992;5:379.
10. Gmelch. WH, Wilke PK, Lovrich NP. Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national survey. *Res Higher Educ.* 1986 ;24:266-286.
11. Deal TE, Kennedy AA. *Corporate Culture: The Rites and Rituals of Organisational Life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishers; 1982, pg. 4.
12. Kabanoff B. An exploration of espoused culture in Australian organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources.* 1993;31:1-29, pg. 2.

13. McMurray AJ. The relationship between organisational culture and organizational climate with reference to a university setting. Joint International Communication Association- Australia and New Zealand Communication Association Conference, Sydney, Australia; 1994.
14. Verbeke W, Volgering M, Hessels M. Exploring the conceptual expansion within the field of organizational behavior: Organizational climate and organizational culture. *J Management Studies*. 1998;25:303-329.
15. Froh RC. Revitalizing faculty work through intrinsic rewards. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 1993;81:87-95.
16. Drucker PF. Management Challenges for the 21st Century. New York: Harper Collins; 1999.
17. Tierney WG. *Building the Responsive Campus: Creating High Performance Colleges and Universities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc; 1999.
18. Nagy J, Burch T. Communities of Practice in Academe (CoP-iA): Understanding academic work practices to enable knowledge building capacities in corporate universities. *Oxford Rev Educ*. 2009;35:227-247.
19. Magill MK, Catinella AP, Haas L, Hughes CC. Cultures in conflict: a challenge to faculty of academic health centers. *Acad Medicine*. 1998;73:871.
20. Marsh HW, Hattie J. The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *J Higher Educ*. 2002;73:603-638.
21. Freed JE, Klugman MR, Fife JD. *A Culture for Academic Excellence: Implementing the Quality Principles in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1997.
22. Tam M. Managing change involves changing management: Implications for transforming higher education. *Qual Higher Educ*. 1999;5:227-232.
23. Kashner JB. Changing the corporate culture. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 1990;71:19-28.

24. Martin WB. Corporate culture--college culture. *New Directions for Higher Education*. No. 50 (*Applying Corporate Management Strategies*). 1985;13:75-81.
25. Meskill VP, McTague MJ. Nurturing new ideas: Inhibitors and enhancers in the search for new ideas. *Business Officer*. 1995;29:46-48.
26. Davies JL. The emergence of entrepreneurial cultures in European universities. *Journal of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education*. 2001;13:25-44.
27. Wessell NY. Run a Business Like a University? You Bet! *Trusteeship*. 1999;7:28-32.
28. Kezar A, Eckel PD. The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *J Higher Educ*. 2002;73:435-460.
29. Berquist WH. *The Four Culture of the Academy: Insights and Strategies for Improving Leadership in Collegiate Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1992.
30. Sporn B. Managing university culture: an analysis of the relationship between institutional culture and management approaches. *Higher Educ*. 1996;32:41-61.
31. Rhoads RA, Tierney WG. *Cultural Leadership in Higher Education*. University Park, Pa.: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment; 1992.
32. Austin AE, Rice RE, Splete AP. *A Good Place to Work: Sourcebook for the Academic Workplace*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges; 1991.
33. Anderson MS, Louis KS, Earle J. Disciplinary and departmental effects on observations of faculty and graduate student misconduct. *J Higher Educ*. 1994;65:331-350.
34. Willson R. The dynamics of organizational culture and academic planning. *Planning for Higher Education*. 2006;34:5-17.
35. Allen DK. Organisational climate and strategic change in higher education: Organisational insecurity. *Higher Educ*. 2003;46:61-92.
36. Wolfgang AP, Gupchup GV, Plake KS. Relative importance of performance criteria in promotion and tenure decisions: Perceptions of pharmacy faculty members. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 1995;59:342-347.

37. Austin AE. Institutional and departmental cultures: The relationship between teaching and research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 1996;90:57-66.
38. Davis T. Peer observation: A faculty initiative. *Currents Pharm Teach Learning*. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*. In press.
39. Kennedy RH, Gubbins PO, Luer M, Reddy IK, Light KE. Developing and sustaining a culture of scholarship. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2003;67:Artice 92.
40. Finnegan DE, Gamson ZF. Disciplinary adaptations to research culture in comprehensive institutions. *Rev Higher Educ*. 1996;19:141-177.
41. Volkwein JF, Carbone DA. The Impact of Departmental Research and Teaching Climates on Undergraduate Growth and Satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*. 1994;65:147-167.
42. Zahorski KJ. Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: A synergistic approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 2002;90:29-40.
43. Kuhn TS. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press;1970.
44. Lodahl JB, Gordon G. The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments. *Am Sociol Rev*. 1972;37:57-72.
45. Biglan A. The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *J Appl Psychol*. 1973;57:195-203.
46. Becher T. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press; 1989.
47. Hargens LL, Kelly-Wilson. Determinants of disciplinary discontent. *Soc Forces*. 1994;72:1177-1195.
48. Braxton JM, Berger JB. How disciplinary consensus affects faculty. In RJ Menges and Associates, eds. *Faculty in New Jobs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1999:243-267.
49. Desselle SP, Collins CC, Harrold MW, Kalis MM, Quattrocchi EJ. Quantitative and qualitative assessments of consensus within pharmacy's academic subdisciplines. *J Pharm Teaching*. 2002;9:1-33.

50. Desselle SP, Collins CC, Harrold MW, Kalis MM, Quattrocchi, EJ. Consensus within five academic subdisciplines of pharmacy: Progress toward establishing their scientific paradigms. *J Pharm Teaching*. 2002;9:27-46.
51. Schoenfeld AC, Magnan R. *Mentor in a Manual: Climbing the Academic Ladder to Tenure*: Madison, WI: Magna Publications, Inc.;1992.
52. Gibson S. Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education*. 2006;31:63-79.
53. Jazwinski CH. Judgments of sexism on the job: An attributional model. Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association. Chicago, IL; 1989.
54. Aziz S, Mullins ME, Balzer WD. Understanding the training needs of department chairs. *Studies Higher Educ*. 2005;30:571-593.
55. Schuh JH, Kuh GD. Promoting student success: What department chairs can do. *National Survey of Student Engagement*. 2005 (Occasional Paper No. 10):4.
56. Munro S. A tool kit for new chairs. *Academic Psychiatry*. 2006;30:301-303.
57. Seedorf RG. The problem-solving role of the university department chair. American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. San Francisco, CA; 1992.
58. Morris A, Miller M. Leadership role of the department chair in private colleges. *Academic Leadership*. 2008;6:Article 1.
59. Aggarwal P, Rochford L, Vaidyanathan R. The hot seat: Profiling the marketing department chair. *J Market Educ*. 2008;10:1-12.
60. Slick SK. The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 1998;14:821-834.
61. Gmelch WH, Parkay FW. Becoming a department chair: Negotiating the transition from scholar to administrator. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Ontario;1999.
62. Bowman RF. The real work of department chair. *The Clearing House*. 2002;75:158-162.

63. Carroll JB, Gmelch WH. The relationship of department chair roles to importance of chair duties. Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Minneapolis, MN; 1992.
64. Daly F, Townsend BK. Faculty perceptions of the department chair's role in facilitating tenure acquisition. Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Minneapolis, MN; 1992.
65. Braxton JM, Hargens LL. Variation among academic disciplines: analytical frameworks and research. In Smart JC, ed. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. New York: Agathon; 1996.
66. Braxton JM, Berger JB. How disciplinary consensus affects faculty. In Menges RJ and Associates. *Faculty in New Jobs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1999.
67. Grumbles K, Bregman NJ. The academic department head: Duties and compensation. AIR 1994 Annual Forum Paper. The Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. New Orleans, LA; 1994.
68. DeFleur MH, Kurpius DD, Osborne A, Hamilton JM. The masters: Creating a new generation of leaders for mass communication education and beyond. *Communication Education*. 2010;59:19-40.
69. Hancock TM. The business of universities and the role of department chair. *Int J Educ Manage*. 2007;21:306-314.
70. Leftwich PR. *Transformational Leadership at the Department Chair Level in North Carolina Community Colleges* [doctoral dissertation]. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University, 2001.
71. Garcia E. The first year in office: Strategies and tactics for success. *ADFL Bulletin*. 2001;32:10-12.
72. Wolverton M, Ackerman R. Cultivating possibilities: Prospective department chair professional development and why it matters. *Planning for Higher Education*. 2006;34:10.

73. Hoffman S. Teaching and managing: Conflicting roles of the department chair. International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy. Phoenix, AZ; 1996.
74. Gmelch WH, Gates GS. The stressful journey of the department chair: An academic in need of a compass and clock. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA; 1995.
76. Gmelch WH, Miskin VD. *Chairing an Academic Department*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1995.
76. Moye MJ, Henkin AB, Floyd DJ. Faculty-department chair relationships: Examining the nexus of empowerment and interpersonal trust in community colleges in the context of change. *Int J Educ Reform*. 2006;15:23.
77. Hubbell L, Homer F. The academic department chair: The logic of appeasement. *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 1997;14:209-213.
78. Keaster R. Distance education and the academic department: The change process. *Educause Quarterly*. 2005;28:48-53.
79. Franklin KK, Hart JK. Influence of web-based distance education on the academic department chair role. *Educational Technology and Society* 2006;9:213-228.
80. Isaac C, Griffin L, Carnes M. A qualitative study of faculty members' views of women chairs. *Journal of Women's Health*. 2010;19:533-546.
81. Seagren AT, Creswell JW, Wheeler DW. *The Department Chair: New Roles, Responsibilities and Challenges*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2000.
82. Hickson M, Stacks DW. *Effective Communication for Academic Chairs*. Albany, NY: University of New York Press; 1992.
83. American College of Clinical Pharmacy Leadership and Management Certificate Program. <http://www.accp.com/academy/leadershipandmanagement.aspx>. Accessed August 04, 2010.

84. American Society of Health-Systems Pharmacy Leadership Academy.
<http://www.ashpfoundation.org/MainMenuCategories/CenterforPharmacyLeadership/PharmacyLeadershipAcademy.aspx>. Accessed August 04, 2010.
85. American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy Academic Leadership Fellows Program.
<http://www.aacp.org/career/leadership/Pages/default.aspx>. Accessed August 04, 2010.
86. American Association of Medical Colleges. Leadership Training Program for Medical School Department Chairs.
<http://www.aamc.org/members/old/facultyvitae/winter07/leadershipprograms.pdf>.
Accessed on August 04, 2010.
87. American Council on Education. Department Leadership Program.
http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Course_Descriptions#evaluating.
Accessed August 04, 2010.
88. Report of the AACP COD-COF Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce, June 1, 2010.
<http://www.aacp.org/governance/councildeans/Documents/Report%20COD%20COF%20Workforce%20task%20force%20report.pdf>. Accessed August 04, 2010.
89. Chung SW, Clifton JS, Rowe AJ, Finley RJ, Warnock GL. Strategic faculty recruitment increases research productivity within an academic university division. *Can J Surg*. 2009;52:401-406.
90. Smith DC. Will there be enough excellent profs? *Report on Prospective Demand and Supply Conditions for University Faculty in Ontario*. Council of Ontario Universities; 2000.
91. AACP Recruitment and Retention Task Force: 2009-2010 Final Report.
<http://www.aacp.org/governance/SECTIONS/pharmacypractice/Documents/Recruitment%20and%20Retention%20Task%20Force.pdf>. Accessed August 6, 2010.
92. Sagraves R. Council of Deans Chairman's Section. A workforce issue: Faculty needs. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2001;65:92.
93. Beardsley R, Matzke GR, Rospond R, Williams J, Knapp K, et al. Factors influencing the pharmacy faculty workforce. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2008;72:Article 34.

94. June AW. Public colleges fight raids on faculties. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 2008;54:1.
95. Conklin MH, Desselle SP. Development of a multidimensional scale to measure work satisfaction among pharmacy faculty members. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2007;71:Article 61.
96. Latif DA, Grillo JA. Satisfaction of junior faculty with academic role functions. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2001;65:137-143.
97. Desselle SP, Conklin MH. Snapshot of the pharmacy faculty workforce. *J Pharm Teaching*. 2007;14:53-78.
98. Nykamp D, Murphy JE, Marshall LL, Bell A. Pharmacy students' participation in a research experience culminating in a journal publication. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2010;74:Article No. 47.
99. Hammer DP, Paulsen SM, An innovative clerkship in pharmacy education. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2001;65:284-93.
100. Poirier TI, Santanello C. Impact of a pharmacy education concentration on students' teaching knowledge and attitudes. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2010;74:Article 23.
101. Leiker LL, Mehta BH, Rodis JL, Pruchnicki MC, Pedersen CA. Assessment of pharmacy faculty opinions regarding required postgraduate pharmacy residencies. *Am J Health-Syst Pharm*. 2009;66:378-88.
102. Stanley JM, Capers CF, Berlin LE. Changing the face of nursing faculty: minority faculty recruitment and retention. *J Prof Nursing*. 2007;23:253-261.
103. Capomacchia AC, Garner S. Challenges of recruiting American minority graduate students: The Coach Model. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2004;68:Article 89.
104. Stanley JM, Capers CF, Berlin LE. Changing the face of nursing faculty: minority faculty recruitment and retention. *J Prof Nursing*. 2007;23:253-261.
105. Wharton G. *Faculty and Affirmative Action: Attitudes and Perceptions Concerning a Plan to Recruit Diverse Faculty at the University of Cincinnati*. [doctoral dissertation]. Jackson, TN: Union University, 2009.

106. Jaffer RA. *Diversity in Higher Education: Hiring Policies and Practices to Diversify Faculty in the College of Agriculture at a Midwestern University*. [doctoral dissertation]. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University; 2008.
107. Bickel J, Brown AJ. Generation X: implications for faculty recruitment and development in academic health centers. *Acad Med*. 2005;80:205.
108. Teevan JJ, Pepper S, Pellizzari JR. Academic employment decisions and gender. *Res Higher Educ*. 1992;33:141-160.
109. Ambrose S, Huston T, Norman M. A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Res Higher Edu*. 2005;46:803-830.
110. Draugalis JL. Recruitment, retention and renewal with a little respect. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2005;69:Article 79.
111. Leslie S. Pharmacy faculty workforce: increasing the numbers and holding to high standards of excellence. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2005;69:Article 93.
112. Proto MB, Dzurec LC. Strategies for successful management and oversight of nurse faculty workforce initiatives: lessons from the field. *J Prof Nursing*. 2009;25:87-92.
113. Matier MW. Recruiting faculty: Complementary tales from two campuses. *Res Higher Educ*. 1991;32:31-44.
114. Vardaman Jr DL. *Knight v. Alabama and Faculty Hiring in Alabama's Public Universities*. [doctoral dissertation]. Montgomery, AL: Alabama State University; 2008.
115. Murray JP. Interviewing to hire competent community college faculty. *Community College Review*. 1999;27:41.
116. Maine LL. Recruitment and retention of faculty: A faculty member's point of view. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 1995;59:304-311.
117. Blouin RA, Bergstrom RF, Ellingrod VL, Fletcher CV, Leff RD, et al. Report of the AACP Educating Clinical Scientists Task Force. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2007;71:Article S05.
118. Yanchick VA. Thinking off the map. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2009;72:Article 141.
119. Bennetts CE. Traditional mentoring relationships, intimacy, and emotional intelligence. *Qual Studies Educ*. 2002;15:155-170.

120. Mount MK, Barrick MJ. The big five personality dimensions: implications for research and practice in human resources management. *Res Pers Hum Res Mgmt.* 1995;13:153-200.
121. Digman JM. Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Rev Psychol.* 1990;41:417-440.
122. Johnson WB. A framework for conceptualizing competence to mentor. *Ethics & Behavior.* 2003;13:127-151.
123. McAuley MJ. Transference, countertransference and mentoring: The ghost in the process. *Br J Guidance Counsel.* 2003;31:11-23.
124. Johnson WB, Huwe JM, Lucas JL. Rational mentoring. *J Rational-Emotive Cog-Behav Therapy.* 2000;18:39-54.
125. Busch RJ. Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentor's perspectives. *Group Org Studies.* 1985;353-372.
126. Tepper K, Shaffer BC, Tepper BJ. Latent structure of mentoring function scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.* 1996;56:848-857.
127. Erkut S, Mokros J. Professors as models and mentors for college students. *Am Educ Res J.* 1984;21:399-417.
128. Dinham SM. Being a newcomer. In: *Robert RJ, ed. Getting Adjusted as a New Pharmacy Faculty Member.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 1999.
129. Bronstein P, Farnsworth L. Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Res Higher Educ.* 1998;39:557-585.
130. Thomas DA. Race matters: The truth about mentoring minorities. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2001;79:99-107.
131. Garvey B, Alred G. An introduction to the symposium on mentoring: Issues and prospects. *Br J Guidance Counsel.* 2003;31:3-9.
132. Gerstein M. Mentoring: An age old practice in a knowledge based society. *J Counsel Develop.* 1985;64:156-7.
133. Haines ST. The mentor-protégé relationship. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2003;Article 82.

134. Thomas R. Exemplary junior faculty mentoring programs.
<http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJunior%20Faculty%20MentoringPrograms.pdf>.
Accessed on August 20, 2010.
135. Delsky AS, Baerlocher MO. Academic mentoring—how to give it and how to get it. *JAMA*. 2007;297:2134-7.
136. UCLA School of Medicine Guidelines for Mentoring Junior Faculty.
www.deans.medsch.ucla.edu/academic/Mentor.doc. Accessed August 12, 2010.
137. Olmstead MA. Mentoring junior faculty: Advice to department chairs.
<http://faculty.washington.edu/olmstd/research/Mentoring.html>. Accessed August 12, 2010.
138. University of Minnesota Academic Health Center Mentoring Policy.
http://www.ahc.umn.edu/prod/groups/ahc/@pub/@ahc/@news/documents/asset/ahc_78345.pdf. Accessed August 13, 2010.
139. Corwin SJ, Bates T, Cohan M, Braggs DS, Roberts E. Two models for implementing senior mentor programs in academic medical settings. *Educational Gerontology*. 2007;33:383-393.
140. Stanford School of Medicine Faculty Mentoring Program.
<http://facultymentoring.stanford.edu/guidelines.html>. Accessed August 18, 2010.
141. University of California—San Francisco Mentoring Program.
<http://acpers.ucsf.edu/mentoring/>. Accessed August 18, 2010.
142. Washington State University Faculty Mentoring Guidelines.
http://provost.wsu.edu/faculty_mentoring/guidelines.html. Accessed August 20, 2010.
143. University of California, San Diego Health Sciences National Center of Leadership in Academic Medicine. <http://nclam.ucsd.edu/>. Accessed August 20, 2010.
144. UCSF Faculty Mentoring Program: Mentoring Facilitator Toolkit.
<http://www.fae.org/about/documents/UCSFToolkit.pdf>. Accessed August 23, 2010.