RESEARCH

Faculty Members' Opinions of What Defines a "Star" in Academic Pharmacy

Shane P. Desselle, PhD,^a David P. Zgarrick, PhD,^b Sujith Ramachandran, PhD^c

^a Touro University California, College of Pharmacy, Vallejo, California

^b Northeastern University, Bouve College of Health Sciences, Boston, Massachusetts

^c University of Mississippi, School of Pharmacy, University, Mississippi

Submitted February 7, 2021; accepted April 23, 2021; published September 2021.

Objective. This study sought to identify attributes or performance aspects, most notably those defining what constitutes a "star" faculty in academic pharmacy, and to describe differences in perceptions of the strength of these aspects across faculty varying by discipline, academic rank, experience, type of institution employed, and supervisory experience.

Methods. An electronic survey was distributed via email link to a census sample of 3378 members within the 2018 American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) list-servs. Performance aspects were derived from key literature enumerating academic responsibilities and behaviors. Reminders were employed to maximize survey responses. Frequency distributions and Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to describe the data.

Results. Responses from 463 persons identified the importance of quality rather than quantity of teaching; publishing in refereed journals, and demonstrating collegiality to be among the more salient aspects defining a star faculty member. There were differences in perceptions of what constitutes a star mostly by institution type employed and among pharmacy practice respondents vs those from other disciplines. Respondents from private institutions indicated that their deans and chairs were less likely to recognize and attempt to retain star faculty. However, responses were generally in the same direction and congruent, even between those with vs without supervisory responsibility.

Conclusion. This study highlighted the importance of demonstrating collegiality along with high-quality teaching and productivity as qualities warranting star status in academic pharmacy. Given the importance of faculty stars, academic pharmacy organizations, particularly private institutions, should make an effort to recognize and retain them.

Keywords: star faculty, productivity, organizational culture, collegiality, academic governance

INTRODUCTION

There are growing bodies of research regarding productivity among academic faculty and on the concept of "star" employees in general. Star employees are those exhibiting high levels of performance over a sustained amount of time who are plainly "visible" and help the organization promote its brand effectively.¹ Oldroyd and Morris discuss how star employees create social capital and value for their organizations by promoting trust, extending their networks, and facilitating ease and transparency of communication.² Perkmann and colleagues found that stars in academia are able to leverage their talents to create partnerships that result in positive outcomes, including

successful grant applications, community service endeavors, and educational placement sites for students.³

Researchers have observed that an organization's stars are responsible for a disproportionate share of that organization's output.⁴ To that end, the loss of star employees exerts a serious negative effect on an organization⁵ to the point that the employee's departure can be felt for years.⁶ Stars help create star organizations, which are then able to attract even more stars, given the enhanced likelihood that their collaboration will lead to noteworthy achievements.⁷

The behaviors and issues that help define productivity in teaching and in research in academic pharmacy have been described, particularly those for faculty members in the basic sciences.⁸⁻¹¹ Likewise, the collective contributions of certain practice faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service have been examined.¹² The contributions of faculty have been placed into the context of ideal reward

Corresponding Author: Shane P. Desselle, Touro University California, College of Pharmacy, 1310 Club Dr., Vallejo, CA 94952. Tel: 918-892-1168. Email: sdessell@touro.edu

systems.¹³ These ideal reward systems include consideration for the collegial behaviors of faculty peers.^{14,15}

It might appear easy to describe what high-level performance is, such as an abundance of high-quality publications and excellent teaching evaluations. Less obvious, though, is what constellation of these activities help describe a “star” faculty member. A star in academic pharmacy was previously described by a focus groups of CEO deans, which emphasized the importance of faculty doing whatever they can to help when called upon.¹⁶

It is instructive to understand how various types of faculty and administrators at different types of institutions describe the qualities of a star faculty member. Knowing the attributes that faculty and administrators use to describe a star may help an organization position its recruitment and hiring strategies and inform its efforts to retain its most valued members. The objectives of this study were to identify those characteristics and behaviors most important in describing the characteristics/performance of a star faculty member at their institution (and potentially other institutions) and to discern differences in perceptions about the salience of those characteristics and behaviors across faculty who vary in terms of their length of service, type of appointment, and type of institution at which they are employed.

METHODS

The investigational review board at the principal investigator’s institution deemed this study exempt. The study employed a cross-sectional design in implementing a self-administered questionnaire survey delivered via email to a census sample of faculty and administrators belonging to AACP in one or more of several member email lists they maintain. The email lists included were those for CEO deans, AACP members of all academic sections, and department chairs of all disciplines. Removal of duplicate names from the list compiled resulted in the sample of 3378 members who were targeted for this study.

The researchers employed methods recommended by Dillman and colleagues to maximize survey responses,¹⁷ which consisted of sending a prenotification email to the sampled population on May 6, 2019, followed one week later by an email with a link to the survey. Reminders were sent approximately one week apart. The survey process was executed through Qualtrics (Qualtrics, 2019).

The questionnaire presented respondents with a list of 18 different activities and behaviors of academic pharmacy faculty and asked them to indicate their perceived importance of each using a four-point scale. Respondents were instructed to consider the items first in light of their

importance to being a productive faculty member, then specifically in terms of their importance to being a “star” vs being merely productive. For confidentiality reasons, faculty members’ self-ratings of their productivity (vs those considered important for being a star) are not reported here or elsewhere. Further, respondents were not provided an operational definition of “star,” as the authors sought to determine this via the participants’ responses without any attempt to lead them. The list of activities was taken from the literature in a general sense, including outside of pharmacy; however, two papers in pharmacy were particularly instructive for enumerating faculty activities.^{14,18} Respondents also were provided 13 additional items on which to indicate their agreement using a six-point scale. These items were aimed at various concepts, such as the need to be excellent in more than one area to be considered a star, how stars are “grown/developed” at their institution, and the program’s effort to recognize its star faculty.

Eight pharmacy academicians reviewed the questionnaire for its content, instructions, and flow, and made suggestions on items to include as actions or behaviors that describe a star faculty member. The academicians were known to the investigators as leaders in academic pharmacy from various disciplines, and varied by gender, academic rank, length of service, and type of institution. Some of them had expertise in survey methodology. This review effort was conducted as an asynchronous discussion through email.

Data were imported from Qualtrics into SPSS, (IBM SPSS for Windows, v.25, 2017) for analysis. Frequency distributions and percentages were calculated for each item. For several demographic variables, categories of data were combined to improve the clarity of the analysis and avoid empty cells, including variables related to institute type, faculty discipline, and length of service. Nonparametric statistical tests (Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests) were performed to compare groups on their responses.

RESULTS

Out of the 3378 invitations to complete the surveys distributed by email, 29 were returned as undeliverable or with error messages. Of 568 faculty members who initiated a survey response, 463 completed the entire survey. This yielded a usable response rate of 13.8%, which compares favorably with other web-based surveys of academics and health professionals.¹⁹ Descriptive statistics for the respondents and their employing organizations appeared to resemble that for full-time faculty in academic pharmacy (Table 1).²⁰ Study respondents did consist of

Table 1. Characteristics of Pharmacy Faculty Who Responded to a Survey on How They Defined “Star” Faculty (n=463)^a

Characteristic	N (%)
Sex	
Male	184 (39.7)
Female	261 (56.4)
Prefer not to answer	18 (3.2)
Race	
White/Caucasian	350 (75.6)
Black/African American	18 (3.2)
Asian/Pacific Islander	37 (8.0)
Hispanic/Latino	15 (3.2)
Other	7 (1.5)
Prefer not to answer	36 (7.8)
Discipline	
Biological Sciences	23 (5.0)
Experiential Education	24 (4.2)
Medicinal chemistry	14 (3.0)
Pharmaceutics	28 (6.0)
Pharmacology/toxicology	29 (6.3)
Pharmacy Practice	264 (57.0)
Social/Behavioral Pharmacy	72 (15.6)
Other	9 (1.9)
Academic rank	
Instructor	5 (1.1)
Assistant professor/clinical assistant professor	146 (31.5)
Associate professor/clinical associate professor	149 (32.2)
Professor/clinical professor	151 (32.6)
Other	12 (2.6)
Tenure status	
Non-tenure track	249 (53.8)
Tenure track, but not tenured	50 (10.8)
Tenured	144 (31.1)
Other	20 (3.5)
Administrative title/Position^a	
None	222 (47.9)
Coordinator/Director	91 (19.7)
Department Chair/Vice-chair	58 (12.5)
Assistant/Associate dean	72 (15.6)
Dean	20 (4.3)
Other	12 (2.6)
Supervises other faculty (previously or currently)	
Yes	123 (26.6)
No	340 (73.4)

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued)

Characteristic	N (%)
Ownership/Governance of institution where employed	
Public	249 (53.8)
Private, not-for-profit	169 (36.5)
Private, for-profit	45 (9.7)
Mission of institution where employed	
Teaching	215 (46.4)
Balanced	154 (33.2)
Research	94 (20.3)
Years as a faculty member	
0-10 years	226 (48.8)
11-20 years	128 (27.6)
21 or more years	103 (22.2)
Identify themselves as a star	
No	102 (22)
Not yet, but on the path to becoming a star	159 (34.4)
Yes	200 (43.6)

^aTotals slightly exceed 463, as respondents were asked to select all that apply.

somewhat greater proportions of faculty from social/administrative (7% vs 16%), faculty in pharmacy practice (57% vs 49%), and female pharmacy faculty (56% vs 51%) compared to the proportion of faculty in the AACP database with these characteristics. Among study respondents, over 40% considered themselves a star and another third of them considered themselves on the path to becoming one.

Respondents’ perceptions of the importance of various factors in defining a star faculty member are presented in Table 2. Among the respondents, 77.8% rated effective teaching as being extremely important. Other factors which approximately half of respondents indicated were extremely important were developing a positive reputation at your institution/college/school and in your field, publishing frequently in peer-reviewed journals, and demonstrating collegiality beyond volunteering. Conversely, only 13.7% of respondents perceived acquiring intramural funding as extremely important. Other factors with lower proportions of respondents indicating importance were quantity of teaching and being invited to speak locally or regionally.

In examining differences across faculty varying by position or institutional characteristics, the tact taken here is a focus on those variables rather than focusing on each of the factors, individually, and with attention to results

Table 2. Defining the Characteristics of Someone You Would Call a "Star" Faculty

	Not Very Important N=463 (%)	Somewhat Important (%)	Rather Important (%)	Extremely Important (%)	Subgroup Differences <i>p</i> ≤.01
Effectively Teaching Professional (PharmD) Students	0.4	4.8	17.1	77.8	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline
Effectively training/mentoring/advising post-graduates (MS, PhD, residents, fellows, post-docs)	10.2	21.6	34.8	33.5	P/P, Mission
Quantity of Teaching	7.8	36.3	35.9	20.1	Mission
Giving peer reviewed posters and presentations at professional/scientific conferences	2.6	16.8	45.6	35.0	
Being invited to speak to local/regional groups/panels/conferences	6.3	24.6	44.7	24.4	
Being invited to speak to national/international groups/panels/conferences	3.9	17.9	37.4	40.8	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Supervisor
Publishing frequency in peer-reviewed journals	3.0	15.6	34.1	47.3	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Supervisor
Publishing in high-impact factor journals	7.8	26.6	34.3	31.3	
Acquiring intramural (internal) funding to support your research, teaching or programs	16.2	42.3	28.3	13.7	
Acquiring extramural (external) funding to support your research, teaching or programs	10.2	29.2	25.5	35.2	
Committee service to your department, school or institution	5.8	16.8	37.6	39.7	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline
Service to professional associations or scientific societies external to your institution	2.4	18.8	46.9	32.0	Discipline
Developing a positive reputation within your department, school, college or institution	2.4	6.7	26.8	64.1	
Developing a positive reputation within your field locally or regionally	2.2	11.0	41.3	45.6	
Developing a positive reputation within your field nationally or internationally	1.9	14.0	37.6	46.4	
Demonstrating innovation in your teaching, scholarship and/or service	2.4	15.6	38.7	43.4	P/P, Mission
Volunteering to help out when asked	7.6	14.7	38.9	38.9	
Demonstrating extraordinary collegiality beyond volunteering	5.0	15.1	32.4	47.5	

Abbreviations: P/P=Public vs. Private; Mission=Teaching vs. Research/Balanced; Tenure status=Tenured or tenure track vs. not on tenure-track; Discipline=Pharmacy Practice vs. Social and Administrative Sciences; vs Pharmacological, Biological Sciences and Medicinal Chemistry; Supervisor=Currently or formerly supervised other faculty vs. those who have not

with a p value below .01, given all the univariate tests conducted. The variables most frequently significant across these tests were: respondents' institution, specifically being private or public, and teaching vs balanced/research-oriented. Respondents from private and teaching-oriented institutions were more likely to rate effective teaching as an important factor in being a star faculty, yet less likely to rate effectively training/mentoring of postgraduate students as important. Respondents from public and balanced/research-oriented institutions were more likely to place importance on speaking at national/international conferences, as well as on publishing frequency and publishing in high-impact journals. Respondents from public and balanced/research-oriented institutions were more likely to place importance on acquiring extramural funds. Committee service was more likely to be regarded as important by respondents from private and teaching-oriented institutions. Respondents from teaching institutions were more likely to place importance on developing a positive reputation within the institution; however, those from public and balanced/research-oriented programs were more likely to place importance on developing a positive reputation nationally and internationally.

Faculty not on a tenure track were more likely to rate effective teaching as important, but less likely to rate being invited to speak at national/international conferences as important. They were also less likely to place importance on publishing and acquiring extramural funding. Respondents for pharmacy practice placed higher priority on effective teaching and service to the institution and to professional bodies, demonstrating collegiality, but lower priority on acquiring extramural funding, publishing, and developing a national and international reputation. Interestingly, there were not many differences of opinion between those who supervise faculty and those who do not. Those who do so were more likely to indicate importance on publishing and developing a national and international reputation.

Additional insights on the perceptions of star faculty are provided in Table 3. Nearly two-thirds of respondents agreed that being a star requires excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, and there were no differences across any of the respondent variables related to that perception. The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that no matter how excellent a faculty might be in other areas, they also had to exhibit good citizenship to be considered a star. Nearly half of respondents agreed that a star at one institution would likely be a star at another. Approximately 40% agreed that their department chairs make a conscious effort to recognize/reward and retain star faculty. Nearly half of respondents

disagreed to some extent that their university makes conscious efforts to recognize and retain star faculty.

Pharmacy practice respondents were less likely to agree that networking and an ability to leverage resources are important for star faculty. Respondents from pharmaceutical sciences were more likely to agree that department chairs, deans, and institution make conscious efforts to recognize and retain star faculty. Those who supervise were more likely to agree that stars put in more than 40-50 hours of work per week. They also were more likely to agree on the importance of networking, as well as to indicate conscious efforts by department chairs, deans, and institution to recognize and retain star faculty.

DISCUSSION

This study sought to identify the factors most important in defining "star" faculty members among pharmacy academicians. The results demonstrated the value of quality rather than quantity of teaching, scholarly publications, and good citizenship behaviors. While some differences exist between those who supervise faculty and those who do not, there were more common areas of agreement. While there were considerable differences between respondents in terms of the type of institution they were employed by and by discipline they generally agreed that someone who is a star at one institution would likely be a star at a different institution. This suggests that respondents may have believed that hard work and talent would allow them to adapt to changes in the work environment and mission focus at a different institution. This would support the findings from previous research.²¹

The results indicated the importance pharmacy faculty place on the quality of teaching, even among those at research-oriented institutions. The challenge lies with organizations defining and recognizing high-quality teaching.^{22,23} Faculty must take steps to negotiate and ensure that their contributions to teaching are valued, given that quantity of teaching might not be as highly regarded as quality.^{24,25} Scholarly productivity remains important, and our results underscore the value of peer-reviewed publications.²⁶ In spite of differences in the proportion of respondents who regarded publishing as extremely important, very few from any rank, level of experience, or type of institution disagreed that scholarly publications were at least somewhat important.

The observations in this paper are made within the context that star faculty are also those who exhibit collegiality and citizenship behaviors, as high-performers absent of such an ethos will not willingly engage with their colleagues. Those engaged in pharmacy faculty recruitment and retention efforts should bear in mind the importance

Table 3. Further Defining/Identifying What it Means to be a "Star" Faculty Member

	Strongly Disagree N=463 (%)	Disagree (%)	Slightly Disagree (%)	Slightly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Subgroup Differences $p \leq .01$
A star faculty member must be excellent at teaching, scholarship AND service	3.2	6.3	8.9	19.2	35.0	27.4	
A star faculty member can be good/adequate at teaching if they are EXCELLENT in research/scholarship	5.0	16.6	15.8	22.9	26.3	13.4	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline
A star faculty member can be good/adequate at research/scholarship if they are EXCELLENT in teaching	2.2	7.8	9.3	19.7	36.3	24.8	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline
No matter how excellent in teaching or scholarship, someone cannot be considered a star faculty if they consistently exhibit poor collegiality	1.1	4.3	7.3	13.4	28.1	45.8	P/P, Mission, Discipline
Someone who is a star at one institution would likely be a star at any other institution	5.2	11.2	17.1	21.8	30.9	13.8	
Someone can become a star even without the support of their institution	10.2	27.0	22.2	21.8	13.6	5.2	Years on Faculty
A star faculty member will likely put in more than 40-50 hours of work per week	1.7	5.4	14.0	21.0	32.0	25.9	Tenure Status, Discipline, Supervise Faculty, Years on Faculty
Networking is important to being a star faculty	1.1	2.6	8.6	28.1	41.1	18.6	Mission, Supervise Faculty, Years on Faculty
The ability to leverage resources is important in being a star faculty	0.6	1.7	6.3	25.5	43.8	22.0	Mission, Discipline
Department chairs at my college/school of pharmacy make a conscious effort to recognize/reward and retain star faculty	7.6	11.4	12.5	24.0	31.3	13.2	P/P, Tenure Status, Discipline, Supervise Faculty, Years on Faculty
The dean at my college/school of pharmacy makes a conscious effort to recognize/reward and retain star faculty	8.9	13.8	11.9	24.0	26.1	15.3	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline, Supervise Faculty, Years on Faculty
My institution/university makes a conscious effort to recognize/reward and retain star faculty	10.8	14.3	13.8	28.9	24.0	8.2	P/P, Mission, Tenure Status, Discipline, Supervise Faculty, Years on Faculty
A "star" faculty member is necessarily one who fits with the college/school's organizational culture	2.4	4.1	11.9	26.8	38.9	16.0	

Abbreviations: P/P=Public vs. Private; Mission=Teaching vs. Research/Balanced; Tenure status=Tenured or tenure track vs. not on tenure-track; Discipline=Pharmacy Practice vs. Social and Administrative Sciences; vs Pharmacological, Biological Sciences and Medicinal Chemistry

not only of a faculty's organizational fit, but also whether they will or do contribute to a positive organizational climate. While managing uncivil and selfish faculty has always posed a challenge, evidence suggests that rather than attempt to take away their power, it is more productive to empower their peers and thus relegate "academic jerks" to greater irrelevance.²⁷ Together, faculty and administrators must discern mechanisms to properly define and use collegiality as a performance measure.²⁸

Supporting faculty development, retaining faculty stars, and ameliorating poor citizenship behaviors are among the many challenges for academic pharmacy administrators. In what must be seen as a positive development, those respondents who supervise other faculty were largely consistent in terms of describing a star. Those who supervise faculty must connote to them the importance the institution places on faculty developing a national/international reputation. While there was some level of agreement among respondents that chairs and deans are supportive of faculty stars, there were differences in agreement as to how supportive they were. The role of chairs cannot be understated, and it has been recommended that they perform transparent and concrete actions in support of their faculty, even while assisting other administrators at their institution in carrying out organizational policy.²⁹⁻³²

Among the pharmacy faculty we surveyed, the greatest differences in perceptions about what defines a star came from those working at different types of institutions. Thus, the differences in perception should not be surprising given the differing missions of those schools and what behaviors and accomplishments are likely rewarded at those institutions.³³ However, respondents from private and teaching-based institutions were less likely to agree that their chairs, dean, and institution engage in conscious attempts to retain star faculty.

There are several limitations to this study. The study was only conducted in one academic field (pharmacy), and faculty in other fields might have responded differently. The response rate, which was below 20%, does not preclude the possibility of selection bias as faculty with certain interests and/or those with a highly favorable or unfavorable disposition about their own institution might have been more likely to respond. The questionnaire items were generated by the study investigators and thus makes comparisons with other studies difficult. Respondents were asked to rate how strongly they believed a behavior or attribute constituted a star faculty; however, respondents were not asked the degree to which the behavior or attribute existed or occurred. Future research might consider the number, type, or impact of grants, publications, or meetings that make a faculty a star vs simply being productive. Respondents were left to their own to determine what constitutes

"quality," "quantity," and other such terms, because we knew that respondents' expectations of faculty would differ across disciplines and appointments. Greater specificity would likely have resulted in greater discord in evaluations; however, the researchers aimed to examine pharmacy faculty members' concept of a star rather than specific numbers. Respondents were asked to think of a star as someone having a similar appointment to theirs at their institution, rather than stars within the discipline in a more general sense. The researchers also did not provide respondents with definitions within the questions. The respondents might have used themselves as a reference point for their evaluations, and indeed many of the respondents identified themselves as either a star or one in the making. This might indicate either some overestimation on their part in self-evaluation or a response bias that respondents were more likely among those with greater achievements and/or productivity. Pharmacy practice faculty and social/administrative faculty were somewhat overrepresented among the respondents. While the data were witness to widespread agreement, it does not represent a consensus. A consensus on what aptly describes a pharmacy faculty star was not sought and reaching one would have likely been impossible to achieve and impractical for us to have pursued.

CONCLUSION

In a cross-sectional, self-administered survey, US pharmacy faculty identified factors they believed constituted being a "star" at their institution. The results point toward the importance of quality rather than quantity of teaching, as well as scholarly productivity. Respondents largely agreed that a faculty could not be a star if they were not collegial, regardless of their productivity. That is, star faculty are those who help make everyone around them better. This is seen as largely transferable, even while benchmarks for quantifying productivity might differ from one institution to the next. Faculty perceive modest efforts by academic administrators to recognize and retain star faculty. They believed that star faculty work long hours and are able to network and leverage resources. Faculty from different types of institutions have some differences in their opinions about star faculty but are still largely on the same page. Academic supervisors, particularly those overseeing faculty in pharmacy practice and in non-tenured positions must effectively communicate expectations for what is considered excellent performance and be creative in attempts to maintain their top-performing talent.

REFERENCES

1. Call M. Organizational value capture, embeddedness, and status notification among star employees. Doctoral dissertation. University

of South Carolina. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2017;77:(12-A)(E).

2. Oldroyd JB, Morris SS. Catching falling stars: a human resource response to social capital's detrimental effect on information overload of star employees. *Acad Manag Rev*. 2012;37(3):396–418.
3. Perkmann M, King Z, Pavelin S. Engaging excellence? Effects of faculty quality on university engagement with industry. *Res Policy*. 2011;40(4):539–552.
4. Downs L. Star talent: investing in high-potential employees for organizational success. *Industrial Commercial Training*. 2015;47(7):349–355.
5. Kim J. Three essays on strategic human capital, managers and competitive advantage. Doctoral dissertation. Purdue University. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. 79(10-A)(E); 2018.
6. Zucker LG, Darby MR. Star scientists and institutional transformation: patterns of invention and innovation in the formation of the biotechnological industry. *PNAS*. 1996;93(23):12709–12716.
7. Zucker LG, Darby MR. Movement of star scientists and engineers and high-tech firm entry. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper. No. 12172. June 2014.
8. Hammer D, Piascik P, Medina M, Pittenger A, et al. Recognition of teaching excellence. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2010;74(9):Article 164.
9. Bloom TJ, Schlesselman L. Publication rates for pharmaceutical sciences faculty members at nonresearch-intensive US schools of pharmacy. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2015;79(9):Article 136.
10. Kehrer JP, Svensson CK. Advancing pharmacist scholarship and research within academic pharmacy. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2012;76(10):Article 187.
11. Thompson DF, Nahata MC. Pharmaceutical science faculty publication records at research-intensive pharmacy colleges and schools. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2012;76(9):Article 173.
12. Bacci JL, Akinwale TP, Adam AJ, McGivney MS. An analysis of community pharmacy shared faculty members' contributions to teaching, service, and scholarship. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2016;80(7):Article 115.
13. Monaghan MS, Ryan-Haddad A, Wilkin N, Anderson HM, Howard PA. Academic administrators' and faculty's perceptions of current and ideal reward systems: A multisite investigation. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn*. 2009;1(2):71–78.
14. Hammer DP, Bynum LA, Carter J, Hagemeyer NE, et al. Revisiting faculty citizenship. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2019;83(4):Article 7378.
15. Desselle SP, Semsick GR. Identification and development of items comprising organizational citizenship behaviors among pharmacy faculty. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2016;80(10):Article 168.
16. [Redacted to maintain author anonymity]
17. Dillman DA, Smyth JD, Christian LM. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys—The Tailored Design Method*, 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2009.
18. Fitzpatrick LR, Millette-Snodgrass C, Atef E. A novel mathematical model for determining faculty workload. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2015;80(9):Article 152.
19. Hardigan PC, Popovici I, Carvajal MJ. Response rate, response time, and economic costs survey research: a randomized trial of practicing pharmacists. *Res Social Adm Pharm*. 12(1):141–148.
20. AACP. 2018-19 AACP Profile of Pharmacy Faculty. <https://www.aacp.org/system/files/2019-02/PPF1819-final.pdf>. Accessed April 4, 2020.
21. Kehoe RR, Lepak DP, Bentley FS. Let's call a star a star: task performance, external status, and exceptional contributors in organizations. *J Manag*. 2016;44(5):1848–1872.
22. Stroebe W. Why good teaching evaluations may reward bad teaching: on grade inflation and other unintended consequences of student evaluations. *Perspectives Psychol Sci*. 2016;11(6):800–816.
23. Chalmers D. Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the scholarship of teaching in higher education. *Higher Edu Res Develop*. 2011;30(1):25–38.
24. Malcolm DR. On being present with learners and the deeper lessons from acting. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2020;84(3):Article 8062.
25. Wilborn TW, Timpe EM, Wu-Pong S, Manolakis ML, Altieri RJ. Factors influencing faculty perceptions of teaching workload. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn*. 2013;5(1):9–13.
26. Braxton JM, Del Favero M. Evaluating scholarship performance: traditional and emergent assessment templates. *New Direct Inst Res*. 2002;114:19–32.
27. Mewborn I. The thesis whisperer: academic assholes and other jerks. *Advocate: Journal of the National Tertiary Education Union*. 2014;21(2):44.
28. Schmidt CE, McNulty B, Howard-Baptiste S, Harvey J. Perspectives about how to define and use collegiality in higher education. *Intl J Kinesiol Higher Educ*. 2017;1(1):28–34.
29. Chung KC, Song JW, Kim HM, Wooliscroft JO, et al. Predictors of job satisfaction among academic faculty members: do instruction and clinical staff differ? *Med Educ*. 2010;44:985–995.
30. Willett CG. Reflections from a chair: leadership of a clinical department at an academic medical center. *Cancer*. 2015;121:3795–3798.
31. Baker B, DiPiro JT. Evaluation of a structured onboarding process and tool for faculty members in a school of pharmacy. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2019;83(6):Article 7100.
32. Peirce GL, Desselle SP, Draugalis JR, Apies AR, et al. Identifying psychological contract breaches to guide improvements in faculty recruitment, retention, and development. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2012;76(6):Article 108.
33. Bland CJ, Arthur B, Finstad DA. The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *J Higher Educ*. 2006;77(1):89–123.