

## RESEARCH

### Qualitative Evaluation of a Junior Faculty Team Mentoring Program

Lana M. Minshew, PhD, MEd,<sup>a</sup> Jacqueline M. Zeeman, PharmD,<sup>a</sup> Amanda A. Olsen, PhD,<sup>b</sup> Antonio A. Bush, PhD, MS,<sup>a,c</sup> J. Herbert Patterson, PharmD,<sup>a</sup> Jacqueline E. McLaughlin, PhD, MS<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

<sup>b</sup> University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas

<sup>c</sup> Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), Washington, DC.

**Corresponding Author:** Jacqueline McLaughlin, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599. Tel: 919-966-4577. Email: [Jacqui\\_mclaughlin@unc.edu](mailto:Jacqui_mclaughlin@unc.edu)

Submitted July 7, 2020; accepted December 18, 2020; ePublished December 2020

**Objective.** To investigate the strengths and challenges of a structured junior faculty mentoring program at a public four-year school of pharmacy, identify areas of opportunity to improve the program, and describe mid-career mentoring faculty needs.

**Methods.** Focus groups and interviews were conducted to elicit participants' experiences, perceptions, and suggestions for opportunity. Stakeholder groups included junior faculty in the program, mid-career faculty who graduated from the program, mid-career faculty who did not participate in the program, internal mentors, external mentors, and division chairs. Thematic coding was used to identify semantic themes, and summaries of participant perceptions were generated. The program was mapped to the PAIRS checklist from the 2014 American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring.

**Results.** Participants described the structure of the program and mentee-mentor relationships as strengths of the program. Challenges included finding time to meet and ensuring mentee-mentor fit. Several areas of opportunity were identified, such as adjusting large mentee seminar topics, providing mentors with training, and mentoring for mid-career faculty. Needs for mid-career faculty were described as unique and requiring potentially different strategies than junior faculty mentoring.

**Conclusion.** Mentoring is critical for faculty professional development, supporting retention and job satisfaction, and reducing burnout. Scholarly endeavors that explore faculty mentoring, specifically those utilizing qualitative methods, can help pharmacy education better understand and meet the needs of faculty. This study provides insight into the strengths and challenges of faculty mentoring and provides evidence for increasing mentoring among mid-career faculty within pharmacy education.

**Keywords:** mentoring, junior faculty, mid-career faculty, program evaluation, team mentoring

## INTRODUCTION

Faculty mentoring is widely recognized as an important component of professional development, with effective mentoring having positive associations with job satisfaction,<sup>1-3</sup> productivity,<sup>4,5</sup> promotion,<sup>6</sup> socio-emotional support,<sup>7</sup> professional identity, and sense of competence.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, lack of mentorship can lead to burnout,<sup>9</sup> impede career progression, reduce satisfaction, and contribute to faculty attrition.<sup>5,10</sup> For institutions, this can result in lost opportunity, reduced faculty connectedness, damaged reputation, and costs associated with recruitment and onboarding of new faculty.<sup>11</sup>

Despite the apparent benefits of faculty mentoring, most pharmacy schools do not offer formalized mentoring, often opting for informal mentoring, or none at all.<sup>12,13</sup> Although formal mentoring programs may require more resources, benefits include higher rates of faculty retention due to the structure and curriculum of the program and commitment from the mentee, mentor, and institution.<sup>1,13-15</sup> In a recent review of faculty mentoring programs, McRae and colleagues<sup>1</sup> identified only four papers describing formal programs within schools of pharmacy. The described programs utilized various formats and approaches, including external faculty mentoring,<sup>14,16</sup> department mentoring,<sup>17</sup> multi-institution mentoring,<sup>18</sup> and voluntary mentoring.<sup>15</sup> These programs were largely described as beneficial for faculty and emphasized the importance of effective program design.<sup>1</sup>

The lack of literature describing and evaluating formal programs within schools of pharmacy is somewhat surprising, given a long-standing emphasis on mentoring among pharmacy thought-leaders.<sup>19,20</sup> Mentoring was described as one of four key strategies for elevating pharmacy faculty productivity and work-life quality by the Continuing Professional Development (CPD)-Council of Faculty (COF) Joint Task Force on Faculty Workforce nearly a decade ago.<sup>20</sup> Yet most mentoring, and research related to mentorship in pharmacy, appears to focus on students and trainees.<sup>21-24</sup> At this time, more research is needed to better understand the structure, need, and opportunities for formal faculty mentoring within pharmacy education.

The 2014 American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACCP) Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring outlined key design steps and recommendations for successful faculty mentoring programs.<sup>19</sup> The task force specifically recommended the use of formal, systematic approaches to mentoring with clearly defined mentor roles, the inclusion of multiple mentors for different aspects of faculty life (eg, external mentors for faculty transitioning to administrative roles), the appropriation of key resources for program sustainability, and the implementation of programmatic assessments to evaluate and improve mentoring programs.<sup>19</sup> This work resulted in the development of the PAIRS checklist, which provides a guiding framework for faculty mentoring focused on 1) intent, 2) structure, 3) process, 4) resources, and 5) assessment and evaluation.<sup>19</sup>

The University of North Carolina (UNC) Eshelman School of Pharmacy launched the Bill and Karen Campbell Mentoring Program (CMP) in 2006 with goals recruiting, retaining, and helping junior faculty reach their full potential, and taking advantage of the unique and valuable talent of senior faculty within and outside the School (Table 1).<sup>25</sup> The CMP utilizes a team mentoring approach, with one mentor internal to the School and one mentor external to the School within the University<sup>16,25</sup> – a unique structured design compared to other formal faculty mentoring programs. Mentors are selected based on area of scholarship by the CMP Director with consultation from the junior faculty member and their division chair.<sup>16</sup> During this selection process, the needs and interests of the mentee (eg, grants, publications, teaching) and the mentors' expertise as well as the mentors' capacity to commit to formal mentoring are considered in an effort to optimize the mentor-mentee match. These individuals mentor the junior faculty member one-on-one and are encouraged to meet on a monthly basis and attend an annual team meeting with the CMP Director, the faculty member, the faculty member's Division Chair, and the administrative supervisor (if applicable). This team advises, mentors, and supports the mentee as they acclimate to the School and University, develop in their faculty role, and navigate the promotion, reappointment, and tenure process. Additionally, the CMP offers monthly large group seminars during the academic year that provides opportunities for mentees to meet, network, and socialize and for guest visitors to present and lead discussions on key topics (eg, promotion and tenure, grant writing). Mentees graduate from the CMP upon successful faculty promotion. The time to promotion is variable, since tenure track and fixed term assistant professors are included in the program. Internal and external mentors are paid an annual stipend for their participation in the program. Kohn<sup>16</sup> provides a more detailed description of the CMP.

As part of the assessment and evaluation of the CMP, mentees were surveyed in 2013 about their experiences.<sup>16</sup> Most agreed or strongly agreed the CMP was a valuable experience (94%) and met their expectations (87%). Interacting with mentor(s) was identified as the most beneficial, followed by interacting with the CMP director and monthly luncheons.<sup>16</sup> Several years after the CMP survey evaluation, the School and CMP underwent leadership changes and more information was needed to specifically understand the strengths, challenges, and opportunities of the program.

Upon reviewing the literature, a paucity of in-depth qualitative research exploring faculty mentoring within pharmacy schools could be found, despite recommendations by the AACCP Task Force to include qualitative methods.<sup>19</sup> Further, Desselle argued for faculty mentoring programs to be treated like other scholarly endeavors; by conducting rigorous in-depth studies that aim to better support current faculty, future leaders, and the profession of pharmacy.<sup>20</sup> The purpose of this study was to investigate the benefits and opportunities for mentoring junior within pharmacy and, specifically, the CMP at the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy.

## METHODS

A formal, qualitative evaluation was conducted to provide a deeper look at the CMP beyond the quality improvement feedback provided informally to the CMP Director throughout the year. Specifically, focus groups were conducted to provide an in-depth view of CMP participant and stakeholder experiences in and perceptions of the program. While this type of data collection and analysis is not feasible on a yearly basis, it provides detailed insight into the program and a formative way to identify areas of opportunity.

To accomplish this, six stakeholder groups were included in this evaluation. Five groups were engaged through 1-hour focus groups: current CMP mentees (n=9); CMP graduates (n=5); internal CMP mentors (n=8); external CMP mentors (n=9); and associate professors who did not participate in the CMP (n=9). To accommodate scheduling

constraints, individual interviews were conducted with the sixth set of stakeholders: current and former division chairs (n=5).

Focus group and interview scripts were structured to elicit participants' experiences, perceptions, and suggestions for opportunity regarding the CMP (interview scripts available upon request). For example, CMP mentees and graduates were prompted, "Talk about the benefits of being a part of the CMP" whereas CMP mentors were asked, "Tell me how you think the CMP has benefited your mentee" and division chairs were prompted, "Tell me how you think the CMP has benefited faculty in your division." The questions were intentionally broad to elicit participants' overall perceptions of and experiences with CMP regardless of duration.

Two post-doctoral research assistants not associated with CMP conducted all focus groups and interviews from January 2019 to July 2019. Interactions were audio recorded with the participants' consent and comprehensive field notes were recorded for analysis purposes. Data from each participant group were compiled into a single corpus for that group (eg, division chairs) prior to analysis. One member of the research team used thematic coding to identify semantic themes within each set of focus group data.<sup>26,27</sup> This type of thematic analysis provided a description of what existed in the data and allowed for the data to be organized into interpretative patterns.<sup>26</sup> Saturation of themes was achieved, providing a rich description of the entire data set, and themes were pervasive across participant groups.<sup>26,27,28</sup> The semantic themes were then used to construct comprehensive summaries that reflected the voices of each participant group. Summaries were reviewed and verified by the second researcher who helped conduct the focus groups and interviews. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved between the two researchers. This study was submitted to the UNC IRB and determined to be not human subjects research (IRB #19-2482).

## RESULTS

Three major themes and related subthemes emerged across all participant groups: strengths of the CMP (eg, structure, mentoring relationships); challenges experienced by the participants (eg, time, mentoring fit); and future directions and opportunities (eg, mentee seminars, mentor training, associate professor mentoring). A discussion of these themes and subthemes follows, direct quotations from the different participant groups provided as representative examples within the text and Tables 1 and 2.<sup>26,27,28</sup> As seen in Table 1, participant responses mapped to each category of the PAIRS checklist, suggesting alignment between the CMP design and key recommendations from the 2014 AACP Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring.

**Strengths of CMP.** All participant groups lauded the ability of the program to support assistant professors on their path to promotion and tenure, aligning with the process and intent components of the PAIRS checklist.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, participants acknowledged that the CMP supported new faculty during their transition into the University and School communities. One participant shared, "*the connection between teaching, service, and scholarship are not linked well, so the CMP really helped to bridge these three big buckets. It helps new faculty understand the culture at UNC.*"

The formal structure of the program was seen as a critical strength for ensuring mentees were engaged, progressing appropriately, and aware of expectations. This included the monthly seminars, individual mentoring meetings, and annual team mentoring meetings. External mentors suggested that the formal structure helps junior faculty because, "*sometimes young faculty have challenges and don't know when they should reach out*" and the CMP provides a platform for those conversations. Monthly seminars were specifically identified as being important to help build relationships and provide assistant professors guidance. These findings further support the importance of structure, as identified in the PAIRS checklist,<sup>19</sup> as a key framework component for faculty mentoring.

CMP mentoring relationships – which map to the structure and resource components of PAIRS<sup>19</sup> – were regarded as critical for faculty success, promoting collaborations, and retaining faculty. Participants also lauded the use of internal and external mentors, with many focusing on the different perspectives provided by internal and external mentors. For example, one mentee described their external mentor as an "*added benefit*" that provided a "*balance ... and a different perspective*" while an external mentor stated that, "*the key element to success is being external because we bring a different perspective.*"

Mentoring relationships also helped promote research collaborations. As one mentee shared, "*Having a mentor networking across campus has been wonderful to be able to find other collaborators and people to talk to and get suggestions from.*" Similarly, an internal mentor expressed, "*It's nice to have mentees from across divisions [within the School], it helps with our culture and collaborations.*" Several CMP graduates and mentors continued their relationships after mentees graduated from the CMP. Ongoing interactions included research collaborations, occasional coffee meetings, and chatting via email. One external mentor stated, "*if they reach out with a problem, I'm there.*"

Internal and external mentors also suggested that mentoring relationships improved faculty retention and faculty connectedness. Internal mentors suggested, *“the CMP is filling a void”* and supports assistant professors in *“realizing they are not alone in this.”* Similarly, external mentors suggested that the CMP established, *“an intrinsic understanding that I am here for you.”* External mentors also had the impression that *“in pharmacy, there is a stronger sense of a support system”* than other Schools on campus.

**Challenges experienced by the participants.** Although the CMP was lauded for its benefits, participants reflected on several challenges in the program, including scheduling time for mentors and mentees to meet consistently and ensuring appropriate fit between mentors and mentees.

Finding time to meet on a consistent basis with mentors and scheduling yearly progress meetings with chairs, mentors, and mentees were among the topics identified as challenging. The frequency and purpose of meetings varied widely, some participants adhered to very rigid and consistent schedules while others were more flexible and sometimes inconsistent. Division chairs wanted mentors and mentees to meet more consistently and stated that it was the responsibility of the mentees to initiate meetings with their mentors. Several mentees acknowledged that they were, *“mindful about taking up too much [of their mentors’] time or wasting their time.”* However, as one mentor shared, *“Time is a barrier. Sometimes new faculty are involved in so many things, they need to be reminded to meet.”*

While mentor fit was discussed by all groups, their reasons for highlighting this part of the CMP varied. Division chairs, for example, were especially concerned about the possibility of poor fit hindering mentee development. Some CMP graduates indicated that fit changed over time, and they wanted the option to switch mentors as their career progressed. Mentors often discussed the importance of clarifying mentee needs for promotion to ensure they could support the needs of the mentee appropriately. Internal mentors, for example, highlighted differing expectations across faculty tracks (eg, tenure track, fixed term) while external mentors acknowledged lack of awareness about School expectations: *“I was giving conflicting advice on research trajectories. So, then my mentee had to navigate different sets of advice,”* putting an unnecessary burden on the mentee.

**Future Directions and Areas of Opportunity.** Participants identified several areas of opportunity and growth for the CMP. Mentees wanted a broader array of topics for the monthly large group meetings, mentors requested training on how to best support their mentees, and several groups suggested extending the CMP to include associate professors.

CMP graduates and mentees suggested additional topics for the monthly large group seminars, including grant writing, developing entrepreneurial skills, and developing leadership skills. Topics to keep included, sessions on dossier preparation led by a CMP graduate, exemplary teaching tips led by an award-winning university instructor, and self-promotion communication led by a business faculty member. Mentees who were close to promotion and tenure also encouraged the addition of programming specific to preparing for the promotion review process.

Mentors also acknowledged that the mentee large group seminars were an area of opportunity. Mentors wanted to know what was being discussed in the mentee seminars, perhaps through a *“mentor specific email about CMP.”* Another mentor wanted to be informed of the CMP programing because, *“not all seminars benefit everyone, but as a mentor I can help bridge that gap.”* Some mentors wanted the option to attend the mentee seminars so they could have a better understanding of what was being presented. External mentors also wanted to know more about the School and mentee programming, as one noted: *“I don’t understand the structure of the School itself...I think an orientation for mentors would be helpful.”*

When asked about a structured mentoring program for associate professors, division chairs posited the potential benefits of a program for associate professors who sometimes become *“terminal associates,”* (ie, faculty whom achieved tenure and do not progress further), *“lost,” “stuck,”* or *“left hanging.”* Associate professors who did not participate in the CMP acknowledged they could benefit from mentoring, as they sometimes felt overwhelmed by their teaching, research, service, and leadership responsibilities. While largely supportive of mentoring for associate professors, nearly every participant group acknowledged that the needs of this group would differ from assistant professors and across associate professors. Some suggested different pathways for associate professors, such as leadership training. Others suggested making the program optional and extending the CMP team beyond the point of promotion. Associate professors who completed the CMP stated they maintained relationships with their mentors continued the program informally.

## DISCUSSION

Mentoring can play a critical role in the success of faculty and is considered by some as necessary for a successful academic career.<sup>1-3,29</sup> This study is one of the first in-depth qualitative evaluations of a structured faculty mentoring program within pharmacy education and the first to include the viewpoints of associate/mid-career faculty as mentees. By

engaging various stakeholders, including division chairs and non-program participants, this study was able to holistically explore the strengths, challenges, and opportunities for a pharmacy faculty mentoring program. Namely, participants highlighted the ability of the program to facilitate the transition into the School and the contributions of mentors to the development and progression of junior faculty toward promotion and tenure. While these findings align with previous research about faculty mentoring programs, they also provide additional support and insight into the specific needs of pharmacy faculty.

The strengths of the CMP align with the AACP Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring recommendations, including the use of a formal and systematic approach focused on mentoring relationships. Notably, the results highlight key structural aspects of team mentoring that align with these recommendations and the value of internal and external mentors.<sup>14,19</sup> The use of external faculty within the university may be particularly well-suited for pharmacy programs, since many faculty specialize in areas that intersect or align with other disciplines, such as chemistry, engineering, education, medicine, and public health. Although the CMP does not currently utilize peer mentors, this could be another strategy for enhancing the diversity of perspectives, networking opportunities, and types of support that faculty experience.<sup>9,30</sup>

Despite these strengths, participants explicated common faculty mentoring challenges, including finding time to meet and ensuring that mentors and mentees were well-matched.<sup>1,5,15</sup> Protecting time for career development is a critical aspect of success in academia and strategies for incentivizing commitment to the program may warrant attention. Mentor fit is critical for a successful program, and the selection of mentors is done with great care to ensure mentees obtain the best support. CMP has an endowment that supports the program and provides a financial incentive to its mentors. The mentors felt like their time and mentoring was valued and many invested the financial incentive in their mentee by taking them out to lunch or coffee.

Resources, such as incentives and time, must be well-understood and secured to ensure the success and sustainability of faculty mentoring.<sup>1</sup> As it relates to the CMP, the School has committed a clear administrative infrastructure that includes a Director and staff support. Financial support is available for monthly seminar lunches, occasional socials, and mentor incentives. Division Chairs understand and support the time investment required for junior faculty and the internal mentors to participate in the program. Participants described this program's infrastructure as critical to their success, and the evaluation identified ways in which to optimize time and resources.

Program evaluation, including the use of qualitative data, is critical for ensuring that mentoring programs are aligned with and meeting the needs of mentees, mentors, and schools.<sup>1,19,20</sup> Conducting focus groups with all stakeholders allowed for insight into all aspects of the CMP from various viewpoints. Coupled with previous evaluations,<sup>16</sup> this qualitative evaluation effort provided additional depth and insight into opportunities for improving faculty development and equipped CMP and School leadership to make changes.

Although the benefits of CMP for mentors was beyond the scope of this study, most mentors expressed satisfaction with the program and provided only minor suggestions for improvements (eg, providing mentors with training prior to meeting with mentees, extending invitations to monthly seminars). Previous research has shown benefits to mentors, including career development, improved leadership skills, new networks, and enhanced research.<sup>31,32</sup> As such, exploring the role of the CMP in promoting the professional development of mentors could be an important next evaluation step. As stated by Pioloi and Knight,<sup>33</sup> "Everyone can benefit from mentoring in important ways, regardless of status, position, or level of expertise."

Given the critical role of mentoring in faculty success, it is somewhat surprising that most pharmacy schools lack formalized faculty development programs.<sup>12,13</sup> As pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences evolve, and pharmacy curricula undergo significant revisions, mentoring will play a critical role in helping faculty develop the skills requisite for success within academia. More research is needed to understand the unique needs of pharmacy faculty, as schools commonly embody faculty on various tracks (eg, tenure, clinical, research) with a wide range of primary responsibilities (eg, teaching, research, practice, precepting) across diverse fields that often intersect other disciplines. Further, formal mentoring could be critical for promoting the retention of underrepresented minority faculty in pharmacy, as a lack of mentoring has been cited by faculty of color for unsuccessful tenure attainment.<sup>34</sup>

Shortly after this evaluation, School leadership chose to pilot an expansion of the program to include associate professors as mentees. Associate professors wanted guidance on how to advance and shape their careers, such as adapting their research agendas over time or positioning themselves for administrative and leadership positions. Although most faculty mentoring programs focus on early career faculty, mid-career faculty can also benefit from mentoring.<sup>19</sup> In Fall 2019, five associate professors from the School (ie, one from each of the School's five divisions) were included as mentees in the program. A sixth associate professor joined the program during the Spring of 2020. Subsequent CMP

evaluations will examine the experience of associate professors and additional opportunities for improving and expanding the program.

This study has several limitations. First, this evaluation was conducted at a single institution with endowed funds to support the mentorship program. While this design limits generalizability, the needs and experiences of these participants are likely reflected at similar schools. Second, the participants interviewed were volunteers, which may have introduced self-selection bias. However, the qualitative design of this study enabled us to reach saturation among participants as the themes discussed appeared across all participant groups.<sup>29</sup> Third, social desirability bias could have occurred despite de-identifying data and ensuring anonymity in the dissemination of findings.

Despite these limitations, this work contributes to a gap in the literature concerning qualitative evaluation of faculty mentoring programs in pharmacy. More specifically, explored the perceived strengths and limitations of this team-based mentoring program and unveiled the perceived needs of mid-career faculty. It also highlighted the design of the CMP as it relates to the 2014 AACP Task Force PAIRS checklist and provided rich data about faculty experiences and needs within a structured, systematic mentoring program for junior faculty. The results informed changes within the CMP and are offered in hopes of helping other schools in the development of their own faculty mentoring programs.

## CONCLUSION

Mentoring is important for faculty professional development as it supports job satisfaction, productivity, and helps reduce burnout. The Bill and Karen Campbell Mentoring Program is an endowed, structured program that supports junior faculty as they acclimate to the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy and their role as faculty. The structure of the program provides junior faculty with numerous points of contact to support them during their initial years in academia (ie, peer community, internal and external mentors, CMP program director, and division chairs). The qualitative evaluation of CMP provided insight into the strengths, challenges, and areas of opportunities for the program, which is critical for the program's continued success in supporting junior faculty. The evaluation also identified the mentoring needs of mid-career faculty and future opportunities for inclusion within the CMP. Participants provided invaluable information regarding the program that will inform the future of not only the CMP at the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy but also faculty mentoring programs throughout pharmacy education.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge: William "Bill" Campbell, PhD, former Dean of the School and namesake of the CMP with his wife Karen, for his role in helping design and support the program; UNC Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert A. Blouin, PharmD, Dean of the School when the CMP was established; Harold Kohn, PhD, founding Director of the CMP; and the Pharmacy Foundation of North Carolina for their support of the CMP. In addition, the authors would like to thank former CMP Director Dhiren Thakker, PhD, who was serving as the School's Interim Dean at the time of this evaluation and provided support and feedback during the design of the focus group scripts. We would also like to thank Susan Charamut for her help scheduling and organizing the focus groups.

## REFERENCES

1. McRae M, Zimmerman KM. Identifying components of success within health sciences-focused mentoring programs through a review of the literature. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2019;83(1): Article 6976.
2. Higgins MC, Kram KE. Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: a developmental network perspective. *Acad Manag Rev* 2001;26(2): 264-288.
3. Allen TD, Eby LT, Poteet ML, Lentz E, Lima L. Career benefits associated with mentoring for proteges: a meta-analysis. *J Appl Psychol* 2004;89(1):127-136.
4. Seely EW, Kram KE, Emans SJ. Developmental networks in translational science. *Transl Res* 2015;165(4):531-536. Jackson et al. 2003
5. Jackson VA, Palepu A, Szalacha L, Caswell C, Carr PL, Inui T. "Having the right chemistry": a qualitative study of mentoring in academic medicine. *Acad Med* 2003;78(3):328-334.
6. Whitley W, Dougherty TW, Dreher GF. Relationship of mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. *Acad Manag J.* 1991;34(2):331-351.
7. Sorcinelli MD, Yun J. From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change.* 2007;39(6):58-61. Doi:10.3200/CHNG.396.58-C4
8. Kram KE, Isabella LA. Mentoring alternatives: the role of peer relationships in career development. *Acad Manag J.* 1985;28(1):110-132.

9. El-Ibiary SY, Yam L, Lee KC. Assessment of burnout and associated risk factors among pharmacy practice faculty in the United States. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2017;81(4):Article 75.
10. Ambrose S, Huston T, Norman MA. A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Res High Educ.* 2005;46(7):803-830.
11. Monk PE, Irons JE, Carlson NL, Walker C. Mentoring: A safety-net for retention and tenure for faculty in institutions of higher education. *Nat Soc Sci J.* 2010;33(2):126-133.
12. Wutoh AK, Colebrook MN, Holladay JW, et al. Faculty mentoring programs at schools/colleges of pharmacy in the US. *J Pharm Teach.* 2000;8(1):61.
13. Staton AG. Adapting to academic life: Junior pharmacy practice faculty's preparation for academia and their intent to leave [dissertation]. Auburn: Auburn University; 2017.
14. Haines SL, Popovich NG. Engaging external senior faculty members as faculty mentors. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2014;78(5): Article 101.
15. Jackevicius CA, Le J, Nazer L, Hess K, Wang J, Law AV. A formal mentorship program for faculty development. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2014;78(5): Article 100.
16. Kohn H. A mentoring program to help junior faculty members achieve scholarship success. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2014;78(2):Article 29.
17. Metzger AH, Hardy YM, Jarvis C, et al. Essential elements for a pharmacy practice mentoring program. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2013;77(2):Article 23.
18. Eiland LS, Marlowe KF, Sacks GS. Development of faculty mentor teams in a pharmacy practice department. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn.* 2014;6:759-766.
19. Law AV, Bottenberg MM, Brozick AH, et al. A checklist for the development of faculty mentorship programs. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2014;78(5):Article 98.
20. Desselle SP. Treating mentoring programs as scholarly endeavor. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2012;76(6):Article102.
21. Kiersma ME, Hagemeyer N, Chen AM, Melton B, Noureldin M, Plake KS. A graduate student mentoring program to develop interest in research. *Am J Pharm Educ.* 2012;76(6):Article 104.
22. Katajavuori N, Lindblom-Ylänne S, Hirvonen J. Pharmacy mentors' views of practical training. *Res Sci Educ.* 2005;35(2-3):323-45.
23. Waghel RC, Wilson JA, Battise DM, Frye J. Reflections on a year-long student and pharmacist paired mentorship program. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn.* 2017;9(4):713-8.
24. Hammond DA, Garner SS, Linder MA, Cousins WB, Bookstaver PB. Assessment of mentor involvement with pharmacy students pursuing post-graduate residency training. *Curr Pharm Teach Learn.* 2016;8(1):18-23.
25. UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy. Bill and Karen Campbell Faculty Mentoring Program. <https://pharmacy.unc.edu/quick-links/faculty-staff/faculty-mentoring-program/> Accessed November 22, 2019.
26. Braun V, Clark V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.* 2006;3:77-101.
27. Ponterotto JG. Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of qualitative research concept "thick description." *Qual Rep.* 2006;11(3):538-549.
28. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: A synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med.* 2014;89:1245-1251.
29. Leslie K, Lingard L, Whyte S. Junior faculty experiences with informal mentoring. *Med Teach.* 2005;27(8):693-698.
30. Lumpkin A. A model for mentoring university faculty. *Educ Forum.* 2011;75(4):357-368.
31. Luna G, Cullen DL. *Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed.* Washington DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education; 1995.
32. Gazza EA. Establishing a supportive culture through mentorship. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum.* 2004;84(4).
33. Pololi L, Knight S. Mentoring faculty in academic medicine: A new paradigm? *J Gen Intern Med.* 2005;20(9):866-870.
34. Trower C. Amending higher education's constitution. *Academe.* 2008;94(5):16-18.

Table 1. CMP structure and representative participant quotes mapped to the PAIRS checklist from the 2014 AACCP Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring

<b>Construct*</b>	<b>Definition*</b>	<b>CMP Design</b>	<b>Example Quotes from Focus Groups</b>
<i>Intent</i>	Examine goals and purpose(s) of mentorship program	Assist in recruitment and retention of junior faculty, help junior faculty reach their full potential, leverage the unique and valuable talent of internal and external senior faculty; guiding principles are to keep it simple, voluntary, and faculty-driven.	<i>“The program inserts junior faculty members into a cohort of peers along with support from senior faculty. The dedicated monthly support from senior faculty is invaluable and is critical for accelerating success.” – <b>Division Chair</b></i>
<i>Structure</i>	Provide oversight, policy document, mentor definition, mentor incentivization	Director appointed by Dean serves to oversee program and facilitate mentor matching; staff provides administrative support by helping schedule and manage meetings; full professors preferred as mentors; one mentor must be internal to School and one must be external to School; mentors paid an annual stipend.	<i>“I think the formal arrangement has been great. Sometimes young faculty have challenges and don’t know when they should reach out. The formality is better, because there is an intrinsic understanding that I am here for you.” – <b>External Mentor</b></i>
<i>Process</i>	Match, assign, and train mentors; orient mentees; set expectations for the pair	Possible mentors discussed by mentee and Director until appropriate candidates identified; mentors invited by Director and must commit to expectations; mentors expected to support the mentee as they acclimate to the School and University, develop in their faculty role, and navigate the promotion, reappointment, and tenure process. Kick-off team meeting facilitated by Director to help set team expectations.	<i>“One on one meetings are more about guiding them [mentee] and reigning them in and not letting them be over committed, finding balance and identifying where they should be spending their time.” - <b>Internal Mentor</b></i>
<i>Resources</i>	Secure time, money, programmatic support, and technology	Mentors expected to meet with mentees monthly; mentees attend monthly seminars; mentoring team meets annually; financial budget includes mentor stipends and seminar lunches; standing technology used to connect remotely with faculty at the Asheville campus.	<i>“I don’t feel bad about bothering my mentor because they get money and it formalizes the process, so I don’t feel bad about taking up their time. Someday I will be paying it forward as a mentor. Plus, the mentors signed up.” – <b>Early Career Faculty</b></i>
<i>Assessment and Evaluation</i>	Conduct periodic assessments of mentoring relationship quality, annual assessment of mentoring relationship renewal, and program evaluation	Programmatic evaluation conducted with mentees in 2014; <sup>14</sup> program director conducts annual interviews all mentees individually about program; focus groups conducted with multiple stakeholders in 2019.	<i>“I am a huge fan of the program. I love that you are evaluating the program.” – <b>External Mentor</b></i>

CMP = Campbell Mentoring Program; AACCP = American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

\*Adapted from the 2014 AACCP Joint Council Task Force on Mentoring<sup>18</sup>

Table 2. Representative quotes for themes and subthemes identified from the focus group evaluation of the Campbell Mentoring Program (n=45)

Themes	Sub-Themes	Example Quotes
Strengths	Structure of Program	<p><i>"I like the formality of the mentoring program. It is important to have clear expectations that can decrease anxiety. General expectations can help you focus and remove stress."</i> – CMP Graduate (Tenured Associate Professor)</p> <p><i>"It is nice to meet people who are your same level/place and using that as a way to bounce ideas both formally and informally."</i> – Early Career Faculty (mentee)</p>
	Mentoring Relationships	<p><i>"What has been of continuous value is the relationship with the mentors that has been set up."</i> – Early Career Faculty</p> <p><i>"The dedicated monthly support from senior faculty is invaluable and is critical for accelerating success."</i> – Division Chair</p> <p><i>"First couple of years were really tough because you don't know anyone. Having a mentor networking across campus has been wonderful to be able to find other collaborators and people to talk to and get suggestions from."</i> – Early Career Faculty</p>
Challenges	Time	<p><i>"I'm mindful about taking up too much of my mentor's time or wasting their time."</i> – Early Career Faculty</p> <p><i>"Time is a barrier. Sometimes new faculty are involved in so many things, they need to be reminded to meet."</i> – Internal Mentor</p>
	Mentor Fit	<p><i>"The mentor/mentee relationship is pivotal, if the relationship deteriorates the mentee is typically not as successful as they could be."</i> – Division Chair</p> <p><i>"There are often people who are great scientists but who are not great mentors. So, there should be an alternative plan to pick someone else."</i> – Early Career Faculty</p>
Future Directions & Opportunities	Mentee Seminars	<p><i>"Not all seminars benefit everyone, but as a mentor I can help bridge that gap."</i> – Internal Mentor</p> <p><i>"The invited speaker/topic is the lowest yielding thing in the program."</i> – Early Career Faculty</p>
	Mentor Training	<p><i>"I don't understand the structure of the school itself...I think an orientation for mentors would be helpful"</i> – External Mentor</p> <p><i>"Do mentors have the right training to be a good mentor? It's really based on the mentor's experience/lives/what we did."</i> – Internal Mentor</p>
	Associate Professor Mentoring	<p><i>"[Associate Professor] is the most fragile place ... because you get all these resources as an assistant and nothing as an associate ... that puts you in a vulnerable position."</i> – Mid-Career Faculty</p> <p><i>"Maybe it [mentoring programming] could be pathways to deanship or some other focused leadership training."</i> – Mid-Career Faculty</p>