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INTRODUCTION

The charges for this chapter of the AACP Academic Management System included the following: discuss those factors which attract candidates to a particular school; define the essential elements which ensure satisfaction of faculty; identify those issues which arise as retirement draws close. To adequately address these issues the education literature was searched to identify papers which critically examine these and other issues impacting upon the recruitment and retention of faculty. Relevant papers in the pharmacy literature were also identified and incorporated into the discussions. As appropriate, cases and anecdotes collected from colleagues serve to reinforce particular concepts in the chapter.

RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY

The Association for the Study of Higher Education has published an extensive monograph on the subject of faculty recruitment, retention and fair employment (1). This document contains practical and sound advice for administrators, search committee members and prospective faculty members participating in recruitment activities.

ADVERTISING POSITIONS

From the perspective of the faculty member, recruitment can be broken down into four components: (i) position announcement; (ii) on-campus interview; (iii) “closing the sale;” and (iv) overall management of the process. Given the small number of schools of pharmacy, the homogeneity of the individual academic disciplines, and the ease of making announcements through the professional associations’ publications, advertising for available positions is fairly straightforward and uniform. Assuming the position descriptions are honest reflections of the available jobs, little more needs to be said about advertising from the prospect’s vantage point. It is specifically the interview and the overall management of the process that can have the greatest impact on successful faculty recruitment.

There is one item to mention relevant to administrators who seek out candidates for openings on their faculty. Be realistic in your encouragement. It can reflect poorly on a program when someone who has been strongly pursued follows up with a letter of intent or application only to be rejected by the search committee even prior to the interview.

THE CAMPUS INTERVIEW

By the time one or more faculty prospects are invited to campus, the persons responsible for the search should be convinced that these are the very best available candidates. The interview should then serve as an opportunity to validate the impressions derived from reviewing the candidates’ curricula vitae and references, but should primarily be used to persuade the candidates to accept a position if offered.
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Table I. Faculty members' attitudes toward the importance of information categories for inclusion on resumes for academic positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percent indicating Important/Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research background</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of publications</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic employment history</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal references</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/honors</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career objectives</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College transcripts</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal information</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary desired</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While they should be aware of their existence, candidates should not have to deal with members of the faculty who are unable or unwilling to extend the common courtesy of good manners, genuine interest and hospitality.

Organizing the visit properly is the first step in assuring the interview will work to the school's advantage in attracting the desired candidate. Exercise reason in allocating the candidate's time such that the schedule is not totally exhausting or impossible to follow. To the extent it is feasible, provide the prospect an advance copy of the full itinerary, including the names and titles of the people on the schedule. The faculty of the institution should also receive a copy of the schedule and the prospect's curriculum vitae to facilitate a meaningful exchange during the interview. Essentially all interviews for academic positions involve a formal lecture delivered by the candidate. Although probably an exception, some programs have arranged to pay a modest honorarium for preparation and delivery of the lecture. It is imperative that the institution can at least provide an attentive audience of adequate size. For young faculty this may be one of their first formal lectures. Even "seasoned" individuals may find themselves anxious when speaking before an audience of their peers. Every attempt should be made to make the candidate comfortable.

McDowell and Mrozia\(^3\) examined the key elements of the interview from the perspectives of administrators, search committee members and faculty recently hired by a large Midwestern university. Their study provides interesting insights for all parties involved in the interview into what makes both an academic resume and an interview "successful." Tables I through IV are included in this paper to show their findings.

The categories of information considered to be an important part of the academic resume are not surprising. Most curricula vitae are constructed with an educational history, list of scholarly achievements, previous employment record, and memberships/awards/honors. The most interesting information related to the data in Table I was the relatively low rating given to "personal information" (only 33 percent rated this as important or very important). It is also notable that personal information was the only category of information rated significantly different by new faculty compared to administrators and search committee members. One could surmise that those doing the hiring may still feel that the age, gender and marital status of a faculty prospect are relevant in the hiring decision, while new faculty members prefer to adhere to Equal Employment policies and procedures.

In reference to the McDowell data contained in Table II, it is striking to note the weight placed on the communications skills in the overall process of evaluating faculty candidates. Males in the study and full professors indicated that gender was significantly more important to consider than did females and faculty at lower ranks. There were no other significant differences to be noted from the data in Table II; the rest of the data are self-explanatory.

**"CLOSING THE SALE"

What then becomes important in "closing the sale" to attract a desirable candidate to your institution? Table III provides some insight from the McDowell study. Full disclosure of the nature of the position appears to be the most important information to impart to the prospective faculty member. This would include an explanation of the balance between teaching and scholarly activities and their relative weight in promotion and tenure decisions, as well as the current and future directions of the department and the college. The structural issues of facilities and the salary-benefits package are also very important. The availability of laboratory space and equipment, a reasonable office and the nature of the clinical setting for co-staff faculty should be clearly described to the candidate.

**START-UP MONIES**

It has become apparent in discussions with several new pharmacy faculty members that one key element about the negotiations for faculty positions is not dealt with very openly. The topic in question is that of the art of negotiating a package of start-up supplies or seed monies to support initial efforts at building an active research program. The void is particularly acute in the clinical and administrative sciences where equipment and laboratory space may seem secondary considerations. This issue, not addressed in Table III is rarely discussed by major professors in advanced
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degree programs, and is not addressed to any extent in the higher education literature.

Anecdotal evidence of such funding for some new faculty at the research-intensive institutions breeds discontent among those — perhaps branded naive for not asking — who learn later of the package used to recruit another assistant professor. As such funds could make the difference between a productive or faltering early research track record, it would seem to be to the program’s advantage to be honest about the availability of these funds.

The last set of relevant data in the McDowell study (Table IV) provides a review of information which a candidate should be prepared to provide the prospective employer. In comparing the responses across academic ranks, positions (new faculty versus search committee member) and gender for the data in Table IV, there were no significant differences.

**MANAGEMENT OF THE OVERALL PROCESS**

While the above discussion reveals a great deal about the importance of specific aspects of the recruitment process, this section is not complete without a discussion of the overall management of the process. Attention to detail and adherence to reasonable deadlines can make the difference when a candidate reaches the point of making a decision between two very similar institutions. Some common but often overlooked issues include: acknowledgment of receipt of application materials; disclosure of the details of the interview well in advance; meeting the candidate on arrival; and general hospitality throughout the process. It is also important to provide ample information to the candidate to familiarize him/her with the university and surrounding community. Some schools find that the Chamber of Commerce will be extremely helpful in providing material to promote the community.

Most important for many candidates is the completion of the process in a timely fashion. Be as specific as possible about the timeline following the on-campus interview, including how long it may be before the department or school can be expected to make its decision, when the school would need an answer and what the anticipated start date for employment would be. In leaving a candidate without these answers you may offer the impression that the position and/
member with an interesting proposition. There might be some money for new faculty positions at the University in the next fiscal year and, if there is, we would like to add a position to our department for someone with your qualifications. If we find a qualified candidate who is interested in an affiliation with our institution it strengthens our position with the administration in asking for a new position. Would you be willing to come and interview for a position even though it may not materialize?

“Nothing ventured, nothing gained” captured the attitude of the faculty prospect who accepted the invitation to interview on campus. The interview itself was handled smoothly and completely with no indication that the entire process might be moot. At the end of the second day, the department chair indicated that the decision about the existence of the position would be made within two weeks. A date was set for a follow-up telephone contact to share the outcome of the University’s deliberation.

Before noon on the established day the chair called the prospect to explain that the position had not been approved. The faculty member accepted the outcome positively, feeling flattered by the interest of the University rather than cheated or misled as might have been the case with a poorly handled process.

FACULTY RETENTION

The Foundations for Success: The New Faculty Member

In his paper on faculty recruitment and retention, Waggoner draws attention to a myth in higher education that anyone can learn to become a good professor if he/she simply applies enough personal effort(1). This myth ignores the fact that our PhD and PharmD programs, while doing a superb job of expanding the discipline-specific knowledge base of a graduate, typically provide few of the skills pertinent to teaching, course management, independent research, and survival as a member of a politicalized or divided faculty.

The Individual Faculty Member’s Responsibility

As the burden of responsibility for assisting a new faculty member rests on the shoulders of the individual’s immediate superior. However, Waggoner’s report(3) also enumerates nine principles that new faculty should follow in order to be successful. These are as follows:

1. Demonstrate dependability. Do whatever is required ahead of time and do it thoroughly.
2. Where a choice of professional activities exists, choose those that provide the best information to build a career (e.g. identify sources of funding if research and publication are important).
3. Over achieve only on things with “exchange value” (activities that contribute to career goals) and minimize those things with “use value” (regular work assignments).
4. In setting priorities, do those things first that contribute to professional growth; as a bonus, they help develop and demonstrate competence and expertise to colleagues.
5. When outside forces of accountability impinge on professional activities, report them to peers for their response, suggestions, and recommended strategies for coping.
6. Learn the formal and informal institutional rules, understand them, use them to achieve career goals, and attempt to change them if they are hindrances.
7. Manage time; don’t get trapped into nurturing and developmental activities beyond those necessary for a reasonable performance of regular assignments.
8. Learn which activities count most in the quest for promotion and tenure; maximize the ones that count the most.
9. Be active professionally; establish a broad network of contacts and sources of information; become professionally visible.

THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

New faculty who are embarking on their first position in academe need coaches and advocates who are willing to help them avoid the common pitfalls in higher education. Unfortunately, the “older” faculty in many cases may not have that many more years in service and may be struggling themselves with tenure deadlines and the demands of the teaching/research/service morass. This places much of the burden of helping the faculty member develop on the department chair or other appropriate administrator.

A succinct review of the rationale and process of using faculty development plans in pharmacy education is offered by Manasse(4). According to Waggoner, “It is the department head’s responsibility to develop a plan and simple indicators of successful performance for each competency [teaching, research, advising students and service]”(5). The concept of using annual and term-specific assignments, particularly in the first few years of the new faculty career, may seem somewhat paternalistic, but may ultimately dictate the difference between success and failure in an academic career. Those faculty and administrators that operate on a laissez-faire approach the first five years and then switch to intense scrutiny in year six as promotion and tenure questions arise face a much greater likelihood of encountering failure.

The need for a clearly articulated plan and guidance for new faculty is borne out in an older study which found that faculty who separated from the university left feeling that they should have had better communications with the department chair. Specifically the younger faculty felt that there should have been more direct discussions about the possibilities for promotion and tenure. More basically, they simply wished the chair had shown some interest in their work(6).

Special Challenge of Clinical Faculty

It would seem that those administrators with responsibility for clinical or co-staff faculty have a particularly challenging task in assisting the new faculty member to get firmly established. “No man can serve two masters” is an ignored maxim in clinical education. A person with a joint appointment at a school of pharmacy and a clinical setting firmly established. “No man can serve two masters” is an ignored maxim in clinical education. A person with a joint appointment at a school of pharmacy and a clinical setting needs a clear understanding of the rules and expectations of both institutions. It is not uncommon for each employer to believe that the half they support is worth more than 50 percent. A new faculty member may become unrealistically burdened with committee expectations and high teaching commitments on both sides.

A healthier school of pharmacy philosophy of clinical education was expressed by a department chair in counseling a new assistant professor. The woman somewhat naively asked if it would seem more appropriate to divide her time in half each day, staying at the clinic until noon and then coming to the college, or giving two whole days to each institution and splitting just one day each week. Somewhat surprised by the question, the chair replied that the most
important work the clinician could do for the school was establish a strong practice base through which the students could experience clinical care. It became clear that unless the faculty member had didactic teaching responsibilities, a meeting or some other direct need to be at the college, her time was to be spent at the co-staff site. Knowing that no one expected her to clock in 20 or more hours a week in each site freed her to accomplish much more than she might otherwise have.

**Role of the Mentor**

The term “mentor” is very fashionable these days both in and out of academe. Quoting Blackburn and colleagues, “The mentor provides a role model, academic advice, and eventually, assistance in gaining access to the profession.” (7) Given the direct supervisory responsibilities of the department chair, it may not be wise for that individual to serve in the role of the mentor. This suggests that other faculty need to assume this charge. The small size and diversity of many school of pharmacy faculties make the creation of strong mentor relationships more difficult than in some other professions or disciplines.

Perhaps in no other discipline has this been so acute as in pharmacy administration. The cry for improved management training for pharmacy graduates has created a large market for faculty with management skills. At the same time the industry, health care institutions and other private sector employers have discovered the useful skills of graduates of our pharmacy administration programs. Yet the discipline itself is still relatively young and those trained are actually quite diverse in terms of their specific skills. Since the concept of clinical pharmacy advanced rapidly over the same time period and was established more firmly into the curriculum and licensure competency expectations, the competition for school of pharmacy resources was often won by the clinical programs. The result is the creation of pharmacy administration programs at many schools of pharmacy populated by a single faculty person, often newly credentialed, on whom an inordinate burden of teaching is placed. With few if any other social science colleagues in the school, the opportunity to establish a mentor relationship, or any collaborative activity for that matter, is limited.

**Beginning a Program of Scholarship**

Before leaving the discussion of the program’s responsibility to new faculty, a brief discussion of assistance specifically in the establishment of a research program is in order. Recommended reading for all new faculty and their administrators is Ken Miller’s article, first presented at the Council of Deans and subsequently published(8), on expectations of scholarship at our schools of pharmacy. Despite the fact, as Miller notes, that a substantial percentage of faculty never publish, virtually every new faculty member has placed upon him or her the expectation for maintaining some level of scholarship. How that expectation is fulfilled is too often left entirely up to the faculty member. Too commonly these individuals come to their positions under-equipped to initiate an independent research program.

The administrator and senior faculty have three responsibilities related to this issue: (i) assist junior faculty in identifying sources of support, even the most modest, to “jumpstart” their efforts at scholarship; (ii) be willing to critically review and help strengthen research proposals and manuscripts to minimize the chances that the fledgling scholar receives scathing reviews and rejections from “more knowledgeable” peer reviewers; and (iii) help the young investigator avoid “the sharks” (i.e., senior faculty who may have the talent to write fundable proposals but who unscrupulously will borrow the fresh ideas of younger colleagues and place themselves in senior investigator or author positions). It is a most unusual PhD or PharmD graduate that emerges from our educational system fully prepared for the productive research career now expected of pharmacy faculty. The role of postdoctoral fellowships in all disciplines cannot be overestimated for assisting with the transition to a productive career in academe.

**Promotion and Tenure**

To a younger faculty person one of the greatest mysteries in higher education is the system of promotion and tenure. Although it seems from anecdotal reports that more schools are designing explicit tenure documents, historically the criteria for achieving tenure have been shrouded in non-quantitative, nebulously defined terms. Further complicating the situation of a young assistant professor’s approach to the tenure puzzle is that, at the outset of employment, an evaluation five, six or seven years hence seems an unthreatening and elusive challenge. Answering the latest beeper page and preparing pending lectures, exams and in-service presentations are the more pressing agenda items.

Promotion and tenure require the demonstration of some measure of excellence (or at least activity) in at least two, if not three, of the teaching, scholarship and service triad. What is not always clear to a new faculty member, because rarely is it written or stated by anyone, is how these three areas are evaluated or weighted.

What is also not clear in pharmacy, now that we have the full spectrum of laboratory scientists, clinical scientists and administrative scientists at our institutions, is how we should make comparisons across the disciplines. How does a laboratory scientist, for example, evaluate the research done by protocol in many clinical settings, particularly when the protocol is created not by the faculty member but by another party working in the industry? Does animal model research on some obscure product or process, for which implications on patient care are impossible to assess, carry the same weight as research in the critical care arena which clearly saves lives? And how can the quality of survey research in the social sciences be judged?

The actual answers to these questions are insignificant in the broad discussion of taking an honest approach to promotion and tenure. What is critically important is that specific expectations be established, and quantified when possible, at both the departmental and the school level. These expectations should be clearly explained to all prospective faculty members. Progress toward meeting the criteria should be assessed annually. If the promotion process is explicitly stated there should be no surprises when a junior faculty member prepares the dossier for promotion review. Unfortunately, cases of stellar performers being denied promotion or tenure still surface each year which suggests that the process is not always equitable or fair. An administrator who loses a young star because he or she was dealt with unfairly by a misguided department or school committee has no one to blame but himself. The process should not have that much space for subjective judgment. Contrary to some popular opinion, candidates for faculty openings are not impressed by promotion and tenure systems that have proven themselves unreasonably “tough”.
BEYOND THE NEW EMPLOYEE: RETAINING ESTABLISHED FACULTY

Intuitively it seems that two factors dictate the issue of retaining employees: basic satisfaction with the present position and the competitive opportunities in the marketplace. Both will be examined in this section. Competition will primarily be addressed in regard to the “flight” of faculty to positions in the pharmaceutical industry.

Faculty Satisfaction

The management literature provides a wealth of information about general employee satisfaction. In addition, several good papers have reported studies of faculty job satisfaction. One exploratory study has been published to date on pharmacy faculty satisfaction and additional work is currently underway. This discussion will focus first on the specific data from pharmacy and then more generally on the issue of satisfaction of faculty in higher education.

Pharmacy Faculty Satisfaction. Stajich, Murphy and Barnett(9) examined satisfaction among pharmacy faculty within a broader study and found a general job satisfaction rating of 3.8 in response to the question “All things considered, I am satisfied with my faculty position” (5 point scale, 5 = strongly agree). The respondents were most satisfied with their ability to use their skills (4.1) and least satisfied with their salaries (2.9).

Differences in level of satisfaction were noted between faculty in various pharmacy disciplines and between men and women. Differences were also noted between faculty based on work composition, with those providing the least amount of service noting the greatest satisfaction. Dissatisfaction with salary no doubt contributed to the findings in the study (10) that 88.5 percent of pharmacy faculty responding to the study received income from activities outside their primary faculty appointment.

Faculty Retention in Nursing Programs. Cavenar4 conducted a study involving a national sample of faculty teaching at nursing schools offering the PhD degree. Hers was one of the first to employ a multivariate analysis in an examination of faculty job satisfaction and retention. Given the clinical nature of nursing education and the fact that the respondents were at institutions with graduate degree programs, this paper contains interesting information for comparison with pharmacy education. A notable weakness of the study is the fact that the sample is entirely comprised of females.

Cavenar defined retention in terms of the intent to remain with the current institution. She found direct effects on retention of faculty from the following variables: geographic location and reputation of the school, role ambiguity, role conflict, work satisfaction and promotional satisfaction. Calibre of students, internal professional communication, role ambiguity and role conflict had direct effects on work satisfaction.

Role conflict was defined in this and other studies as a situation where behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent.” Role ambiguity is defined as “a lack of information available to a given organizational position.” Both variables are related to the clarity of the culture and/or mission of an educational program and whether or not there is ambiguity or conflict in the areas of teaching, research, service and administration.

Asmussen5 also used a national sample of faculty to explore job satisfaction and institutional identification. In this study, participation in governance, faculty power in the institution and senior faculty status contributed to a significant portion of the variance in the general satisfaction score. The institutional identification score in this study was the indicator of relative intent to remain at the institution. Senior faculty status and general satisfaction accounted for a significant amount of variation on the institutional identification measure. Satisfaction with administration was a very significant factor in the measurement of institutional identification.

The relationship between pharmacy faculty satisfaction and the management style of pharmacy school administrators is an intriguing but unexplored research question. Vanderveen(11) published the results of an investigation of the management styles of school of pharmacy deans. Using the Managerial Grid developed by Blake and Mouton(12), the investigator characterized respondents on their people and task orientations. Across all deans (i.e., deans, associate deans and assistant deans), 22.8 percent were classified with a high concern for both people and productivity. A similar percentage were found to be in the “compromiser” category which recognizes the importance of the employee in terms of accomplishing the task. Almost 20 percent fell into the “good old boy” category with high concern for people and low concern for productivity. Twenty-six percent were classified with low concern for both people and productivity. These data were not analyzed with regard to faculty satisfaction or retention, but such an analysis might provide extremely useful information about the management styles which might maximize the use of our scarce human resources in schools of pharmacy.

Managing the Inevitable Plateau

Fink(13) stated clearly in an address before the Council of Deans that the management of the human capital on our faculties is one of the most important tasks faced by deans. The majority of our faculty are tenured, which alters the system of rewards and motivations somewhat. One challenge which may therefore be more acute in the academic world than in the private sector is dealing with the concept of career plateaus.

Universities in general and schools of pharmacy particularly have organizational hierarchies with a very broad base and sharp point. There are relatively few opportunities for an individual to climb the ranks to an administrative position. Considering that the decision for tenure is typically made in the first decade of an educator’s career, and that the final academic promotion is to full professor which might also be accomplished relatively early in a 40-year career, there is a special challenge for administrators to manage the inevitable career plateau of faculty.

Slocum, Cron and Yows(14) synthesized some of the research which has examined plateauing in the business sector. Several insights in their work are relevant to this discussion. These authors classified employees in four categories: (i) solid citizens are high performers who are satis
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fied with their position and are not interested in continued promotion (plateaued); (ii) deadwood are typically dissatisfied individuals who produce work of poor quality (plateaued); (iii) comers are individuals high on the learning curve who are not yet plateaued; and (iv) stars are those high performers with bright prospects for promotion.

Recognizing that career plateauing is a natural phenomenon that can be managed is one of the first keys to success for administrators and those that report to them. Some employees make personal choices that lead to a plateau (e.g., resistance to relocation, age, purposely choosing to reduce stress in their job). Others find that the organizational structure imposes the plateau. Regardless of the cause, helping the employee recognize that the plateau does not necessarily signal failure will allow them to make adjustments in expectations and perhaps performance.

These same authors note the importance of managing the categories of employees noted above in different ways. Specifically they suggest that for the solid citizens it is essential to eliminate “content plateauing”. In academia this may be addressed through sabbatical leave, other faculty development activities, new teaching assignments or special projects.

Another suggestion for the solid citizen is identifying rewards other than money or promotion. Certainly access to equipment or travel funds might create an opportunity for productive activities for that individual who is willing to work hard but has not been that successful in the grant-seeking arena.

The final suggestion to the manager of plateaued employees is “be honest”. A common trait of plateaued workaholics, according to the authors, is their investment of greater numbers of hours and energy into the workplace. This may be as much force of habit as a sincere desire to accomplish a task. Unfortunately, this extra time is too often nonproductive, but they may not realize that fact. It is the role of the dean or department chair to help that person realize the point they have reached and design a strategy to either overcome the obstacle or adjust to it.

**Competition For Faculty: The Pharmaceutical Industry**

While competition for faculty comes from a variety of sources, the least of which is not other schools of pharmacy, a great deal of attention has been directed to the number of individuals who leave academia to work in the pharmaceutical industry. Historically this has been limited to the “bench scientists”, but recently an increasing number of clinicians and pharmacy administration faculty have left schools of pharmacy to pursue careers in the industry. A nonsystematic sample of individuals was called upon to reflect on this phenomenon to provide insight to those who may be counseling faculty considering such a move. Consolidation through corporate mergers and acquisitions in the mid-1990s has seemingly slowed the rate of movement of faculty into industry positions.

One colleague still employed by a school of pharmacy thought the rationale for leaving a position in education could be described as a “push/pull” situation. The push away from academe is a function of general job dissatisfaction, the realities of the grant seeking game and the implications for promotion and tenure, and differences of opinion between faculty and administration on the general philosophy and direction of the college. The pull to the industry was described in the obvious terms of salary differential and the perception, accurate or not, that resources would be more readily available for the pursuit of one’s research agenda. The stability of working for a well-establish industry, or the thrill of working for a start-up firm with a novel drug or dosage form, can also contribute to the decision to leave academia.

A former pharmacy administration faculty member cited the challenge of putting to practice that which he had taught for many years as a primary reason for making the transition to the industry. Besides the challenge of embarking on a new career, the unique opportunity to have resources to apply to projects which potentially can advance the profession of pharmacy also motivated the move.

The “push” from this person’s perspective was the frustration of poor management in our colleges of pharmacy and the lack of incentives to stay in the system. Unfortunately, this makes it more difficult to retain many of the top-notch faculty members. Several concepts which might contribute to retention of faculty include: clearly defining a career path, providing additional responsibilities for qualified individuals, naming faculty as managers of subsections of departments, enhancing salaries based on merit and granting consultant or short-term leaves.

Former clinical faculty reflected on several different themes related to the decision to move to the industry. Limited opportunity for growth (except into administration) and the pressure of the increased demand for teaching and clinical service increased demand for teaching and clinical service at the same time that research expectations are rising were motivating factors. The industry offered a more focused, although not less demanding, agenda.

**Beyond Retention to Retirement**

The final charge of this chapter was to discuss those issues which arise as retirement draws near. A quick glance at most university faculty handbooks will likely reveal little beyond the calculation of pension payments and a description of when an employee is eligible to receive these benefits. With the high percentage of tenured faculty in schools of pharmacy, administrators will face the issues of retirement with greater frequency.

What are some of the issues and concerns? What follows is purely anecdotal information gathered from a variety of informed sources (i.e., those who have retired or have counseled retiring faculty).

The nature of the academic milieu is changing from the “community of scholars” that provided a supportive and comfortable cocoon for teaching and scholarly investigation to more of a “big business” environment. The change in environment is difficult for some older faculty, and this may be forcing the retirement question at an earlier point than had been anticipated.

Because of the unique character of educational institutions and that community of scholars, those faculty that retire today are leaving more than just a job. They leave a respected place in the community and an intellectual home. They also may face the prospects of retiring on a pension that provides less financial security than they might have realized had they worked in the corporate sector.

Retiring faculty mention three common themes surrounding their comfortable retirement:

1. **Economics.** While pension benefits cannot often be manipulated, perhaps certain other considerations could be given retiring faculty. Often mentioned are such things as...
providing for adequate health insurance for them and/or their spouse, particularly if one or both are not yet qualified for Medicare coverage, and other insurance coverage. Part-time teaching activities might provide an economic cushion for the newly retired faculty member.

2. **Professional Activity.** After committing their entire professional life to academia, many faculty find it difficult to imagine not having some outlet for professional activity. This speaks again to the value of part-time teaching assignments or special projects that call on the historical insight of the retiree.

3. **Access to Facilities.** Closely tied with the second point is the desire of retired faculty to have access to a small amount of space and/or equipment at the institution. An office, laboratory space or computer might allow them to pursue an avenue of inquiry long before placed on the back burner for lack of time or resources. The ability to take courses unrelated to their discipline might open up a second career opportunity. Certainly access to the university library and other university resources can provide a more reasonable transition for a retiree.

The most basic need perhaps is simple recognition of the contributions made over the course of 25, 35 or more years of service to the university. Those retiring today often worked for modest salaries, not because they had no alternative, but because they honestly loved teaching students and having the freedom to pursue their scholarly interests in the academic environment. They felt that what they were doing was making a contribution to the health of society and the profession of pharmacy and that deserves the recognition of the university’s faculty and administrators.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This chapter has provided a broad overview of the issues related to faculty recruitment, retention and retirement. The available data were discussed to provide insights into the opinions of faculty on these issues. In general, there is not a lot of specific information published about pharmacy faculty satisfaction although additional work is reportedly underway. The currently available commissioned papers in higher education and research in related disciplines does provide a starting point for more detailed inquiry in our profession.
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