

The Brief CV Review Session: One Component of a Mosaic of Mentorship for Women in Academic Medicine

Joan M. Von Feldt, MD, MS Ed; Mirar Bristol, MA; Seema Sonnad, PhD; Stephanie Abbuhl, MD; Patricia Scott; Karin L. McGowan, PhD

Background: In the current climate of increasing demands on a disproportionately small number of senior female faculty, we implemented a brief curriculum vitae (CV) review session as an opportunity to expand the professional network of junior women faculty and provide them with additional formal career advice.

Methods: For 3 years, junior (mentees) and senior (mentors) faculty from different departments were paired in half-hour CV review sessions, as part of an annual conference focused on professional development for faculty women. Participating faculty received questionnaires to assess their experience with the sessions, and their feedback was combined over all 3 years and compared using χ^2 and Fisher's tests.

Results: During the 3 years, there were 93 CV review sessions. Although 84% of the mentees reported having a mentor, only 62% of mentees reported that any previous mentoring experience was helpful. Most (90%) participated in the CV review to determine if their career was "on track." The mentees reported that the CV review session was helpful (93%), provided new information (87%), and identified that they were "on track" for promotion (75%). The mentors felt that their mentees were progressing appropriately in their career (78%) and provided specific recommendations for the mentees (100%). The majority (78%) of mentors felt comfortable mentoring junior faculty outside their department.

Conclusions: Brief interventions, such as a CV review session, can provide additional counsel to junior faculty, helping them assess their career progress as part of a mosaic of mentorship.

Keyword: education

J Natl Med Assoc. 2009;101:873-880

Author Affiliations: Department of Surgery (Dr Sonnad, associate professor and director of outcomes research), Division of Outcomes Research (Ms Bristol, research coordinator), and FOCUS on Health & Leadership for Women (Dr Abbuhl, executive director; Ms Scott, director of operations), University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine (Dr Von Feldt, associate professor of medicine; Dr McGowan, professor of pathology and laboratory medicine; Dr Abbuhl, vice chair and associate professor of emergency medicine), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Corresponding Author: Joan M. Von Feldt, MD, MS Ed, University of Penn-

sylvania, 504 Maloney, 3600 Spruce St, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (vonfeldt@mail.med.upenn.edu).

INTRODUCTION

The disproportionately small percentage of women in the senior ranks of academic medicine represents a significant loss of talent for medicine and remains a stubborn challenge for which no solution has yet been found.¹⁻³ In fact, it is likely that multiple and simultaneous efforts will be required to create an environment that supports a diverse faculty and where the full contributions of female faculty can be realized. Junior faculty members face increasing challenges to achieving academic success. Many are pessimistic about their ability to succeed in academic medicine, and this feeling is more prevalent among women.^{4,5} Mentorship consistently appears as an issue.⁶ While research shows that mentoring contributes to both career satisfaction and research productivity, in recent meta-analyses, fewer than 50% of faculty respondents had a current mentor, and women perceived that they had more difficulty finding mentors than their male colleagues.⁷⁻¹³ A recent study at our institution showed that female associate professors were more likely than men to have primary mentor(s), suggesting that having a mentor may be especially valuable for women in progressing to higher rank.¹¹ Because academic career progression is measured and assessed through the curriculum vitae (CV), mentorship in academic medicine should include guidance for maintaining a CV that will support faculty during review and promotion.

We report our experience with the implementation of one-on-one CV review sessions and satisfaction with this intervention by both junior and senior women faculty, as part of an annual professional development conference for faculty women.

METHODS

FOCUS, a program at the University of Pennsylvania dedicated to advancing leadership of women in academic medicine, coordinates an annual professional develop-

ment conference for women. Three years ago, a CV review session was added to the program. It was modeled after the format used by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) at their professional development seminars. CV review sessions were offered in 2005, 2006, and 2007. Approximately 1 month before the conference, e-mails were sent to all women associate and full professors asking for their participation as CV review mentors. Simultaneously, the CV review was announced by e-mail to all women assistant professors. The assistant professors were asked to pre-register over the Internet and send a copy of their CV by a deadline to receive a CV review mentoring session at the conference. The list of available mentors was sent to all preregistered junior female faculty, who were asked to rank their top 3 mentor choices. Program staff then assigned each junior faculty member to 1 of their mentor selections, ensuring that the mentor was not in the same department or division but was on the same academic faculty track (tenure, clinician-educator, academic clinician and research are the 4 faculty tracks at our institution). During the week prior to the conference, each mentor was sent a copy of their assigned mentee's CV to review.

During the first 2 years of the program, mentor/mentee pairs met either at the breakfast or lunch tables, or found a space elsewhere in the conference venue on their own. In the third year, a separate room was provided, although some pairs still elected to meet in other locations.

For each year, approximately 2 weeks after the conference, an e-mail was sent to all mentors and mentees requesting that they complete an anonymous Web-based evaluation of the CV review. Links to targeted versions of the surveys were embedded in the e-mails. Both versions were estimated to take 5 minutes (Tables 1 and 2).

In the second year there was an additional "mentor prep" workshop (45 minutes) provided by one of the authors (K.M.). The mentor prep session reviewed a list of suggestions and resources that might be beneficial for a more successful CV review session (Box). The third

year, both mentors and mentees were sent a list of Web links related to Penn's promotion requirements on the various faculty tracks from the Office of Faculty Affairs, but the mentor prep workshops did not occur. Mentor support that occurred during each of the 3 years consisted of a detailed e-mail that:

- Stressed that the value of the session would undoubtedly be enhanced if the mentor reviewed some of the specifics related to promotion at Penn.
- Contained Web links to UPenn faculty affairs Web site
- Provided guidelines for mentor/mentee conversations
- Provided information on preparing promotion dossiers.

The summary of mentor preparation information given to mentors is given in more detail (Box).

Summary data were collected for all 3 years for both mentor and mentee results. Results from all 3 years were combined into overall percentages. Mentee results were compared over time using χ^2 and Fisher's exact tests.

RESULTS

There were 93 CV review sessions (23 in 2005, 32 in 2006, and 38 in 2007). Seventy-eight mentors reviewed and discussed the CVs with 93 mentees. Over all 3 years, 61 mentees and 63 mentors completed the survey, for an aggregate response rate of 67%. The 3-year mentor response rate was 81% of all participants (63 of 78), while the mentee response rate was 66% of all participants (61 of 93).

Mentee Responses

Table 1 lists the mentee responses overall. Table 3 compares the distribution of mentees participating in the CV review by track, compared to the distribution of women faculty by track within the school of medicine

Box. Mentor Preparation Session

- Review and answer questions about promotion packet available on faculty affairs website (copy distributed to each mentor for review with mentee)
- Evaluate mentee's Curriculum vitae
- Share and explain usefulness of faculty affairs website (shows format for faculty CV, contains information concerning promotion for all tracks, shows faculty how to start and maintain an educational database)
- Make mentee aware of most common problems encountered by school of medicine promotions committee
 - i) Insufficient peer reviewed papers
 - ii) Insufficient number of invited talks
 - iii) Insufficient teaching or inadequate teaching quality
- Encourage mentee to make yearly goals for teaching, presentations at meetings, manuscripts, and research.

Table 1. Total CV Mentoring Overall Mentee Survey Results, 2005-2007

Total respondents 2005-2007 (61) 100%

	Research	Tenure	C-E	AC	UPHS Physician	Other
24) I am on the following academic track:	(10) 16%	(15) 25%	(29) 48%	(3) 5%	(1) 2%	(3) 5%
			Yes	No		
2) I have accessed the faculty affairs Web site to learn about promotion requirements.			(41) 67%	(20) 33%		
4) I have attended a FOCUS Promotion 101 session as part of the FOCUS Lunchtime Seminar series.			(34) 56%	(27) 44%		
			Disagree	Neutral	Agree	N/A
1) I was aware of the rules and regulations for promotion prior to the fall FOCUS "one-on-one CV review" mentoring session.			(8) 13%	(5) 8%	(48) 79%	
3) I have found the faculty affairs Web site information about promotion useful.			(1) 2%	(11) 18%	(31) 51%	(18) 30%
5) I have found the information from attending a FOCUS Promotion 101 Session useful.			(1) 2%	(0) 0%	(34) 56%	(26) 43%
6) I have a mentor at Penn.			(7) 11%	(3) 5%	(51) 84%	
7) My previous experience being mentored as a faculty member at Penn has been helpful and productive.			(8) 13%	(15) 25%	(38) 62%	
8) I found this FOCUS mentored CV review session helpful.			(1) 2%	(3) 5%	(57) 93%	
9) I would want to participate in a one-on-one CV review session like this again.			(1) 2%	(6) 10%	(54) 89%	
10) I would have preferred a more private space for the session.			(13) 21%	(22) 36%	(26) 43%	
11) It was helpful to have this CV review session off campus.			(8) 13%	(34) 56%	(19) 31%	
12) Having a CV review session with someone from outside my department was as helpful as with someone from within my department.			(10) 16%	(9) 15%	(39) 64%	(3) 5%
13) The mentoring I received in this session identified that I was appropriately progressing in my career.			(5) 8%	(10) 16%	(46) 75%	
14) This session provided new information/advice.			(4) 7%	(4) 7%	(53) 87%	
15) This session provided information/advice that conflicts with previous information I have received.			(30) 49%	(15) 25%	(16) 26%	
16) I have kept in contact with my FOCUS CV review session mentor.			(22) 36%	(17) 28%	(22) 36%	
17) My intention for this session was to establish a new mentor.			(32) 52%	(16) 26%	(13) 21%	
18) My intention for this session was to assess whether I was on target for career advancement/promotion.			(1) 2%	(5) 8%	(55) 90%	
19) I appreciated mentorship by someone who was outside my department.			(1) 2%	(9) 15%	(51) 84%	
20) This mentoring session stirred emotions of fear anger or grief.			(44) 72%	(8) 13%	(9) 15%	
		Man	Woman	Both	Either/No Preference	
21) I prefer mentoring by a:		(0) 0%	(16) 26%	(13) 21%	(32) 52%	
		15 min.	30 min.	45 min.	1 hour	>1 hour
22) What is the optimum time for this CV review session?		(1) 2%	(39) 62%	(14) 22%	(8) 13%	(1) 2%
		3-6 yrs	6.1-9 yrs	9.1-12 yrs	12.1-15 yrs	15 yrs
23) I have been a faculty member at Penn for the following time period:		(7) 11%	(6) 10%	(19) 30%	(11) 17%	(20) 32%
		0%-19%	20%-39%	40%-59%	60%-79%	80%-100%
25) How likely do you think you are to get promoted to associate professor at PENN?		(3) 5%	(5) 8%	(22) 36%	(19) 31%	(12) 20%
26) How likely do you think you are to still be at PENN in 5 years?		(5) 8%	(7) 11%	(19) 31%	(15) 25%	(15) 25%

Abbreviations: AC, academic clinician; CE, clinical educator; SOM, School of Medicine; UPHS, University of Pennsylvania Hospital System.

and compared to attendance at the faculty development conference. Over all 3 years, 79% of mentees reported that they were aware of promotion rules and regulations

(Q1). The number of mentees reporting having accessed the faculty affairs Web site was 50% in 2005, 88% in 2006, and 63% in 2007 (Q2). Half of the mentees (51%)

Table 2. CV Mentoring Overall Mentor Survey Results, 2005-2007

Total Respondents 2005-2007 (63) 100%							
	Research	Tenure	C-E	AC	UPHS Physician	Other	
24) I am on the following academic track:	(6) 10%	(14) 22%	(42) 67%	(1) 2%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	
			Yes	No			
6) I have accessed the faculty affairs Web site to learn about promotion requirements.			(56) 89%	(7) 11%			
8) I have attended a FOCUS Promotion 101 Session as part of the FOCUS Lunchtime Seminar series.			(36) 57%	(27) 43%			
			Disagree	Neutral	Agree	N/A	
1) My mentee was aware of the rules and regulations for promotion.			(15) 24%	(12) 19%	(36) 57%		
2) My mentee identified a mentor that she had consulted while at Penn.			(7) 11%	(14) 22%	(42) 67%		
3) My mentee was appropriately progressing in her career.			(10) 16%	(4) 6%	(49) 78%		
4) I have concerns about the mentoring that my mentee received in the past.			(24) 38%	(18) 29%	(21) 33%		
5) I was prepared (knowledgeable and experienced) to mentor this person.			(4) 6%	(6) 10%	(53) 84%		
7) I have found the faculty affairs Web site information about promotion useful.			(3) 5%	(9) 14%	(44) 70%	(7) 11%	
9) I found the information from attending a FOCUS Promotion 101 Session useful.			(2) 3%	(3) 5%	(35) 56%	(23) 37%	
10) I felt that this session was a useful exercise for my mentee.			(0) 0%	(6) 10%	(57) 90%		
11) I felt that this session was a useful exercise for me.			(1) 2%	(19) 30%	(43) 68%		
12) I would have preferred more private space for the session.			(18) 29%	(18) 29%	(27) 43%		
13) I felt comfortable mentoring someone outside my department and/or academic track.			(5) 8%	(9) 14%	(49) 78%		
14) I provided specific recommendations to my mentee.			(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(63) 100%		
15) We have kept in contact since this FOCUS mentoring session.			(25) 40%	(17) 27%	(21) 33%		
16) I have previously mentored junior faculty.			(2) 3%	(3) 5%	(58) 92%		
17) Mentoring is a valuable activity for me.			(0) 0%	(3) 5%	(60) 95%		
18) I would mentor more junior faculty if I received recognition for the effort.			(10) 16%	(21) 33%	(32) 51%		
19) This mentoring session stirred emotions of anger or grief in me.			(49) 78%	(8) 13%	(6) 10%		
20) This session helped me reevaluate my career tracks and goals.			(36) 57%	(18) 29%	(9) 14%		
		Man	Woman	Either/No Difference	Neither/I Don't Feel at Ease		
21) I feel more comfortable mentoring:		(0) 0%	(11) 17%	(52) 83%	(0) 0%		
		15 min.	30 min.	45 min.	1 hour	> 1 hour	
22) What is the optimum time for this CV review session?	(39) 62%	(14) 22%	(8) 13%	(1) 2%	>15 yrs		
	3-6 yrs	6.1-9 yrs	9.1-12 yrs	12.1-15 yrs	(20) 32%		
23) I have been a faculty member at Penn for the following time period:	(1) 2%	(7) 11%	(6) 10%	(19) 30%	(11) 17%		

Abbreviations: AC, academic clinician; CE, clinical educator; SOM, School of Medicine; UPHS, University of Pennsylvania Hospital System.

Table 3. Track Distribution Over 3 Years of CV Review Sessions, 2005-2007^a

	Research	Tenure	C-E	AC	Instructions	Other ^b
All female assistant professors and instructors in the school of medicine	10%	14%	38%	21%	17%	n/a
Assistant professor and instructor attendees at fall conference	10.5%	16.5%	47.5%	11%	14.5%	n/a
Mentee participants of CV review	15%	23%	41%	7.5%	6%	7.5%
Mentee survey respondents of CV review	16%	25%	48%	5%	5%	2%

Abbreviations: AC, academic clinician; CE, clinician-educator.

^a While the CV review session was targeted to assistant professors, instructors and "others" were permitted to participate when the mentor pool was sufficient.

^b Includes fellows, postdocs, and University of Pennsylvania Hospital System physician.

believed they had a 60% or greater likelihood of being promoted to associate professor at Penn (Q25). The number of mentees that reported being between 40% and 59% sure that they would be promoted to associate professor at Penn increased over the 3 years from 29% in 2005 to 35% in 2006, and 40% in 2007. The mentees had similar responses to the question of how likely they were to still be at Penn in 5 years (Q26).

More than three-quarters of mentees reported having a mentor (86% in 2005, 76% in 2006, 87% in 2007) (Q6), but fewer agreed that their previous mentoring experience at Penn was helpful and productive (50% in 2005, 64% in 2006, and 66% in 2007) (Q7) ($p = .103$ to 0.067 from 2005 to 2007). These data coincide with the previous climate survey reported from our institution.¹¹ Most (86% in 2005, 94% in 2006, 90% in 2007) participants took part in the CV review with the primary purpose of determining whether their career was on track for promotion (Q18).

Overall, 93% of mentees agreed that the CV review session was helpful; 81% in 2005, 94% in 2006, and 90% in 2007 (Q8). The majority of mentees (87%) felt that the CV review provided new information, with an increase from 79% in 2005 to 94% in 2007 (Q14) ($p = .307$ for the increase from 2005 to 2007). Mentee responses also indicated an increase in reports of receiving conflicting information: 14% in 2005, 18% in 2006, and 37% in 2007 (Q15) ($p = .170$ for the increase from 2005 to 2007). Only a small group (15%) felt anger or guilt as a consequence of the CV review session (Q20). When asked if they would want to participate in a one-on-one CV review session like this again, 89% agreed (Q9).

A slight majority of mentees expressed no preference for gender (52%). However, reported preference for female mentors increased over time (7% in 2005, 29% in 2006, 33% in 2007) (Q21) ($p = .132$ for the increase from 2005 to 2007). Overall, the majority of mentees (64%) reported that mentoring from someone outside their department was as useful as that from someone within their department (Q12). However, 16% stated that they disagreed with this statement.

Mentor Responses

Overall 89% of mentors reported accessing the faculty affairs Web site to learn about promotion (Q6), and the majority of mentors (78%) were comfortable mentoring outside their departments (Q13). Slightly more than half of mentors (57%) reported that promotion rules and regulations were known by the mentee (Q1), while more than three-quarters of mentees believed they had knowledge of these rules and regulations before attending the CV review (Q1). During each year, mentee responses were different than mentor responses concerning appropriate career progression. Additionally, each year, mentors expressed concern that a small percentage of junior faculty were not progressing appropriately (16%) (Q3).

A modest majority of mentors and mentees (56%-62%) believed that a half hour was sufficient time for the CV review and did not feel that the session required more private space.

DISCUSSION

Promotion through the academic ranks has been slow and incomplete for women in academic medicine. Across all medical faculty ranks, current statistics compiled by the AAMC¹⁴ indicate that only 4% of all faculty are female full professors, while 20% are male full professors. The distribution is only slightly improved at the associate professor rank, where 6% of all faculty are female associate professors vs 15% men as a percentage of total faculty. Self-assessment of career progression is an integral part of advancement within academic medicine. A valuable source of assessment is feedback from supervisors and mentors.

Mentorship has been identified as critical to successful academic careers. Traditional mentorship, by faculty within the same specialty, is a relationship that involves a teaching-learning process, coaching, role modeling, assessment, and guidance. It can be limited by the availability of senior faculty members willing to serve as mentors. Additionally, the time required for constructive

mentoring is usually uncompensated, difficult to fit into busy schedules, and often undervalued by the medical school. Promotion and tenure criteria in most academic health centers emphasize scholarship, not citizenship.¹⁵

Peer mentoring programs, under the aegis of faculty development, have been evaluated in some schools of medicine, with significant success.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ More structured than networking, these efforts have provided alternative mentorship for junior faculty. Emory University developed a peer mentoring group within the Division of General Medicine originally focused on women and minority faculty, coupled with advanced faculty development.¹⁷ Other schools and specialty societies have implemented similar programs.^{18,19,21} Networking, an informal and less-structured method of peer mentorship, may also be helpful to junior faculty members. However, in a climate survey at the University of Wisconsin, women felt that informal networking excluded faculty based on gender.²² At our institution, formal networking activities for women, sponsored by the Department of Medicine, have been only marginally successful, due to poor attendance. Descriptions of other mentoring models, such as mentorship mosaics, involving multiple mentors have also appeared in the literature.^{15,18,20}

Enrichment of mentorship with other interventions can promote career advancement and academic success. The term *mosaic mentoring* has been coined indicating that faculty should try to assemble a network of mentors who support their personal and career development. The CV review session is a brief intervention that can contribute to this mosaic of mentorship for junior faculty. The CV review session is a single event, providing information, feedback, and advice. Therefore, the session carries a relatively short time commitment for both junior (“mentees”) and senior (“mentors”) faculty. Nevertheless, this intervention was reported as a very valuable experience for both the mentee and mentor. This intervention has been utilized by the AAMC at faculty development programs, but we are not aware of any published experience with these CV review sessions.

Despite a requirement at our institution that mentor(s) be named in a mandatory academic plan at appointment or reappointment, a recent faculty work climate survey showed that mean overall satisfaction with mentoring (using a 10-point scale, 10 being the highest) was 6.6 (SD, 2.8), and associated with track, highest in the tenure track and lower in the research and clinician-educator tracks.¹¹ Despite this mandatory schoolwide mentoring program, we found that 25% of junior faculty still reported having no mentor. Even though most mentees reported that previous mentoring experiences at Penn had been helpful (60%), an even greater percentage (93%) found the CV review session was helpful, suggesting these junior faculty still had unmet mentoring needs.

The high proportion of assistant professors who reported having a mentor was largely due to the require-

ment that mentor(s) be named in a mandatory academic plan at appointment or reappointment. However, mentoring was still more prevalent among faculty in the tenure track than among clinician-educator or research track faculty members. Leadership investment and faculty motivation for establishing a mentoring relationship may differ among tracks. Although there is no requirement for a mentor at associate professor rank, the relatively low proportion with a mentor (48%) is surprising and could reflect reduced pressure for promotion after attaining associate rank.

Our institution maintains a faculty affairs Web site that reviews the promotion rules and regulations. The mentees perceived that they understood the rules and regulations more frequently than did the mentors working with them. Although understanding the rules and regulations of promotion does not guarantee promotion, knowledge of the requirements is a necessary prerequisite. This mentored CV review provided another opportunity for junior faculty to become more familiar with requirements for promotion. The popularity of this program may also signal the need to present information for faculty in a variety of venues to assure access for all types of learners.

This is a unique experience in that it involved pairing mentors and mentees from different departments, a practice that we believe contributed to its success by providing an outside point of view in what is potentially a less-threatening environment. With 87% of junior faculty reporting that the session provided new information and/or advice, we suggest that mentoring across specialties and departments may have an important role as one of several opportunities to gain perspective on one’s career. In our experience, it is often revealing and helpful to get advice from outside one’s immediate circle of colleagues so that basic assumptions can be challenged. Also, outside input may provide different approaches to common hurdles for junior faculty. We have witnessed remarkable differences in culture from department to department that can have a large impact on the mentoring of junior faculty. Exposure to senior women from other specialties provides a sharing of best practices that may otherwise not occur. In addition, we have found unexpectedly that, on more than 1 occasion, contacts were made during these sessions that led to meaningful collaborations on multidisciplinary research projects. Nevertheless, there was a consistent minority that was less positive about cross-department mentorship. This suggests that a brief CV review session within the mentee’s own department would also be a beneficial event. In future CV review sessions, it may be beneficial to offer junior faculty a choice of mentors within or outside their departments/divisions.

Table 3 indicates that the track distribution of participants in the CV review session is proportional to the track distribution of instructor and assistant professor

female faculty in the school of medicine, except for the academic clinician track. This relatively new track has no scholarly requirements but demands excellence in clinical care and teaching, and is the only track for which there is no mandatory promotion probationary period. The junior faculty in the academic clinician track may not avail themselves of this mentoring opportunity because their promotion criteria are not the traditional expectations of grants, research, and publications that are the hallmark of the other 3 tracks. We recognize that different mentoring opportunities for this new and rapidly growing group of faculty may need to be developed to ensure that these faculty receive effective mentoring appropriate to the goals of that track.

The mentors were comfortable with mentoring outside their departments and appear to have become more comfortable over the 3 years. Although the majority of mentees had no preference for the gender of their mentor, a growing minority preferred female mentors. This may be due to an increasing desire for female role models and mentorship in the changing academic environment. It may also reflect a desire for female mentoring when the option is readily available.

Over all 3 years, mentees reported the CV reviews provided new information/advice. However, they also reported receiving increasingly conflicting information/advice. This variability in advice may reflect disparate understanding of promotion requirements in different departments. It may also be a function of increasing attempts by departments and faculty affairs to provide information to junior faculty. Additionally, the “mentor prep session” that was provided in year 2 was not provided in year 3, and it is possible that the mentors were not aware of the recent changes in regulations (albeit minor). However, it may also reflect different beliefs about the best strategies for achieving promotion and supports the need and usefulness of multiple mentor relationships.

Although this session was well received by both junior and senior faculty, and the qualitative feedback from junior faculty suggested significant value, we did not measure whether this brief intervention changed mentees’ behavior or performance and whether it had a significant impact on career advancement and/or promotion. To assure anonymity, we did not track individual mentee responses over the 3 years. Thus, although our study demonstrates the usefulness and acceptability of this brief intervention, it also raises further questions about which faculty development interventions are optimum, how often they should occur, and what resources are needed to improve career advancement for junior women faculty.

In addition, the group of junior faculty who took advantage of these sessions was likely self-selected to have different characteristics than a group of junior faculty not actively seeking such advice. While we suspect that this group may have had a higher investment in suc-

ceeding in their academic careers than a random sample of junior faculty, we cannot be sure of how this selection bias affected our intervention and questionnaire results.

In summary, this brief mentored CV review session has many benefits and required relatively few resources. Although a mentored CV review session does not replace more traditional longitudinal mentoring, this intervention is a valuable adjunct to mentoring/academic counseling for junior faculty. It expands the professional network of junior women faculty and provides additional formal career advice by identifying junior faculty who are not progressing as they should be in their career. It also provides novel insights “outside the box” by matching faculty pairs across different departments. Further studies of mentorship interventions are needed to identify optimum resources to recruit, retain, and improve the success of junior women faculty.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We want to thank Jennifer Beery for her tireless help in manuscript preparation.

REFERENCES

1. Bickel J, Wara D, Atkinson BF, Cohen LS, Dunn M, Hostler S, Johnson TR, Morahan P, Rubenstein AH, Sheldon GF, Stokes E, Association of American Medical Colleges Project Implementation C. Increasing women's leadership in academic medicine: report of the AAMC Project Implementation Committee.[see comment]. *Acad Med*. 2002;77:1043-1061.
2. National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineers, Institute of Medicine. Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
3. Andrews NC. Climbing through medicine's glass ceiling. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357:1887-1888.
4. Lowenstein SR, Fernandez G, Crane LA. Medical school faculty discontent: Prevalence and predictors of intent to leave academic careers. *BMC Med Educ*. 2007;7:37.
5. Gerson LB, Twomey K, Hecht G, et al. Does gender affect career satisfaction and advancement in gastroenterology? Results of an AGA institute-sponsored survey. *Gastroenterology*. 2007;132:1598-1606.
6. Hitchcock MA, Bland CJ, Hekelman FP, et al. Professional networks: The influence of colleagues on the academic success of faculty. *Acad Med*. 1995;70:1108-1116.
7. Sambunjak D, Straus SE, Marusic A. Mentoring in academic medicine: A systematic review. *JAMA*. 2006;296:1103-1115.
8. Palepu A, Friedman R, Barnett R, et al. Medical faculty with mentors are more satisfied. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1996;11(suppl 4):107.
9. Palepu A, Friedman RH, Barnett RC, et al. Junior faculty members' mentoring relationships and their professional development in U.S. medical schools. *Acad Med*. 1998;73:318-323.
10. Levinson W, Kaufman K, Clark B, et al. Mentors and role models for women in academic medicine. *West J Med*. 1991;154:423-426.
11. Wasserstein AG, Quistberg DA, Shea JA. Mentoring at the University of Pennsylvania: Results of a faculty survey. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;22:210-214.
12. Neumayer L, Levinson W, Putnam C. Residents' concerns: Mentors for women in surgery and their effect on career advancement. *Curr Surg*. 1995;52: 163-166.
13. Connor MP, Bynoe AG, Redfern N, et al. Developing senior doctors as mentors: A form of continuing professional development. report of an initiative to develop a network of senior doctors as mentors: 1994-1999. *Med Educ*. 2000;34:747-753.
14. Association of American Medical Colleges. Women in US Academic Medicine Statistics and Medical School Benchmarking 2006-2007. <http://>

www.aamc.org/members/wim/statistics/stats07/start.htm. Accessed June 18, 2008.

15. Lewellen-Williams C, Johnson VA, Deloney LA, et al. The POD: A new model for mentoring under represented minority faculty. *Acad Med.* 2006;81:275-279.
16. Pololi L, Knight S. Mentoring faculty in academic medicine. A new paradigm? *J Gen Intern Med.* 2005;20:866-870.
17. Bussey-Jones J, Bernstein L, Higgins S, et al. Repaving the road to academic success: The IMERGE approach to peer mentoring. *Acad Med.* 2006;81:674-679.
18. Pololi LH, Knight SM, Dennis K, et al. Helping medical school faculty realize their dreams: An innovative, collaborative mentoring program. *Acad Med.* 2002;77:377-384.
19. Seritan AL, Bhangoo R, Garma S, et al. Society for women in academic psychiatry: A peer mentoring approach. *Acad Psychiatry.* 2007;31:363-366.
20. Thorndyke LE, Gusic ME, George JH, et al. Empowering junior faculty: Penn state's faculty development and mentoring program. *Acad Med.* 2006;81:668-673.
21. Kosoko-Lasaki O, Sonnino RE, Voytko ML. Mentoring for women and underrepresented minority faculty and students: Experience at two institutions of higher education. *J Natl Med Assoc.* 2006;98:1449-1459.
22. Foster SW, McMurray JE, Linzer M, et al. Results of a gender-climate and work-environment survey at a midwestern academic health center. *Acad Med.* 2000;75:653-660. ■