

Masters of Radiology Panel Discussion: Encouraging and Fostering Mentorship—How We Can Ensure That No Faculty Member Is Left Behind and That Leaders Do Not Fail

Howard P. Forman¹
David B. Larson²
Alexander Norbash³
Marcia C. Javitt⁴
Norman J. Beauchamp, Jr.⁵
Barbara Monsees⁶
Neil Messinger⁷

Keywords: faculty development, leadership, mentoring

DOI:10.2214/AJR.11.7090

Received April 21, 2011; accepted without revision April 21, 2011.

This article is based on a transcript of a teleconference among the authors.

M. C. Javitt is an unpaid consultant to Code Ryte and her husband owns stock in Code Ryte. D. B. Larson is a case contributor to Amirsys and is reimbursed on a contract basis.

¹Department of Diagnostic Radiology, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT. Address correspondence to H. P. Forman (howard.forman@yale.edu).

²Department of Radiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH.

³Department of Radiology, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA.

⁴Department of Radiology, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC.

⁵Department of Radiology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

⁶Breast Imaging Section, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Washington University Medical Center, St. Louis, MO.

⁷Department of Radiology, Baptist Health Systems, Miami, FL.

AJR 2011; 197:149–153

0361–803X/11/1971–149

© American Roentgen Ray Society

INTRODUCTION

Each quarter, the *AJR* will publish the transcripts of the Masters of Radiology panel discussion hosted by Drs. Howard P. Forman and Marcia C. Javitt. The panel will review topics of importance in the field of radiology and share their unique insight into how these issues are shaping or will shape the future of the specialty.

Javitt: The subject today is “Encouraging and Fostering Mentorship: How We Can Ensure That No Faculty Member Is Left Behind and That Leaders Do Not Fail.” I’d like to cover three main areas that pertain to this topic. The first is mentorship; the second is faculty development, recruitment, and retention; and the third is leadership. Let’s start with mentorship.

What do you think are the new ways of measuring quality and quantity of individual scholarship, and how can mentors do a good job of coaching junior faculty to achieve this? We are now in a mode where academics are becoming increasingly busy. It’s harder to encourage people to do lectures, reading, and all of the things that foster academic development because they have less discretionary time. How should mentoring be done, and how can we learn to adapt to the new ways that we function?

Beauchamp: To ensure that no faculty member is left behind, we need to reinforce this approach with two accountability tools. The first is a mentor–mentee contract that is stored in an archive accessible to the faculty and the chair. This contract outlines the expectations for the mentee and mentor, details a 5-year plan that fosters an impactful career, and ensures that the mentee is on track for promotion. The second layer of accountability is in the annual review between the senior faculty member and the chair. The review should include a section that specifically evaluates how the mentor has impacted the junior faculty member.

The best way for an effective mentor–mentee relationship to be formed is by the mentee doing a gap analysis. This analysis should identify what skills the individual has versus the skills that are needed to be successful. The individual should then recruit a mentor who can help fill these gaps. This approach often results in having a series of mentors. A reasonable 4-step process is to seek others who know more than you do in a desired area of growth, establish a relationship, acquire desired skills, and repeat.

Monsees: First and foremost, mentoring has to be well engrained in the culture of the institution and it has to be in the mission. There also needs to be a clear understanding of what might be expected among both the senior and junior faculty members. One of the most crucial aspects is time. We are all asked to do more, and it’s very hard to figure out how to get all of it done. Also, we need to decide early on in somebody’s career how they are going to start out and what type of track will they choose. When I first started, there was one track and everybody was on the same track. Now we have options that people need to choose from. Someone may not know where they are going to end up a decade or two from now, but at least they can get an idea of where they want to start out.

Also, expectations for advancement may be different depending on what track someone chooses and who is selected as a mentor. As things change in someone’s career along the way, it may be necessary to bring in other individuals to help.

We also have to recognize that it is very time consuming to be a mentor. You have to reward generous mentors and people who have been successful at what they do. The rewards don’t have to be financial. They could be extra time, a pat on the back, or whatever an institution can give for that service that is important. I also believe that there are lots

of other ways that people get mentoring. It could be collaborations with others at the same institution, reviewing manuscripts, being on committees, or doing grant reviews. It's more than just a two-person match. It really does take a village. Putting this all together can result in more success.

Beauchamp: If we accept that mentorship matters, we have to make sure it happens. I have informally surveyed junior faculty during lectures I give on this topic and only about 20% report having a mentor. Without a focused effort, this will not improve.

There is a concept in the book *Nudge* called libertarian paternalism. As the perhaps internally inconsistent term suggests, it gives people the freedom to choose while making sure the choice has the greatest likelihood of being beneficial to them. An example given is food placement in a school's hot lunch line where the healthier foods are more visible and easier to reach. If you want that Moon Pie, you can have it, but you have to reach beyond the broccoli and carrots.

I see mentorship for junior faculty in the same light. We must make it a requirement, with oversight in place to ensure it is happening. The junior faculty should be given the choice to identify their mentors. However, the paternalistic component is that if they do not, the default must be that they are assigned one.

Javitt: What do you think about a mentor being a facilitator for one's career and academics as opposed to being a life coach?

Norbash: With time, I have been fortunate to have accumulated a number of mentors for each of my professional needs. I believed that certain mentors were able to most effectively guide me for certain areas of my professional development. For example, my academic and administrative mentors were not the same as my clinical mentors. In my case, my academic mentoring was from an outstanding MRI physicist, even though my clinical development was guided by a senior diagnostic neuroradiologist, despite the fact that I am an interventional neuroradiologist.

The mentoring relationships that seem to be most fruitful and enduring are rich for both the mentor and the mentee. Not only is such a relationship rewarding for the individual who receives the advice and fortunately avoids potholes, it also enriches mentors' lives at the point where they are interested in generativity and contribution to future generations.

It is neither essential nor realistic to find a "perfect fit" as you search for a mentor; the es-

sential need, however, is to identify somebody who cares about giving guidance, can spend the requisite time and energy in doing so, and has achieved a certain level of stature. From my own experience, I also don't believe that you should seek just one person who overlaps completely with your areas of ambition and either necessary or desired growth. There just needs to be sufficient synchronization for you to gain from the relationship.

Beauchamp: As people advance in their careers, there is a tendency not to seek out a mentor. This is frequently the case at the chair level. However, many of the challenges faced by a new chair will not be optimally addressed using the skills one has acquired along the way. Part of the problem is that it often requires looking outside of one's own department. There are structured mentorship programs and societies for academic radiology chairs in their first 5 years of appointment.

Javitt: How does institutional buy-in affect the success or failure of a mentorship program? And how is this different from one's own grassroots efforts to attract a mentor?

Messinger: Picking a mentor is not easy in a private practice because you are producing a lot of work. We have mentors for all of our young associates who are on the partnership track so that they don't get lost on their way. They are brought in with the idea that they are going to be partners and that they are going to succeed. We want them to succeed.

In our practice, our mentors report to our board of directors on a frequent basis so that these people don't get lost. A lead physician is very important in the mentoring process. You don't want a person who will become wishy-washy or who doesn't support the candidate in all aspects of work.

It's important that we sponsor mentoring programs so that new persons coming in can be familiar with, understand, and become part of that program. We think it is a critical part for us. We have people mentor others who are not in the same subspecialty, and it's not rare for us to have two or three people mentor with one individual. We expect our mentors to be kind, familiar with their mentees, understanding of what their mentees are capable of, willing to put in quality work, and eventually become a good friend to the mentee.

Javitt: How do you match mentors with their mentees?

Larson: At our institution, we do not formally match mentors with mentees, which works well for us. We have a relatively small,

close-knit group. Junior faculty members naturally gravitate toward senior faculty members with common interests. Because we have such a diversity of highly accomplished senior faculty who are also very approachable, mentees have several great options. However, this requires some initiative on the part of the mentee. Mentees need to find areas of interest that match available opportunities and then dive into engaging in projects that will yield tangible results. The most fulfilling mentor-mentee relationships I have seen are those where the mentee is intellectually curious, shows initiative by doing his or her homework before meeting with the mentor, welcomes feedback, and constantly seeks to improve.

Forman: We need to have mentors in practices that allow faculty members to self-actualize, be happy, and acclimate to the routine of the practice. Early on in their careers, individuals require mentors who aren't conflicted about their potential or have a priority of keeping them happy in one specific practice. They need someone who will help them become successful and happy no matter what they do. One person may say, "Here's what you need to do to get promoted at University of X, and I'm going to help you think through the various steps that it will take for you to be successful here." Whereas another person may say, "Ultimately, you won't be at University of X anymore, and I know what you really want to be doing is a, b, and c. I can introduce you to these people to develop these skills to get where you want to be."

Mentoring can play very different roles, and I think we need to be flexible enough to offer our radiologists what they need so that they will be happy and the field will be flourishing with successful individuals.

Javitt: When do you think faculty development should begin?

Monsees: I think it's an evolution. During fellowship, people are exposed to many different professionals in their section and in the institution. They've got their eyes and ears open so they figure out what kind of role they may want to play. We can't necessarily expect young faculty members to know where they want to go right away. They have to feel comfortable, learn about the institution, and be confident in making clinical decisions. It takes a few years for them to really become comfortable with all of that. Different people are going to progress at different rates. Some people may have more drive toward the research end. Some people are go-

Masters of Radiology Panel Discussion

ing to take longer to focus or to find an area of interest.

I've also seen faculty members who've been on the staff for 10–15 years who've decided to change their focus. Now they want to focus on more on academics, participate in clinical trials, or have a hand at writing. So I don't think one's focus is selected at one particular point in time. I think it develops over the course of a career.

Javitt: What do you think are the reasons why the majority of radiologists end up in community practice doing patient care as opposed to academics?

Norbash: Michael Brant-Zawadzki, formerly a neuroradiologist at the University of California, San Francisco, said years ago that one of the principal challenges of academics is that academic radiologists "eat their young." I believe he alluded to the disproportionate rewards for individuals who are senior members of the team, compounded by the lack of a sustained mentoring culture. On a daily basis, however, our academic departments are built on the backs of the junior faculty members who do the heavy lifting and who oftentimes really don't know how to grow, where to go, what direction to head in, how to get ahead, or how to survive in their political worlds. Mike's observation and opinion have concerned me for years. I'm afraid to corroborate Mike's opinion as I look at the larger field, even though I've personally been blessed with outstanding mentors and leaders in my own career. We need to cross this divide and engineer our structures to cultivate generativity and professional development of all faculty levels. If we don't create a connection between individual donors who have something to give and individual recipients who realize they have something to gain, we may not be able to sustain our ability to recruit the best and the brightest. Simple technologic advances are not sufficient. Mentoring at all levels and our social engineering may, indeed, be fundamentally essential to our continued growth.

Javitt: What are the major contributory factors that have resulted in a lack of retention of academic radiologists?

Messinger: I don't think that we have lost the best and the brightest. In our practice, we have made an effort to grow and develop people along the skill lines that they've been taught. In our group, we believe in giving bright people the best of all possible worlds and giving them the ability to use the latest and greatest equipment. You also have to

have the ability to pay them what you think they are worth and what they think they are worth. Everybody in our group has to participate whether it's in a reading function, community function, research, or giving talks or board examinations. They have to prove that they have value. I think it's important in radiology in general to prove that you have value.

Javitt: I've heard references made to the attitudes of people coming out of training now and how they regard their choices for their future careers. Given that there may be some generalities in how they approach their work and that they may be more inclined to optimize their lifestyle, how do you view the gap between an academic lifestyle and a private practice lifestyle affecting our retention?

Larson: Although physicians in general are seeking more predictable schedules and reasonable work hours, personally, I'm not sold on the "kids these days" theory that radiologists coming out of training now are less motivated or feel more entitled. Rather, although the predictability of an academic schedule is appealing, I believe that most radiologists in academic practice choose to accept what may be a lower salary in return for the ability to pursue other noble endeavors, such as research, teaching, and leadership. Leaders need to preserve and honor their commitment to provide academic time, support, and mentorship for faculty members. In return, faculty members need to make the most of those opportunities. I think it would be a mistake for academic leaders to view a perceived increasing desire for better lifestyle or even a tighter job market as the primary means of retaining talent. Rather, they should retain the best and brightest by making sure their faculty members can stay and lead fulfilling careers.

Javitt: How much impact has teleradiology had on the attractive features of being in a private practice versus resident coverage at night in academics?

Monsees: Radiologists in private practice may not be taking the same type of call that they may have had in the past, making it more attractive. In private practice, due to demands of general call, it's been harder to focus on one particular area, be an expert in only that, but also be comfortable with general call. The nighthawk situation has alleviated some of that. For example, some of the fellows I mentored who have gone into private practice and were trained as breast imagers are expected to take call in general radiology. As time goes on, they feel less comfortable with that. Being relieved of

night and weekend duty has made private practice jobs compete favorably with a clinical track job at an academic institution.

Javitt: How can a young scholar be encouraged to balance patient care, research, education, and service in the modern era?

Norbash: Many of us believe that the sooner we positively impact budding academic radiologists, the greater the dividends. Potentially, medical students who show a proclivity toward academics and have already shown research familiarity and productivity are among the most promising long-term recruits for radiology departments. Where young scholars are concerned, it's a matter of giving them opportunities when they are available and recognizing that greater efforts are justified with younger scholars to catalyze their development into academicians. Maximizing the opportunity and engaging those potential academicians means reaching out to them very early on. We also have to prevent overburdening individuals who have no research potential but can serve the departmental needs if they are outstanding teachers and peerless clinicians. Young radiologists also need clearly defined pathways and an explicit understanding of how promotion criteria work within their departments. This will help them to avoid the frustration of not delivering on undiscussed expectations.

Javitt: Would you agree that clearly communicated expectations are key in retaining faculty and making them feel like they are on a level playing field?

Larson: Absolutely. The earlier that can be communicated the better. Along with protected time to pursue their interests, junior faculty members need to know how to best take advantage of that time and be able to gauge their progress. An early part of a career is a delicate period when individuals are trying to find their niche. Without mentoring and guidance, individuals can feel isolated or lost and can unwittingly squander time and resources. There is no worse time to discover that expectations are not being met than at a promotion review. This is especially important for those who are pursuing a less traditional course. The faculty member and the leadership should be in agreement on the faculty member's pathway. Because academic careers evolve, this often does not happen in one meeting; rather, it occurs with frequent interactions and follow-up. This goes hand-in-hand with a well-developed mentoring program.

Messinger: It is important that the mentee steps up to make sure that once things are

in place, that there is follow-through. If not, that person needs to speak up and say, "Hey, this person is not working for me."

Javitt: Jack Welsh said, "Before you become a leader, success is about growing yourself. Once you become a leader, success is about growing others." What do you think he meant by that?

Monsees: When I first became a faculty member, I had to identify an area of interest, then learn it well and become confident. Then I had to learn where my specialty was going and what role I wanted to play in that. Along the way, I also realized that one of the most rewarding parts of my job was passing it on and multiplying my own efforts by training the next generation to do what I do. It's very satisfying to have progeny and to stay in touch with them, even though they have moved on from our institution. I think the greatest measure of what I've done is not the clinical work, but I believe it is training people and helping them find their way.

Javitt: What are the key elements of successful leadership?

Norbash: Successful leadership demands a necessary level of self-awareness to recognize the strengths and deficiencies in your own personality and your own abilities. We all have strengths and weaknesses. It is essential that a successful leader be able to understand what, how, and to whom to delegate certain tasks and activities so that weaknesses are accommodated. It takes insightfulness, good communication skills, and knowing the imperative to know why you are doing what you do. For durable success, it also helps if there is transparency and consistency as you define success, failure, and rewards systems.

Javitt: How much of the success of a good leader is reliant on good resources, such as human resources, financial resources, hardware, and equipment? Are successful leaders also successful at acquiring those resources?

Messinger: I think they are. I think the first thing you have to do when you get into a position of leadership is to have a vision of where you want to go and what you want to do with your practice and with your colleagues. You also need to consider how that's going to impact the hospital and the patients whom you serve. If you are a good leader, you will attract the kind of people who are productive, willing to share credit, and who develop along with you. I want my younger associates and partners to feel that they are in control of what goes on. This philosophy

will let you gain a lot ground administratively, clinically, and educationally. You are not judged only for yourself but by who's with you and how much they can accomplish.

Javitt: I heard an interesting quotation, "Do you want to talk to the person in charge or the one who knows what's going on?" How much is leading by example mission-critical to successful and effective leadership?

Larson: Leading by example is especially critical if you believe that the leader's most important challenge is to create a common vision for the people in the organization. Leaders are under constant scrutiny as to whether they really believe what they are trying to convince others of, especially when it comes to change. One bad decision, one thoughtless comment, or one lapse of judgment can undermine months of effort.

Leaders also need to understand that once they are in a position of authority, everything they are told comes through a filter. Individuals will often tell a leader what they think the leader wants to hear and refrain from relaying bad news—especially if it is clear the leader does not want to hear it. They may also spare leaders details of their daily work, which may place the leader at a disadvantage. This is compounded when leaders are removed from the day-to-day operations. It can be especially difficult for leaders to gauge individual satisfaction and group morale. A good leader finds ways to pierce through the filter to understand what is really going on.

Javitt: Do you think there is a conflict in leadership in modern academic departments between high performance standards and service?

Monsees: It's different in different institutions. For example, in our department, we have a vast array of people with different types of job descriptions. I believe that our chair really feels that each of those people, with their diverse job descriptions, contributes to the department in different and complementary ways. Radiologists conducting clinical or other research need more academic time. Those who have primarily clinical responsibilities bear more of the clinical load. If people recognize that different people contribute to the team in vastly different ways, there is a way to achieve both balance and fairness.

Norbash: It has been my experience that "overperformers" who really do a spectacular job are less interested in the exact parameters of their job description. They are more interested in opportunities for growth so they can learn and grow beyond the limits of traditional

boundaries. Sometimes, when you are reducing your responsibilities or tasks to an overt transactional basis, you are limiting the growth of all involved parties. The people who are most successful are not people who are living in the "you-scratch-my-back, I'll-scratch-your-back" mentality. They are really looking at how they can maximize their contribution and consequently grow as much as possible.

When I look at my section heads who are truly spectacular and successful, they are the ones who aren't asking for a quid pro quo on an ongoing basis. They are energized and excited by what they do. They want to contribute even more on a daily basis. The challenges they face are the human limitations of time and energy. Our successful leaders are continuously in danger of overextending themselves and hence need some external help on identifying their burnout threshold. They can't necessarily see the overwhelming load because they may be internally motivated in an unlimited manner. You can't be an effective leader if you are continuously wondering what's in it for me.

Messinger: I agree. You have to be in it for what's in store for the group to maintain the integrity of the whole operation. If you understand what goes into group dynamics, you are going to be very successful. I've also learned not to ask anybody to do anything that I am not prepared to do myself.

Javitt: How much do you think leaders should inspire their junior faculty members versus showing them how to learn the processes of the organization?

Larson: Certainly it is important for junior faculty members to feel inspired. But at the same time, individuals need the tools to succeed. A big part of that is just helping them learn how to navigate the system. Often, this is the hardest part of actually getting something done. Knowing how to get institutional review board approval, who can help them line up the needed resources, and what pitfalls to avoid are invaluable details that junior faculty members need. No amount of education or inspiration can compensate for a deficit of this kind of knowledge.

On the other hand, I think that leaders often have a poor understanding of what motivates and what demoralizes those they lead. Individuals generally want to contribute in a meaningful way, they want to be appreciated and respected, and they want positive relationships with their coworkers. This is especially true in an academic department. The leaders of the organization have the responsibility to do what they can to make that happen. Because

Masters of Radiology Panel Discussion

these aspects may be less tangible, they are often discounted or even disregarded. A good leader realizes that seemingly small things, such as fostering a supportive culture, providing individuals with tools they need to accomplish their goals, and highlighting individual accomplishments, often cost little and may be more motivating than salary increases.

Javitt: If we believe that faculty development has to begin in medical school and even in residency, why is there so little leadership training in residency curricula today?

Norbash: Inspiration and pathway clarification are essential components of leadership. There is a lot that goes into leadership. In fact, the practice of radiology certainly seems more defined and understandable as a field than leadership. Leadership has so many elements. Arguably, we have not been overtly successful as a field at clarifying and defining pathways to breed and develop our own leadership. It hasn't been our habit to in-

fuse it into our practice. The future is going to demand much more focused and directed leaders than we currently have. Although to date we may have neglected this, we can no longer afford to do so.

Larson: When we train residents to be radiologists, we give them cases, they practice, we give them feedback, and they try it again. Leadership is more difficult to train for because to practice being a leader you have to be in a position of authority. That can be hard to provide for trainees. Consequently, we provide little opportunity for leadership in radiology residency. This doesn't need to be the case. When I began radiology residency, I was struck with how different it was from internship. As an intern, I had relatively little interaction with my attending physicians because most of my supervision was performed by senior residents. We should find ways for more than just the chief residents to practice leadership with training wheels. All senior

residents would benefit from some degree of meaningful authority while they themselves are closely supervised.

Monsees: I really believe leadership skills are taught more in an apprenticeship fashion. You could give a didactic lecture on defined leadership skills, and that might complement the education one gets from real-life experience. It's the same for parenting. You learn some lessons from your own parents, you absorb some of that from other people, and then you learn the rest along the way.

Javitt: One common theme that threads its way through all of these discussions is one in which I have found to be most important in any relationship between a mentor and a mentee—loyalty and trust. Of all of the things we have talked about today, the “loyalty and trust” theme is a lynchpin. We have thoroughly examined the problem, and hopefully in the course of doing so, we can work on some of the solutions for these challenges.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Photos and biographies of our panel are available online at www.ajronline.org.