Writing Accountability Groups (WAGs): A Tool to Help Junior Faculty Members Build Sustainable Writing Habits

By Kimberly A. Skarupski & Kharma C. Foucher

Faculty members have numerous competing demands and struggle to find time to write. Writing Accountability Groups (WAGs) were created to help faculty members establish sustainable writing habits by writing with increased frequency and for shorter session durations. WAGs meet one hour a week for 10 weeks and emphasize accountability to the process of writing using a structured format of 15 minutes of reporting and goal-setting, a 30-minute writing session, and another 15 minutes of reporting and goal-setting. Pre-post WAG assessment data (N=443) provide evidence for significant program impact and participants also affirmed positive outcomes including accountability, habit-formation, and social support.

FACULTY MEMBERS IN ACADEMIA are faced with unprecedented time demands and an increasingly competitive research funding climate which may undermine faculty vitality (Lowenstein, Fernandez, & Crane, 2007; Pololi et al., 2015). We know that in general, faculty members report high levels of stress and low career satisfaction, and in particular, new faculty members report having difficulty balancing professional activities and also report feelings of isolation (Dankoski, Palmer, Nelson, Ribera, & Bogdewic, 2012; Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007; Smith et al., 2001). One of the casualties of the time crunch is scholarship – the 'coin of the realm' in academia. Many junior faculty members in academic medicine report dissatisfaction with their publishing output because of their focus on patient-care, teaching, and grant-writing (Skarupski & Keshavarzian, 2013). Scholarly productivity weighs heavily in faculty vitality (Dankoski, Palmer, Nelson Laird, Ribera, & Bogdewic, 2012; Pololi et al., 2015; Stoykov, Skarupski, Foucher, & Chubinskaya, 2016); hence, addressing scholarly output is important. We sought to develop a tool that would help faculty members: a) increase their scholarly productivity, and b) build small communities of engagement in an effort to minimize feelings of isolation.

In our institution, as in many others, we offer formal biomedical and scientific writing and grant-writing courses that focus on the *content* of writing; that is, how to write a manuscript or a grant application from start to finish. In fact, most writing interventions in academic medicine emphasize writing-skills-improvement, often through a structured curriculum delivered by a senior mentor or outside consultant (Grzybowski et al., 2003; Houfek et al., 2010; McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006; Pololi, Knight, & Dunn, 2004; Rickard et al., 2009; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011; Sonnad, Goldsack, & McGowan, 2011; Steinert, McLeod, Liben, & Snell, 2008). However, despite participating in these types of courses, many of our faculty members voiced concerns about being able to develop and sustain a regular writing practice. That led us to think about writing groups that would focus on the *process* of writing; that is, how to make writing a habit.

There is a wide variety of writing group formats. Writing groups that incorporate feedback and coaching on writing content have been shown to increase writing quality and productivity (Gray, 2015; Gray, Madson, & Jackson, in press). However, since we were focused on building small communities of engagement to counter feelings of isolation, we felt strongly that our small groups should employ a peer mentoring approach. That is, we felt that if the writing groups included a faculty development leader, a senior faculty member, a mentor or coach, or anyone in a position of formal

authority, that the group members may not feel free to express their writing concerns honestly, which would defeat the community-building purpose. We identified extensive literature that points to the benefits of peer mentoring, including individual and collective scholarly productivity, research collaboration, relationship-building, and peer support (Jacelon, Zucker, Staccarini, & Henneman, 2003; Johnson, Hastings, Purser, & Whitson, 2011; Lord et al., 2012; McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006; Pololi & Knight, 2005; Rickard et al., 2008).

As we began to think about developing our writing groups, we drew on the work of Robert Boice, a prolific voice in the area of writing productivity and faculty development (Boice, 1984; 1989; 1992; 2000). Boice employed a "tacit knowledge" framework to promote the success of at-risk college students and to teach writing composition (Boice, 1992). The four components of the framework include: automaticity; regimen; cognitive management; and social management.

(i) "Automaticity" describes the concept of being continuously involved with one's writing projects so that writing becomes an automatic process that does not require the writer to feel ready or even motivated.

(ii) "Regimen" involves consistent time management. For example, people who wait for deadlines before beginning to write, and people who will not write unless their schedule allows large blocks of uninterrupted time, are not practicing the concept of "regimen."

(iii) "Cognitive management" means ensuring that the writer is addressing the right problem at the right time. For example, some writers are slowed down by their efforts to perfect each sentence before composing the next. Solving the problem of composing a sentence to the solution of editing a sentence is often a better approach.

(iv) "Social management" refers to the process of learning the unwritten rules of the game; e.g. institutional norms, nuances of the publishing process, or discipline-specific career expectations.

We chose to focus on productivity gains likely driven by changes in the writing *process* through Boice's knowledge framework. Thus, we designed a small writing group model with a structured format emphasizing increased writing frequency and shorter writing session durations. In this paper, we describe Writing Accountability Groups (WAGs) and present pre-post program outcome data for 443 WAG participants in 71 WAGs from 2013-2018.

Methods

Writing Accountability Groups (WAGs) are peer-facilitated, active writing groups that meet once a week, for an hour, over a ten-week period (Skarupski, 2018). Our WAG approach differs from similar interventions described in the literature in two ways: (1) WAGs are focused on the *process* of writing rather than the *content* of writing, and (2) WAGs rely exclusively on a *peer-mentoring* format. A WAG is limited to four to eight members who commit to attending at least seven of the ten weekly sessions. Faculty members recruit their own WAG members and identify their weekly meeting day, time and place. WAG participants are reminded that they must be committed to the WAG formula, show up on time, and agree to focus on their writing by avoiding distractions via cell phones and email.

WAGs emphasize *accountability* via the practice of publicly-stating specific writing goals, reporting on the status of goals-achievement, and engaging in writing. Because the goal of a WAG is to establish a sustainable writing habit, WAG members are encouraged to write consistently, with increased frequency (e.g., daily or almost daily) and for shorter durations (e.g., 20 minutes is encouraged), which is more sustainable than the practice of binge-writing for several hours every few weeks or months.

WAG sessions follow a structured three-part agenda that emphasizes the process of writing. The first author attends the first day of each WAG to provide an orientation. At that first session, there is a discussion about common writing barriers; namely, the myth of the muse; the myth that there's no time; and trouble starting and finishing (Silvia, 2007). During that orientation, we talk about various writing recommendations and suggestions and encourage participants to share their best -and worst- practices. The session includes a thorough description of the WAG '15-30-15' minutes structure:

• The first 15 WAG minutes: WAG members report the previous week's progress and chal-

lenges (e.g., "Last week, I said that I would write for 20 minutes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and I was successful until Friday when my clinic ran-over"). Each member then states her/his goal(s) for the current writing session (e.g., "In today's writing session, I plan to outline the discussion section of my manuscript"). During this time, WAG members typically address writing barriers, scheduled writing session failures, and then brainstorm time-management and organization strategies.

- The next 30 WAG minutes: This is an individual, but communal, writing session. During this time, each WAG member engages in writing, where 'writing' is expanded to include any and all scholarly-related activities (e.g., literature review, study design, entering or analyzing data, creating tables, charts, and figures, working on references, writing standard text, etc.). When WAG members learn to expand their definition of writing, they gain an appreciation for breaking-down writing into smaller, manageable tasks.

- The final 15 WAG minutes: Each WAG member reports whether or not they met their writing goal(s) for the 30-minute communal writing session and each states their writing goal(s) for the interim period until the next WAG (e.g., "I'm really inspired today and will commit to writing for 20 minutes before I leave for work every day and 20 minutes before I leave for home;" "My plan is to write for 30 minutes Monday-Thursday; 15 minutes before I check my email in the morning and 15 minutes before I go to bed;" etc.)

Procedures

Prior to the first WAG orientation session, participants receive a link to the WAG pre-assessment instrument. The pre-WAG questionnaire collects standard faculty demographic data such as: academic rank; promotion track; years at rank; number of peer-reviewed publications; and number of principal-authored grants. The questionnaire also gauges current as well as desired writing frequency (every day, almost every day, once a week, twice a month, once a month, rarely, never) and duration of writing sessions (0-15 minutes, 16-30 minutes, 31-45 minutes, 46-60 minutes, 1-2 hours, 2+

hours). The questionnaire also provides a 12-item list of writing barriers and participants are asked to check as many are applicable to them, including an open-ended 'other' choice. Finally, participants are asked to indicate their writing goal(s) for the next six and 12 months. After the 10-week WAG concludes, participants are asked to answer the same four questions from the pre-WAG, namely, the current and desired writing frequency and duration of writing sessions.

Analysis

We calculated basic univariate statistics for the standard sociodemographic variables and then used the related samples Wilcoxon signed rank tests for nonparametric data to compare the shifts in writing frequency and writing session duration from pre- to post-WAG (criteria alpha = 0.05). Analyses were conducted using SPSS® for Windows, version 24 (IBM Corporation, 2016) and the research was approved by the Johns Hopkins University institutional review board.

Results

Since the fall of 2013, the first author has provided an orientation to more than 100 new WAGs at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine (SOM), School of Nursing (SON), and the Bloomberg School of Public Health (BSPH). There are approximately 3,000 full-time faculty members in the SOM, 72 in the SON, and 709 in the BSPH. WAGs were initially introduced to the Hopkins SOM faculty as a luncheon seminar and then advertised to the SOM faculty via email. WAGs were and continue to be endorsed at various SOM faculty development seminars and events (e.g., new faculty orientation, promotion sessions, leadership courses, etc.). Requests to start and/or join WAGs have been word-of-mouth and have spread to faculty in the SON, BSPH, and to students and trainees. For this study, we present data from 443 WAG participants in 71 WAGs in the SOM.

The majority of WAG participants are female (64%). More than half (52%) were at the assistant professor rank and nearly one-fifth (17%) were post-doctoral/research fellows. On average, participants were 3.3 years at rank (standard deviation = 3.5 years). Almost half (44%) indicated that they were

clinical researchers and nearly one-quarter (24%) were basic researchers. On average, the participants reported having 15 peer-reviewed publications (SD = 22), but think they should have 23 on average (SD = 29). On average, the participants reported having 2 grants (SD = 3), but think they should have 3 grants (SD = 4).

When asked to indicate all their barriers to writing, there were 1,282 total responses. The most common were: I have trouble getting started (28%); I have difficulty with time management (15%); my perfectionism prevents me from finishing (11%); I

Table 1. Sample Characteristics (N = 443)

Sex, *number (%)*	
Female	282 (63.7)
Male	73 (16.5)
Missing	88 (19.9)
Rank, *number (%)*	
Postdoctoral/research fellow	60 (16.8)
Clinical fellow	11 (3.1)
Research associate	9 (2.5)
Instructor	24 (6.7)
Assistant professor	187 (52.4)
Associate professor	36 (10.1)
Professor	4 (1.1)
Other	26 (7.2)
Years at rank, *mean (SD)*	3.3 (3.5)
Primary academic career track, *number (%)*	
Clinical researcher	134 (43.8)
Basic researcher	72 (23.5)
Clinician educator	44 (14.4)
Other	56 (18.3)
Number of peer-reviewed publications, *mean (SD)*	15 (21.9)
Number of peer-reviewed publications you think you should have by now, *mean (SD)*	23 (28.6)
How many grants (role = PI) have you had? *mean (SD)*	1.6 (2.5)
How many grants (role = PI) do you think you should have by now? *mean (SD)*	2.7 (3.5)
Barriers to writing, *number (%) [denominator = 1,282]*	
I have trouble getting started	360 (28.1)
I have difficulty with time management	196 (15.3)
My perfectionism prevents me from finishing	141 (11.0)
I have too many clinical commitments	132 (10.3)
I have too many personal/family commitments	129 (10.1)
I don't have adequate statistical/data analytic support	83 (6.5)
Teaching responsibilities	63 (5.0)
I don't have anyone (mentors) to give me feedback and encourage me	60 (4.7)
I don't know what to write about	34 (2.7)
My writing skills are poor	32 (2.5)
English is not my first language	26 (2.0)
I am not very interested in my topic	16 (1.2)

have too many clinical commitments (10%); and I have too many personal/family commitments (10%).

There were statistically significant differences (p-values <0.001) comparing pre- to post-shifts in writing frequency and duration (Table 2). Pre-assessment data show that the majority of WAG participants (36%) reported writing once a week and 17% reported writing almost every day. However, approximately one-fifth (18%) reported writing twice a month, and 14% each reported writing only once a month or rarely. After their 10-week WAG, the majority of participants (68%) reported writing almost every day and almost one-quarter (23%) reported writing once a week. At pre-assessment, approximately one-third of participants reported that the duration of their typical writing sessions was 2+ hours (30%) or 1-2 hours (26%); however, at post-assessment, more than a quarter (27%) reporting 46-60 minute writing session durations, nearly one-quarter (24%) reporting 31-45 minutes, and another near quarter (23%) reported 16-30 minutes.

There were also statistically significant differences (p-values <0.001) comparing pre- to post shifts in wishes about writing frequency and duration (Table 3). Pre-assessment data showed that whereas nearly one-third of the participants (30%) wished they would write every day, post-assessment data showed that more than half (52%) wished they would write every day. Pre-assessment data also showed that nearly three-quarters of the participants (75%) wished they would write for 46 minutes to 2+ hours; however post-assessment data showed that 76% wished they would write for 31 minutes to 2 hours.

When asked to describe their WAG experience, WAG participants consistently capture the essence of the *accountability, habit-formation, and social support* components of the WAG. Furthermore, their quotes tend to reflect the WAG-engendered sense of community by their use of the first person plural (i.e. "we" instead of "I"). We have purposely selected quotes that reflect these themes.

Accountability: "We've participated in 3 WAGs now and we agree that we are more organized and efficient when we have to be accountable," "Having accountability…was a huge advantage," "most people appreciated the accountability;" "[it's] Fun to write together and hold each other accountable."

Habit-formation: "We all seem to really get into better writing habits," "There is a general sense that this commitment (WAG) places a more concrete attention to focus on the writing habit," "We all keep renewing our commitment to the WAG."

Social Support: "…Additionally, it is really important to chat with other peers before and after the writing session," "We all love our group and have found it very useful," "…positive peer support," "The WAGs created a support network of peers to hone time management and writing habits which were otherwise hard to find."

Discussion

WAG participants seem to make gains in all four of Boice's tacit knowledge components: automaticity; regimen; and cognitive, and social management. The data show that participants develop a regular writing practice and that they resonate with the accountability, habit-formation, and social support aspects of the WAG. The strongest evidence for WAG efficacy is that after ten weeks of participating in the WAG, the vast majority reported writing almost every day and for less than one hour. This

Table 2. Pre-post Shifts in Writing Frequency and Duration

	Pre-WAG (n=403)	Post-WAG (n=227)	p-value
How often do you write?			< 0.001
Every day	5 (1.2)	16 (7.0)	
Almost every day	68 (16.9)	154 (67.8)	
Once a week	144 (35.7)	51 (22.5)	
Twice a month	72 (17.9)	5 (2.2)	
Once a month	55 (13.6)	1 (0.4)	
Rarely	56 (13.9)	--	
Never	3 (0.7)	--	
What is the duration of your typical writing session?			< 0.001
0-15 minutes	16 (4.0)	4 (1.8)	
16-30 minutes	29 (7.2)	51 (22.5)	
31-45 minutes	63 (15.7)	55 (24.2)	
46-60 minutes	65 (16.2)	62 (27.3)	
1-2 hours	106 (26.4)	43 (18.9)	
2+ hours	122 (30.4)	12 (5.3)	

Table 3. Pre-post Shifts in Wishes About Writing Frequency and Duration

	Pre-WAG (n=403)	Post-WAG (n=227)	p-value
How often do you wish you would write?			< 0.001
Every day	120 (29.8)	117 (51.5)	
Almost every day	191 (47.4) 74	104 (45.8)	
Once a week	(18.4)	5 (2.2)	
Twice a month	8 (2.0)	--	
Once a month	10 (2.5)	--	
Rarely	--	1 (0.4)	
Never	--	--	
What duration do you wish you would write?			< 0.001
0-15 minutes	8 (2.0)	3 (1.3)	
16-30 minutes	35 (8.8)	25 (11.1)	
31-45 minutes	58 (14.6)	54 (23.9)	
46-60 minutes	121 (30.4)	68 (30.1)	
1-2 hours	112 (28.1)	50 (22.1)	
2+ hours	64 (16.1)	26 (11.5)	

is important because faculty members typically do not have large blocks of protected time for writing; hence, writing for less than one hour almost every day has greater likelihood of sustainability. It should be noted that there are detractors to the concept of writing "every day" (Sword, 2016); nonetheless, in Sword's words, faculty should "leave behind their hair shirts of scholarly guilt when they enter the house of writing. Productivity, it turns out, is a broad church that tolerates many creeds" (Sword, 2016: 322).

These data show that WAGs may be particularly effective for younger, more junior faculty members and trainees who need help with goal-setting, task prioritization, and who may lack confidence in their control over the writing process. There seems to be an element of guilt associated with faculty's perceptions of not having enough publications or not having enough grants and WAGs are a tool for some faculty members to overcome their self-doubt and guilt. There is also some evidence that participating in WAGs leads to strengthening social relations, feelings of inclusion, and perhaps minimizing isolation, factors that are beneficial to faculty vitality (Pololi et al., 2015).

Another benefit to WAGs is that they can be broadly implemented across an institution and need not consist of a homogeneous group of faculty members from the same department. Because the WAG emphasizes the writing process as opposed to the writing content, it does not matter who is in the WAG. As long as four to eight participants can find a day, time, and location that works for everyone for 10 weeks, they can start a WAG. This feature of having a heterogeneous group of WAG participants may also facilitate new collaborative relationships and cross-pollination of ideas.

Having had the WAG conversation with several hundred people at WAG orientations and at numerous invited WAG seminars, the top three writing barriers remain: trouble starting; time management issues; and trouble finishing. At each WAG orientation, we have a conversation about these writing barriers and there is a palpable sense of shared understanding and struggle. Participants often share their experiences with these barriers and offer their own solutions and suggestions. Nonetheless, the basic WAG '15-30-15' minutes formula has not changed since 2010. That said, participants who have been 'WAGging' for several years have expanded the writing component into 60 minutes; that is, they follow a 15-60-15 minutes formula and other advanced 'WAGgers' have also participated in their WAG remotely, either synchronously or asynchronously if they are in a different time zone. Through direct observation, the WAGs that are not 'successful' and do not reconvene for subsequent 10-week WAG sessions, report that the primary reason was lack of consistent participation among the participants; hence, we emphasize a firm commitment on behalf of participants prior to starting a WAG.

There are several limitations to this study. Due to limited resources, the first author stopped tracking WAGs after their second iteration. That is, after the first 10-week WAG concludes and participants receive the post-WAG assessment email, they are asked to reply if their WAG has decided to reconvene for another 10-week session. Anecdotally, most WAGs reconvene, some add or lose members. However, the first author discontinued tracking the groups and collecting data as the sheer number of WAGs increased. Similarly, since WAGs are intended to be a helpful tool for faculty members, the decision was made not to send repeated email requests to WAG participants asking them to complete the follow-up assessment. Another limitation is the lack of follow-up data measuring actual writing product outcomes such as submitted manuscripts, grant applications, study protocols, book chapters, etc. Nonetheless, the WAG data show increased writing frequency which is likely associated with increased scholarly output. Additionally, anecdotal evidence via personal communication and social media (i.e. WAG facebook page) point to increased scholarly output.

Faculty development leaders who would like to consider WAGs as a faculty development tool might consider using the WAG pre-assessment instrument (Skarupski, 2018) to survey their faculty members to assess current scholarly writing habits, satisfaction with their writing habits and scholarly output, and barriers to writing. The results of the survey could be used to promote and pilot the WAG model. A simpler option for faculty development leaders is to send a descriptive email (see sample in the WAG book, Skarupski, 2018) to their colleagues or faculty member constituents about the WAG and

how it works. The first-day WAG orientation may be supplanted by a group review of this publication, the WAG book (Skarupski, 2018), or the brief video and resources on the WAG website (www.wagyourwork.com).

Faculty development leaders may wish to develop a standardized protocol to follow WAGs and WAG participants over time for program evaluation purposes. For example, one idea is to develop an application for WAG participants to track writing goals, set milestones, and reward goal achievement. Additionally, we also plan to offer more writing-related resources for faculty members, including scientific writing workshops, science writing consultants, formatting and editing services, and specialized services for non-native English writers.

WAGs are an effective tool to help faculty members establish a writing habit characterized by writing with increased regularity and for shorter durations. Faculty development leaders may find WAGs to be a low-minimal cost tool to help faculty members carve-out time for scholarship and to build small communities of engagement that may also minimize isolation and burnout.

Acknowledgments

References

Austin, A. E., Sorcinelli. D., & McDaniels, M. (2007). Understanding new faculty backgrounds, aspirations, challenges, and growth. In R. Perry, J. Smart (Eds.) *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective* (pp. 39-89). Netherlands: Springer.

Boice, R. (1984). Why academicians don't write. *Journal of Higher Education*, *55,* 567–582.

Boice, R. (1989). Procrastination, busyness and bingeing. *Behavior Research Therapy*, *27,* 605–611.

Boice R. (1992). Combining writing block treatments: Theory and research. *Behavior Research Therapy, 30,* 2.

Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil nimus*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Dankoski, M. E., Palmer, M. M., Nelson Laird, T. F., Ribera, A. K., & Bogdewic, S. P. (2012). An expanded model of faculty vitality in academic medicine. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 17,* 633-649.

Gray, T. (2015). *Publish & Flourish: Become a Prolific Scholar.* (2nd ed.). Las Cruces, NM: New Mexico State University Teaching Academy.

Gray, T., Madson, L., & Jackson, M. (in press). Publish & Flourish: Helping scholars become better, more prolific writers. *To Improve the Academy*.

Grzybowski, S. C. W., Bates. J., Calam, B., Alred., J., Elwood Martin, R., Andrew, R., Rieb, L., Harris, S., Wiebe, C., Knelle, E., & Berger, S. (2003). A physician peer support writing group. *Family Medicine, 35,* 195-201.

Houfek, J., Kaiser, K., Visovsky, C., Barry, T. L., Nelson, A. E., Kaiser, M. M., & Miller, C. L.. (2010). Using a writing group to promote faculty scholarship. *Nurse Educator, 35,* 1.

IBM Corp. Released 2016. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Jacelon, C. S., Zucker, D. M., Staccarini, J. M., & Henneman, E. A. (2003). Peer mentoring for tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 19,* 335-338.

Johnson, K. S., Hastings, S. N., Purser, J. L., & Whitson, H. E. (2011). The junior faculty laboratory: An innovative model of peer mentoring. *Academic Medicine, 86,* 1577-1582.

Lord, J. A., Mourtzanos, E., McLaren, K., Murray, S. B., Kimmel, R. J., & Cowley, D. S. (2012). A peer mentoring group for junior clinician educators: Four years' experience. *Academic Medicine, 87,* 378-383.

Lowenstein, S. R., Fernandez, G., & Crane, L. A. (2007). Medical school faculty discontent: Prevalence and predictors of intent to leave academic careers. *BMC Medical Education, 7,* 37.

McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development,* 25, 19-35.

Pololi, L. H., Evans, A. T., Civian, J. T., Gibbs, B. K., Coplit, L. D., Gillum, L. H., & Brennan, R. T. (2015). Faculty vitality – surviving the challenges facing academic health centers: A national survey of medical faculty. *Academic Medicine, 90,* 930-936.

Pololi, L., Knight, S., & Dunn, K. (2004). Facilitating scholarly writing in academic medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 19,* 64-68.

Pololi, L. & Knight, S. (2005). Mentoring faculty in academic medicine: A new paradigm. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 20,* 866-870.

Rickard, C. M., McGrail, M. R., Jones, R., O'Meara, P., Robinson, A., Burley, M., & Ray-Barruel, G. (2009). Supporting academic publication: Evaluation of a writing course combined with writers' support group. *Nurse Education Today, 29.* 516-521.

Salas-Lopez, D., Deitrick, L., Mahady, E. T., Moser, K., Gertner, E. J., & Sabino, J. N. (2011). Getting published in an academic-community

hospital: The success of writing groups. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 27,* 1.

Silvia, P. J. (2007*). How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Skarupski, K. (2018). *WAG Your Work. Writing Accountability Groups: Boot Camp for Increasing Scholarly Productivity*. New York: Amazon Press.

Skarupski, K., & Keshavarzian, A. (2013). Investing in academic medicine research mentoring: Low cost, high return. *Gastroenterology, 144*, e21-e22.

Smith, J. O., Whitman, J. S., Grant, P. A., Stanutz, A., Russett, J. A., & Rankin, K. (2001). Peer networking as a dynamic approach to supporting new faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 25,* 197-207.

Sonnad, S., Goldsack, J., McGowan, K. (2011). A writing group for female assistant professors. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *103,* 811-815.

Steinert, Y., Mcleod, P. J., Liben, S., & Snell, L. (2008). Writing for publication in medical education: The benefits of a faculty development workshop and peer writing group. *Medical Teacher, 30,* e280-e285.

Stoykov, M. E., Skarupski, K. A., Foucher, K., & Chubinskaya, S. (2016). Junior investigators thinking about quitting research: A survey. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 71,* 2.

Sword, H. (2016). 'Write every day!': A mantra dismantled. *International Journal for Academic Development, 21*(4), 312–322.

Kimberly A. Skarupski, Ph.D., MPH, is the Associate Dean for Faculty Development, the Office of Faculty Development, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.

Kharma C. Foucher, M.D., Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.