**Faculty Council**

### Meeting Specifics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cadence</th>
<th>Executive Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly Scheduled</td>
<td>Third Tuesday of the Month</td>
<td>Dean DiPaola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 18</td>
<td>5:00-6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>MN136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Chair(s) and Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Science Members</th>
<th>Clinical Science Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Blonder, Lee X.</td>
<td>☒ Ballard, Hubert (Vice Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Hatcher, April R.</td>
<td>☐ Deep, Kristy S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Mellon, Isabel</td>
<td>☒ Fragneto, Regina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Spear, Brett</td>
<td>☐ Gabriel, Gaby E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Whiteheart, Sidney</td>
<td>☐ Hays, Lon R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Wilcock, Donna (Chair)</td>
<td>☒ Stevens, Julia C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visitors and Standing Guests

| Despa, Florin (Guest) | Porter, Nada (Guest) | Sawaki Adams, Lumy (Standing Guest) |
| DiPaola, Robert (Standing Guest) | Ross, Shavonna (Standing Guest) | Tannock, Lisa (Standing Guest) |
| Jones, Davy (Guest) | Sanger, Matthew (Standing Guest) |

### Agenda Topics Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task ID</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter/Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Hubert Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction of Regina Fragneto, MD</td>
<td>Hubert Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rules of the Faculty Voting Results</td>
<td>Hubart Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Center for Healthy Metabolism Update</td>
<td>Florin Depsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WELD Mentor Training Project Update</td>
<td>April Hatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Council of Faculty and Academic Societies Senior Representative</td>
<td>Lisa Tannock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1. Opening Remarks** | • Meeting called to order by H. Ballard.  
• Quorum declared at 5:05 p.m. (Six members present.) |
| **2. Introduction of Regina Fragneto, MD** | • H. Ballard introduced obstetric anesthesiologist, R. Fragneto, MD.  
• She joined the council as a clinical science member to replace P. Kearney, who retired recently. |
| **3. Rules of the Faculty Voting Results** | • H. Ballard presented results of the Rules of the Faculty vote.  
• Voting was conducted February 4-14, 2020, among 1,121 voting-eligible faculty.  
• 173 (15%) voted  
  o 116 (67%) Clinical Science Faculty  
  o 57 (33%) Basic Science Faculty  
• 166 (96%) voted YES  
• 7 (4%) voted NO  
• Voter turnout was nearly four times more than last vote in 2018  
• An implementation plan of the changes is currently in development with an anticipated effective date of July 1, 2020. |
| **4. Center for Healthy Metabolism Update** | • F. Despa provided an update on the research center for Healthy Metabolism with the Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences.  
• Its mission is to improve the health of people in Kentucky and beyond through advancing research focused on prevention and treatment of metabolic disorders.  
• Intent is to capitalize on new opportunities for scientific exploration and address new challenges for human health: Prediabetes and Type II Diabetes.  
• Goals: grow strength in diabetes and obesity research priority areas; establish large programmatic initiatives; and facilitate collaborative research with other research priority areas.  
• Strategic partners: Center for Clinical and Translational Science, Markey Cancer Center, Barnstable Brown Kentucky Diabetes and Obesity Center, Saha Cardiovascular Research Center, Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, Center for Obesity and Cardiovascular Disease, and Center For Molecular Medicine.  
• F. Despa and N. Porter met with Dean DiPaola and thought this center was an appropriate to replace the previous center for Disease Metabolism. This center goes hand-in-hand with the endeavors of the Healthy Kentucky Research Building. This is an administrative center. There are no faculty with DOE time and the center does not capture indirects. |
### 5. WELD Mentor Training Project Update

- A. Hatcher shared results of the WELD mentor training project: Fostering Mentor/Mentee Relationships in Research-Intensive Faculty.
- Project goals: encourage self reflection and open dialogue around this subject with faculty and students; use case-based scenarios to promote awareness of mentor/mentee perceptions; receive input from faculty and students on innovative ways to improve mentor mentee interactions.
- Seven departments and 36 students from all years participated in fall 2019 during an 8-week period: Neuroscience, Cellular Biochemistry, Toxicology/Cancer Biology, Pharmacology/Nutritional Sciences, Behavioral Science, Microbiology/Immunology/Molecular Genetics, and Physiology.
- Mentee/Mentor difficulties discovered:
  - Faculty: time management for how long it takes to complete an experiment.
  - Student: communication followed by meeting frequency. Millennials want to meet more frequently and need more informal feedback.
- Next Steps: mentor training is critical to reduce complaints and improve student success; the National Research Mentoring Network (NRMN) provides formal training to senior faculty who can become certified trainers, so they can then train faculty at their institution; the NRMN program is based primarily on scenarios and discussion; and the NRMN could provide a formalized way to require and provide mentor training to our faculty.
- L. Tannock stated Dean DiPaola is taking this very seriously and wants to conduct this training more regularly.

### 6. Council of Faculty and Academic Societies Senior Representative

- L. Tannock introduced L. Sawaki Adams, the AAMC Council of Faculty and Academic Societies (CFAS) Senior Representative.
- One role of the CFAS representative is bidirectional knowledge and communication. She should periodically interact with faculty and staff so she can learn what issues UK is facing and advocate at AAMC, and conversely, bring back specific information from AAMC to UK.
- L. Sawaki Adams has been invited as a standing guest of the Executive Committee (formerly Council of Chairs) and Faculty Council approved of her future presence at Faculty Council meetings.

### 7. Other Business

- None. Meeting ended at 5:55 p.m.
Research Center on Healthy Metabolism

Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences
The University of Kentucky
MISSION

To improve the health of people in Kentucky and beyond through advancing research focused on prevention and treatment of metabolic disorders.
the **NEED** for a center focused on **healthy metabolism**
Limitations in the ability to predict prediabetes progression into diabetes; NO TEST EXISTS; Cannot treat ALL Prediabetics (84 Million)

Capitalize on new opportunities for scientific exploration and address new challenges for human health.

84 Million people with prediabetes in U.S.
5-10% become diabetic every year
Type-2 diabetes: irreversible (30 Million in U.S)
KY hospitals: > 9,000 cases/yr
**The Opportunity:** Novel genes, molecules and cells were found to play a role in metabolic & microvascular dysfunction in diabetes.

**Example 1 - Mechanisms**

- Healthy red blood cell
- Diabetic red blood cell
- Amylin
- HIF-2α
- EPO
- Amylin coating RBCs
- Amylin deposition in microvasculature
- Arginase activity

**Verma et al., Kidney Int. (2019)**
**Example 2 - translational**

**RBC Amylin Levels in Healthy & Diseased Individuals**

Verma et al., Kidney Int. (2019)

**Example 3 - translational**

**CSF Amylin – CSF Aβ42 in Cognitive Decline**

Ly et al., unpublished
Example 4 – Mechanistic Gene Targeting in Rodents

amylin gene deletion

amylin overexpression (3-fold)

wild type amylin

Ly et al., Ann Neurol (2017)
Specific Research Areas

- central regulation of ingestive behavior by pancreatic hormones

- role of pancreatic hormones in aging-related metabolic dysfunction (modulation of brain hypoxia and amyloid)

- pharmacological/dietary modulation of blood levels of pancreatic hormones to prevent/reduce metabolic disturbances with aging
Competitive Position

Metabolic Clinical Research Unit – NIDDK
Metabolism, Energy Balance & Obesity - NIDDK

NIDDK Research Programs and Areas of Interest for Funding

- Diabetes Centers
- Digestive Disease Centers
- Kidney Disease Centers
- Hematology Centers
- Mouse Metabolic Phenotyping Centers
- Cystic Fibrosis Research and Translation Centers
- Nutrition and Obesity Research Centers
- Urologic Disease Centers

Our INNOVATION in the metabolic-microvascular approach will enable UK-RCHM to achieve a competitive advantage in extramural funding.
GOALS

- To further grow strength in diabetes & obesity research priority area
- To establish large programmatic initiatives
- To facilitate collaborative research with other research priority areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Clinical and Translational Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markey Cancer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstable Brown Kentucky Diabetes and Obesity Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saha Cardiovascular Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders-Brown Center on Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Obesity and Cardiovascular Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center For Molecular Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY

- Monthly meetings to discuss the progress, collaborations, and new research developments;
- Promote sharing of resources (equipment, animal models, etc.) between center members;
- Establish a program for pilot project grants.

$ 50k generous pledge from RPA for the initial pilot project grants
• Collaborative grants;
• Extramural funding resulted from pilot projects funded by RCHM;
• Publications.

MILESTONES:
- 2 PPG in 2 years;
- Central grant in 3 years
- International grant in 3 years
Collaborations in the US:

1. Neuroscience Institute, University of South Florida;
2. Department of Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine;
3. Center for Neurodegenerative Science, Van Andel Research Institute, Grand Rapids;
4. Department of Medicine, Division of Renal Diseases & Hypertension, The George Washington University School of Medicine & Health Sciences, Washington;
5. Memory & Brain Wellness Center, University of Washington, Seattle;
6. Department of Neuroscience, University of Chicago;
7. Department of Pharmacology, University of California, Davis;
8. Department of Internal Medicine, McGovern Medical School at UT Health, Houston;
9. Department of Pharmacology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill;
10. Cardiovascular Research Institute, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
International Collaborations

1. UK Dementia Research Institute at University College London, UK;
2. Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience University of Cambridge;
3. Department of Physiology, University of Oxford, UK;
4. Department of Neurology, University Medical Center Utrecht, The Netherlands;
5. Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Department of Medicine, Brussels, Belgium;
6. Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut de Recherche Expérimentale et Clinique, Pôle d'Endocrinologie, Diabète et Nutrition, Louvain la Neuve, Belgium;
7. Department of Psychiatry and Neurochemistry, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, The Sahlgrenska Academy at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden;
8. Department of Internal Medicine, Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
MANAGEMENT

Co-Directors:
Dr. Sanda Despa
Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences
Dr. Florin Despa
Professor, Departments of Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences, and Neurology

New members:
Upon request sent by e-mail to the Co-Directors and voted by the Founding Members
INAUGURAL SEMINAR & OPENNING OF THE CENTER
April 16, 2020, CTW 127

“Unifying Cell Death Programs”

Richard N Kitsis, MD
The Dr. Gerald and Myra Dorros Chair in Cardiovascular Disease
Director of the Wilf Family Cardiovascular Research Institute
Albert Einstein College of Medicine

“Control of energy metabolism and neurodevelopment by amylin”

Thomas A Lutz,
Professor of Veterinary Physiology, Prof. Dr. med. vet., PhD
University of Zurich
Fostering Mentor/Mentee Relationships in Research Intensive Faculty

April Hatcher, PhD and Donna Wilcock, PhD
WELD Final Project 2019
Project Goals

- Encourage self-reflection and open dialogue around this subject with faculty and students.
- Use case-based scenarios to promote awareness of mentor/mentee perceptions.
- Receive input from faculty and students on innovative ways to improve mentor-mentee interactions.
Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Discussion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>October 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Biochemistry</td>
<td>October 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicology/Cancer biology</td>
<td>October 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology/Nutritional Sciences</td>
<td>November 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Science</td>
<td>November 8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology/Immunology/Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>November 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>November 19th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 mentor/mentee scenarios

~20-25 minutes discussion

1-2-4-All discussion format

Survey sent one week post-discussions

Student-led discussion
Led by a doctoral student
6 sessions during October (24th and 28th) and November (1st, 4th, 11th, and 13th)
Scenarios

You are a young, new faculty member who has just transitioned from postdoctoral work. You are used to a laboratory environment where junior and senior lab members are friends, they hang out outside of work, including at each other’s’ homes. They do personal favors for one another and you want to encourage that environment in your laboratory. However, complaints are made that you are placing unreasonable expectations on graduate students outside of working hours, like personal favors, sending work-related text messages late at night, and expecting trainees to come to your house for gatherings on weekends. None of these activities were a problem when you were a trainee, so why are they causing problems in your new lab?

You have a progress meeting scheduled with your second year graduate student, Elsie. This meeting has been rescheduled a couple of times due to extra time needed for a grant deadline. When you meet with Elsie, she walks you through the most recent data she has gathered. You are surprised at this data because it is not in keeping with the experiment you remembered discussing with her a few weeks ago. When you question Elsie, she recounts a different discussion and insists that you did not mention this experimental design before now. How do you respond in this situation?

You have accepted a first-year graduate student, Alec, into your lab. He worked in your lab during an IBS rotation and established a promising start to his graduate training by working hard and contributing to a collaborative learning environment. Currently Alec is completing department specific 2nd-year course requirements. During this time, he is spending between 15 and 20 hours in the lab, and using the remainder of the time to prepare for coursework and a thorough literature search for his new project. Alec feels he is working hard in the lab, but when you approach him about low productivity, he explains he is feeling stressed and working too hard between lab and study. How do you resolve this conflict?
**Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present at discussion</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present at discussion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notable findings from the student survey

• 46% (13/15) of students responded “yes” when asked: “Reflecting on the discussion, do you believe your mentor has made unreasonable requests of you?”.

• 46% related most to the scenario regarding inconsistencies between faculty and graduate student expectations on experimental design.

• 92% o (12/13) respondents have been approached by peers experiencing similar issues to those in the scenarios.
Notable findings from the faculty survey

• Only 1.79% (1 out of 56) responded “yes” to the question “reflecting on the discussion, do you believe you have made unreasonable requests of your mentees”

• 62% related most to the scenario regarding inconsistencies between faculty and graduate student expectations on experimental design.

• 52% of respondents have been approached by graduate students experiencing similar issues to those in the scenarios.
Hour expectations of students

Faculty
Students

Pre-qualifying exam hour expectations

Post-qualifying exam hour expectations

% of respondents
# hours / week
% of respondents
# hours / week
Faculty Q4 - Please rate the following statements according to your level of agreement. (1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree)

Discussion of the mentor-mentee scenarios helped me to:

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

Colors indicate:
- Red: Reconsider my expectations for trainees
- Purple: Change my behavior with my mentee
- Blue: Empathize with mentee concerns
Student Q4 - Please rate the following statements according to your level of agreement. 1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree.

Discussion of the mentor-mentee scenarios helped me to:

- Reconsider my expectations of my mentors
- Change my behavior with my mentors
- Empathize with mentor concerns
**Faculty:** What is your most frequent mentor-mentee difficulty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of comments (out of 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>9 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Expectations</td>
<td>7 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Conduct</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Ownership</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Process</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Time Management**       | “On-time finishing of tasks when time frame was agreed upon with mentee”  
“Students underestimate the amount of time anything takes” |
| **Quality Assurance**     | “Reliability of data”  
“...Student taking shortcuts” |
| **Communicating Expectations** | ”Making sure that my expectations match their expectations”  
“Mentee recognizing that they must work to reap the benefits” |
| **Professional Conduct**  | “Procrastination without justification”  
“Balancing cordiality with maintaining professional arms-length interactions. Not enforcing productivity from the trainees but allowing them to underperform with aplomb.” |
| **Fostering Ownership**   | “Lack of motivation to develop independence in the progression of their research projects”  
“Mentees getting discouraged by negative results or failed experiments.” |
Student: What is your most frequent mentor-mentee difficulty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Comments (out of 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9 (36.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>8 (32.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Environment</td>
<td>3 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>2 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Differences in expectations regarding how long a protocol or experiment actually takes versus how long my PI think it takes to complete.”

“Not meeting frequently; experiments are hard to start since mentor wants input on design, but meeting infrequently prevents this.”

“Mentor's general absence from the lab and thus lack of knowledge of problems with lab dynamics and conflicts occurring between lab members that are a detriment to conducting research.”

“Missing small details in protocols.”
Future Directions

• Mentor training is critical to reduce complaints and improve student success.

• The scenarios were well received and the discussion feedback generally positive.

• The National Research Mentoring Network provides formal training to senior faculty who can become certified trainers, so they can then train faculty at their institution.

• The NRMN program is based primarily on scenarios and discussion, much like our work here.

• The NRMN could provide a formalized way to require and provide mentor training to our faculty.
Rules of the Faculty:
Working Timeline
Rules of the Faculty
Working Timeline

2019

✓ September 17: Faculty Council
   – Process and timeline update

✓ October 8: Faculty Council received copy of Rules of the Faculty for first read prep

✓ October 15: Faculty Council
   – First reading

✓ November 19: Faculty Council
   – Second reading
   – Final Faculty Council approval before sending to Council of Chairs and General Faculty

✓ December 3: Council of Chairs
   – Feedback due December 12

✓ December 17: Faculty Council
   – Review Council of Chairs’ feedback
   – General Faculty Meeting update and schedule
2020

- January 14: Distribute to Faculty in preparation for January 23 General Faculty Meeting
  - Distributed on January 15

- January 21: Faculty Council
  - Timeline update

- January 23: General Faculty Meeting

- February 4-14: Conduct Vote
  - Distribute Rules of the Faculty via email prior to the vote
  - Vote conducted February 4-14

- February 18: Send to Associate Provost for Faculty Development for Provost approval
  - Complete and post to Faculty Resources

- March 3: Council of Chairs renamed Executive Committee
• Voting-eligible faculty as defined in the *Rules of the Faculty*
  
  – 3.1.1.1. *The voting faculty consist of the following: 1) the Dean, all Assistant, Associate and Vice Deans; and 2) full-time Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and those Instructors who are not enrolled as students in the M.D. program or Graduate School*
  
  – 3.1.1.2. *Faculty listed in CR 3.1.1, who hold joint appointments where one (1) of the departments is outside of the College of Medicine, must have their primary academic appointment in the College of Medicine in order to have voting status*
  
  – Number of Voting-Eligible Faculty: 1,121
  
• Of the 1,121 Voting-Eligible Faculty, 173 voted (15%)
  
  – 96% (166) voted YES
  
  – 4% (7) voted NO
  
  – Faculty Type
    ▪ Clinical Faculty: 116 (67%)
    ▪ Basic Science Faculty: 57 (33%)
  
• Implementation Plan