College of Medicine

Faculty Council

Meeting Specifics		
Purpose	**Cadence**	**Executive Sponsor**
Regularly Scheduled	Third Tuesday of the Month	Dean DiPaola
Date	**Time**	**Location**
Tuesday, November 17, 2020	5:00-6:30 p.m.	Zoom

Committee Chair(s) and Members

Basic Science Members		Clinical Science Members	
☒ Campbell, Kenneth		☒ Ballard, Hubert (Chair)	
☒ Clark, Claire		☐ Beck, Sandra	
☒ Hatcher, April R.		☒ Hays, Lon R.	
☒ Mellon, Isabel		☒ Kapoor, Siddharth	
☒ Nikolajczyk, Barbara		☒ Neltner, Janna	
☒ Spear, Brett (Chair-Elect)		☒ Stevens, Julia C.	
		☒ Toney, Dale	

Standing Guests

☒ DiPaola, Robert	☒ Huddleston, Alyssa	☐ Sawaki-Adams, Lumy
☒ Geddes, Jim	☒ Ross, Shavonna	☒ Tannock, Lisa
☒ Greathouse, Lauren	☒ Rowland, Michael	☐ White, Stephanie
☐ Harris, Kim	☒ Sanger, Matthew	

Visitors

☒ Ayoob, Andy	☒ Ragsdale, John	
☒ Jones, Davy		

Agenda Item	Presenter/Facilitator
Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum	Hubert Ballard
Use of Zoom Polling Feature for Action Items	Matthew Sanger
Approval of Meeting Minutes **(Action)** • Faculty Council – October 20, 2020 • General Faculty – October 21, 2020	Hubert Ballard
Review of Acting Internship Course Proposals[1] **(Action)**	John Ragsdale/Hubert Ballard
Vote Results of Administrative Regulation 6:2 Revision	Hubert Ballard
Department of Internal Medicine	Hubert Ballard
Faculty Council Designated Representative on College Committees	Hubert Ballard
Annual Review of Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College of Medicine[2] • Process • Timeline	Matthew Sanger
Dean DiPaola Summative Review[3]	Matthew Sanger
Review Process for Department Chairs and Center Directors	Lisa Tannock
Student Committees • Wellness in Training Committee • Student Advisory Council • Professional Code Committee	Charles Griffith
UK College of Medicine External Website Development	Lauren Greathouse
Next Meeting – December 15, 2020	Hubert Ballard

[1] Preread sent to Faculty Council on November 9, 2020

[2] Preread sent to Faculty Council on November 10, 2020

[3] Preread sent to Faculty Council on November 11, 2020

Minutes	
Topic	**Discussion**
Opening Remarks	- Meeting called to order by H. Ballard. - Quorum declared at 5:01 p.m. (Twelve (of 13) members present.) M. Sanger stated the Zoom polling feature will be used for action items. - Meeting Minutes - October 20, 2020, Faculty Council - October 21, 2020, General Faculty - Moved by D. Toney and seconded by I. Mellon. Approved unanimously.
Review of Acting Internship Course Proposals	J. Ragsdale reviewed course proposals for the following Acting Internships that will be offered to M4 students at the Bowling Green Campus, of which two (2) must be completed - Internal Medicine - Critical Care Medicine - Pulmonary Medicine - Cardiology - Adult Psychiatry Inpatient - General Surgery - Vascular Surgery J. Stevens asked if the above would be offered at all of the regional campuses. J. Ragsdale said that is the intent. H. Ballard asked if the next round would include Pediatrics. J. Ragsdale stated it is a challenge to offer a pediatric internship at regional campuses but they are looking into and will offer if possible. L. Hays moved and D. Toney seconded. Course proposals were approved unanimously.
Vote Results of Administrative Regulation 6:2 Revision	H. Ballard reviewed vote result of the potential changes to Administrative Regulation (AR) 6:2, which guides the procedure for how the University determines responsibility for charges of sexual misconduct on our campus community, including sexual harassment under Title IX, due to changes in Federal Regulations.The University sought feedback from faculty on the matter. - Options included - Change the charge to the AR 6:2 Hearing Panel so that in all Title IX cases of students, faculty and staff the panel uses a '**clear and convincing evidence**' standard, and keep the Senate Hearing Panel using its current 'clear and convincing evidence' for all tenure dismissals - Keep the AR 6:2 Hearing Panel using its current '**preponderance of evidence**' standard for all students, faculty and staff, and change the charge to the Senate Hearing Panel so that all tenure dismissals use the 'preponderance of evidence' standard - Keep the AR 6:2 Hearing Panel using its current '**preponderance of evidence**' standard for all students, faculty and staff, and carve out in the charge to the Senate Hearing Panel that it uses 'preponderance of evidence' in tenure dismissal cases from an AR 6:2 action, but the

Vote Results of Administrative Regulation 6:2 Revision (cont.)	Senate Hearing Panel retains using 'clear and convincing' standard in all other tenure dismissal cases • Option 3 was the majority's choice. • D. Jones communicated Faculty Council's vote results to University Senate Council Chair on October 23. He awaits word of a resolution as of November 17 and will provide an update at the next Faculty Council meeting.
Department of Internal Medicine	• H. Ballard informed the Faculty Council that Dr. David Moliterno, Chair of Internal Medicine, is stepping down as of January 4, 2021. • Transition plan includes appointing a temporary acting department chair for a maximum of four (4) months, if needed, while identifying an acting chair until a permanent chair is hired. • Dean DiPaola is working with the entire department, both faculty and staff, to get their input and nominations for an acting department chair and eventually a permanent chair. • L. Tannock, Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Development, will work with the department to establish a search committee. • Goal of search is to find an individual who is passionate about our college's mission and drives the creation of a collaborative, inclusive, and effective workplace culture.
Faculty Council Designated Representative on College Committees	• H. Ballard reviewed the Faculty Council Designated Representative for each of the College Committees as defined in the Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College of Medicine. The Council will be responsible for scheduling when representatives meet with the Council; expected to vary among committees – some more frequent than others.
Annual Review of Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College of Medicine[2] • Process • Timeline	• M. Sanger provided an overview of the annual review process for the Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College and associated timeline.

Phase	2020-2021 Dates	Reviewer
1	Nov 2 – Nov 8	Chairs, Committees of the College
1	Nov 10 – Nov 15	Dean's Executive Leadership Team and Dean
1	Nov 16 – Nov 17	Editor updates
2	Nov 18 – Dec 3*	Department Chairs and Center Directors
2	Dec 4 – Dec 7	Editor updates
3	Dec 8 – Dec 15	Faculty Council
3	Dec 16 – Dec 20	Editor updates
4	Jan 4 – Jan 15	General Faculty
4	Jan 19 – Jan 24	Editor updates
Final	Feb 2	Executive Committee
Final	Feb 16	Faculty Council
Final	TBD (two weeks)	General Faculty
Final	TBD	Editor updates Note: Any significant changes must be reviewed by the Dean and Faculty Council
Final	TBD	Provost's Office

*Thanksgiving holiday November 26-27

Dean DiPaola Summative Review	M. Sanger updated the Council on Dean DiPaola's upcoming summative review. - Dean DiPaola's current appointment began on March 31, 2016, and ends March 31, 2022. - Summative review is defined by University Administrative Regulation (AR) 3:16 - Purpose is to provide input for establishing future performance goals and expectations and for making compensation and employment decisions - Consists of nine (9) components "(c) Appoint of at least a five-person review committee by the [Chief Administrative Officer's] supervisor in consultation with the [Chief Administrative Officer] and with representation from affected constituencies…" - Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness requested eight (8) to 10 names from which the Provost can choose - Chair, College of Medicine Faculty Council / Clinical Faculty Representative - Chair-Elect, College of Medicine Faculty Council / Basic Science Faculty Representative "(b) An evaluation survey adopted by the University, after consultation with the University Senate and Staff Senate…to solicit feedback from all affected constituencies…" - Assistant Provost for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness asked for five (5) to seven (7) questions to include in the survey tool ***Dean DiPaola is requesting these additional questions be provided by Faculty Council*** - Recommendation due to Associate Chief of Staff by November 20 - Questions used in Dean's Formative Review in July 2019 - The Dean's impact on the following: - Faculty morale - Balance among the college's instructional, research, service and health care programs. - The Dean's support of the following: - Shared governance for decision-making - The college instructional programs - The college research programs - The college service programs - The college health care programs - Faculty Council deliberated on which of the above should be used again in the summative review and what should be used in lieu of. A. Hatcher suggested a question regarding the Dean's communication.

Preliminary working document. Confidential and proprietary.

Dean DiPaola Summative Review (cont.)	■ K. Campbell suggested adding a question about diversity. M. Sanger stated the Provost was including seven (7) questions on diversity and those would be shared with the Council on November 18. ■ Council decided to strike the following and would decide by 3 p.m. on November 19 which question to add. - Balance among the college's instructional, research, service and health care programs • D. Jones asked if feedback on and percent participation of the formative review was available. M. Sanger stated not at the present moment. • Preliminary working timeline (subject to change) - o 2020 ■ November 20: Identify potential members to serve on review committee, finalize questions to be used in evaluation survey tool, provide contact information of constituents external to the college to receive survey ■ November 29: Dean announces upcoming survey to encourage participation ■ November 30 – December 15: Window for evaluation survey to College of Medicine faculty and staff and external constituents - o 2021 ■ January 4 – 22: Analysis by review committee ■ January 8: Dean submits self-assessment ■ January 26: Provost's charge to the review committee ■ January 28 – February 22: Provost's Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Advancement trains review committee ■ February 26: Review committee performance report to Provost ■ March 1 – 12: Window to review self-assessment, performance report, development of a summary report and plan for continuous improvement by and between Provost and Dean ■ March 31: Initiate reappointment as Dean, UK College of Medicine
Review Process for Department Chairs and Center Directors	• L. Tannock provided an overview of the review process for department chairs and center directors. • Chairs and center directors are appointed for terms up to a maximum of six (6) years; renewable • Per AR 1.4 and GR Part IX, unit heads must be reviewed comprehensively at regular intervals - o To provide information to enhance leadership and unit effectiveness - o To guide compensation and employment decisions

Preliminary working document. Confidential and proprietary.

| Review Process for Department Chairs and Center Directors (cont.) | • All chairs and center directors will undergo a 360° evaluation prior to consideration of re-appointment
   o Review performed six (6) months ahead of expiration of first term
   o Review performed 12 months ahead of expiration of second (or more) terms
   o Includes standardized questions and report
• 360° evaluation will include
   o All faculty in unit
   o Senior staff in unit
   o Others upon recommendation by chair/center director
   o All chairs/center directors
   o Dean and EVPHA office members
• The IDEA company will be used for chair reviews
   o Standardized "Feedback system for Chairs"
   o Maintains confidentiality of respondents
   o Includes standardized questions and report
• Email addresses are provided to IDEA
• IDEA emails the survey every two to three days until returned
• Survey open two to three weeks
• Center directors
   o IDEA survey has been used; feedback is that it is not appropriate for center directors
   o Have now changed to a "home-grown" survey tool
• Collated results are sent to Office of Faculty Affairs
• Results are shared with the Dean and the chair or center director
   o Chair/center director will develop a plan to address issues raised
• Dean and Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Development will attend a unit meeting to discuss the survey results, plans moving forward, and to address individual questions
• For re-appointments, the data is provided to the Provost in support of the recommendation for re-appointment
• It was stated that someone with a three-year appointment benefits from the formative review. One feature of the review process is that terms are allowed to be six (6) years and at the Dean's discretion.
• Surveys will be used to conduct mid-term evaluations as well (at approximately half way through the term) |
| Student Committees:
• Wellness in Training Committee | • C. Griffith provided an update on various student committees.
• Wellness in Training
   o Original committee split into separate resident and student groups because their respective needs are different, e.g., residents are concerned about retirement benefits
   o Student and resident issues are addressed through College of Medicine and Graduate Medical Education Committee wellness initiatives; therefore, the need for a separate entity/committee is obsolete
   o Recommend to remove this committee from the Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College |

Preliminary working document. Confidential and proprietary.

Student Committees (cont.):	Council was in agreement with proposal to remove. When communicating to faculty during the review process, they asked that a communication accompany the Rules of the Faculty and Administation of the College of Medicine so facuty are aware the Wellness in Training Committee will still exist.
• Student Advisory Council	• Student Advisory Council - University GR VII.E.3.C and Senate Rule 6.1.6 requires each college within the university to establish a Student Advisory Council (SAC) to represent student opinion on educational policy matters pertinent to the college or school - The form and areas of responsibility for SAC are determined by the college faculty - Membership on the college's respective Faculty Council, with or without voting privileges, may be extended - The SAC serves as an official forum in which medical students may express their concerns and opinions concerning the conduct of the educational program of the College of Medicine - Charge: - Makes recommendations on issues impacting the M.D. programs of the college; - Facilitates the development of an appropriate form of responsible and representative student government in the College of Medicine; - Serves as a liaison and advisory group to the Dean's office on problems of student welfare and extracurricular activities; and - Evaluates annually the adequacy and effectiveness of the various services of the College of Medicine as they may contribute to student education and general welfare - Membership: - Composed of representatives elected from each medical student class and representatives from other student organizations as designated by the Dean - Problems - Not inclusive of all College of Medicine students (i.e., does not include graduate students) - Current makeup of SAC is class leaders and may not reflect the diversity of the student body - Regional campus representation is limited - Current student members are class leaders, "House" leaders, and organization leaders; a very large committee - Solution - In the process of vetting a straw proposal of SAC committee members who would allay these concerns (e.g., graduate student representatives, regional campuses, etc.), for presentation to Faculty Council in January or sooner

| Student Committees (cont.):
• Professional Code | • Professional Code Committee
   o The Professional Code Committee (PCC) originally had been students and faculty considering professionalism concerns of students and recommending actions
   o Now that professionalism is a "competency" under the Student Progress and Promotion Committee (SPPC), professionalism concerns are addressed through SPPC
   o PCC (Committee on Advocacy and Professional Ethics - CAPE) is now students working towards ensuring an environment of high professionalism and advocacy among themselves, not a decision-making committee
   o Recommend to remove this committee from the Rules of the Faculty and Administration of the College of Medicine
   o Council agreed with the recommendation.
• Discussion
   o D. Jones asked how many post docs there are. C. Griffith estimates 200. B. Nikolajczyk suggested a separate council be created for post docs to have their own voice. B. Spear stated The Graduate School recently hired a Post Doc Coordinator to help with these kinds of issues.
   o D. Toney asked if these requests will go before General Faculty for a vote. C. Griffith said they will be addressed by that body.
   o J. Stevens asked if A. Dearinger will continue to be the liaison regarding wellness for the medical student body. C. Griffith said yes but not within the Rules of the Faculty because voting does not take place with respect to that group. |
| UK College of Medicine External Website Development | • L. Greathouse provided an update on the college's external website: [med.uky.edu](med.uky.edu).
• Current status
   o 60+ unique domain names (i.e., meded.med.uky.edu, neuroscience.med.uky.edu, etc.)
   o 160+ individuals who are able to edit the website
   o Thousands of individual pages
   o Multiple voices, target audiences, and rogue sites, e.g., Emergency Medicine
• Goal
   o This new site should clearly communicate the College of Medicine to it's target audiences as a national leader in solving the challenges in health care through transdisciplinary and transformational research, education, and advanced clinical care. Additionally, it should have a user-friendly content management system and be mobile-first.
• Objectives
   o Create a positive user experience that considers the needs, values, fears, and goals of all identified user types based on the insights from our user research
   o Identify a design to allow users to intuitively and efficiently navigate through the site |

Date Created: 1/9/2021

UK College of Medicine External Website Development (cont.)	- Objectives (cont.) - Account for the needs of the many departments and centers across the site - Communicate clearly and consistently the college's reputation for research, education, and clinical care - Increase website traffic and search engine visibility of the College of Medicine - Overall - Expand the workforce of individuals heavily qualified in both medicine and research by fostering the growth of the College of Medicine - Aid in the recruitment and application process for qualified prospective students, residents, and faculty - Escalate and integrate team and resources with a new facility - Target Audiences - Prospective student - Prospective resident/fellow - Prospective faculty - Alumni - Current faculty - Current student - Current resident/fellow - Key Stakeholders - Primary Day-to-Day - Content Stakeholders - Development and User Experience Stakeholders - Executive Team - Senior Executive Team - Executive Team - Lauren Greathouse, senior director of communications (Chair) - Stephen Welch, academic and research technology manager (Co-chair) - Matthew Sanger, executive director and chief of staff - Geoff Blair/Jason Britt, UK HealthCare brand strategy - Katie McKinney (or representative), senior associate dean for graduate medical education - Beth Garvy, associate dean for biomedical education - Stephanie White, associate dean for diversity and inclusion - Pam Woods, college of medicine project manager - Staff representative – TBD - Clinical chair representative – TBD - Basic science chair representative – TBD - Student representative – TBD - Resident representative – TBD - Biomedical student representative – TBD - Michelle Lineberry, associate dean for student affairs - Wendy Jackson, associate dean for admissions - Jan Taylor/Steve Harris, UK HealthCare corporate communications

UK College of Medicine External Website Development (cont.)	- Proposed timeline - Discovery Phase: 6-12 weeks total - Initiate/define - Creative Brief and Project Charter - Plan and R&D - Project Charter, SOW, Estimate, Concepts - Execute Draft Phase: 20-25 weeks total - Draft - Design Lock (All design is approved by the UK College of Medicine) - Execute Production Phase: (UK to determine) - Development/Production/Content Entry - Site is functional, pending QC - Check Phase: (UK to determine) - QC site - Site Launch - Current phase: Discovery - Evaluating what our visitors are looking for and how they are finding it - Performing a detailed audit of the content – page by page - Distributing a questionnaire to those with editing privileges to understand needs and points of pain - Meeting with departments to update content and structure - Developing the site map - Discussion L. Greathouse stated the Executive Team will have a more active role in decision-making. - Other stakeholders include donors. D. Jones asked about the community. L. Greathouse reiterated key audiences listed above. K. Campbell noticed residents and students were listed at the top of the audience list and asked if the website's purpose was really to attract learners. J. Neltner stated given the pandemic and virtual interviews, having a better website is excellent. Now is the time to enhance it. L. Hays mentioned that the navigation is different for all departments. D. Jones asked if the college's website will fit within UK guidelines. L. Greathouse confirmed it would.
Other Business	- The next Faculty Council meeting is December 15, 2020, at 5:00 p.m. H. Ballard adjourned the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

Preliminary working document. Confidential and proprietary.