### Faculty Council

#### Agenda Item

**Call to Order**

**Declaration of Quorum**

**Approval of Minutes – Action**
- December 21, 2021 – Regularly Scheduled Faculty Council Meeting¹
- January 10, 2022 – Specially Called Faculty Council Meeting²

**Consent Agenda – Action**
- Course Proposals²

**Mission, Vision, Pillar, and Enabler Awards Update (5 minutes)**

**UK@Work Survey Results (30 minutes)**

**Next Meeting: February 15, 2022**

---

¹Pre-read sent January 4, 2022

²Pre-read sent January 3, 2022

³Pre-read sent January 11, 2022

---

**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>Acting Dean Griffith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**

Tuesday, January 18, 2022

**Time**

5:00-6:00 p.m.

**Location**

Zoom

---

**Committee Chair(s) and Members**

**Basic Science Members**

- Campbell, Kenneth
- Clark, Claire
- Mellon, Isabel
- Nikolajczyk, Barbara
- Spear, Brett (Chair)

**Clinical Science Members**

- Ballard, Hubert
- Beck, Sandra
- Bensalem-Owen, Meriem
- Bylund, Jason
- Kapoor, Siddharth
- Mardini, Sam
- Meadows, Amy
- Neltner, Janna
- Toney, Dale

**Guests**

- Allison, Roxie
- Dutch, Becky
- Greathouse, Lauren
- Griffith, Chipper
- Rogers, Cassandra
- Ross, Shavonna
- Sanger, Matthew
- Tannock, Lisa
- White, Stephanie
- Chambers, Erika
- Jones, Davy
- Verble, Bill

---

Date Created: 2/23/2022

Preliminary working document. Confidential and proprietary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Opening Remarks                                       | • Meeting called to order by B. Spear at 5:01 p.m.  
• Quorum declared at 5:02 p.m. (12 (of 14) members present.)  
• Meeting Minutes Approval  
  o December 21, 2021 – Regularly Scheduled Faculty Council Meeting  
    Moved by H. Ballard and seconded by D. Toney. Minutes approved unanimously.  
  o January 10, 2022 – Specially Called Faculty Council Meeting  
    Moved by H. Ballard and seconded by D. Toney. Minutes approved. One abstained and nine approved. |
| Consent Agenda                                         | • Course proposals were sent to Faculty Council on January 3, 2022. Endorse fourth year elective course proposals submitted by the Medical Student Curriculum Committee.  
  o 25 total proposals  
  o Seven of the 14 members of Faculty Council participated in the call for endorsement. Seven of the seven endorsed proposals unanimously via Qualtrics.  
• Moved by H. Ballard and seconded by D. Toney. Consent items approved. |
| Mission, Vision, Pillar, and Enabler Award Update      | • B. Spear shared the new College of Medicine awards, associated with its strategic plan, and the process that is being used. The award process is very detailed and he appreciates the work done by those who helped build the new awards and associated process.  
• New awards previously reviewed and approved by Faculty Council at regularly scheduled meeting on August 17, 2021.  
• Call for nominations ongoing  
  o January 10 through January 21  
• Faculty Council Chair will serve as one of the Level 1 Screeners for the Mission and Vision Awards.  
• Awardees notified by March 18 with awards ceremony to be held in April.  
• B. Spear shared that there is still time to submit nominations and that it is a fairly quick process to nominate. |
| UK@Work Survey Results                                 | • B. Spear welcomed E. Chambers and B. Verble to discuss the 2021 UK@Work Survey Results.  
• E. Chambers shared that this is for the college overall and specifically faculty. Personnel answer these questions based on where they spend the most time not necessarily their home department. The gray bars are 2021 scores and convey the people who agree or tend to agree with the items in that category. There was an increase in participation across the college. If there is a dark green or dark red, that means there is a statistically significant change, with positive or negative.  
• E. Chambers stated there was great improvement overall for the College of Medicine.  
• Human Resources looked for scores that were 75 percent favorable or higher. |
| UK@Work Survey Results (cont.) (B. Verble/E. Chambers) | • B. Verble shared that 2019 was the first year that clinical faculty were included in the UK@Work survey. He stated this survey is geared more toward faculty members versus clinical setting.  
• B. Verble shared that the well-being category is new since the last survey so there is no data to compare to. He made note that retention declines in this survey.  
• 2021 survey categories show the breakdown across overall scores for Basic Science, Centers, Clinical Departments, Medicine Operations and Medicine Overall. On the slides, if there is an asterisk, it denotes a statistically significant difference. Some departments/areas cannot be compared to larger areas, e.g. 196 versus 11.  
• E. Chambers pointed out that the results show improvement in the Supervision category. She noted that this is favorable. Compared to UK faculty overall, the UK College of Medicine faculty scored significantly above other colleges.  
• E. Chambers is delighted to see that there is also strong progress and great improvement in the centers.  
• E. Chambers stated that Human Resources will reword the wellness question as it did not pinpoint exactly what they were trying to ask.  
• B. Verble stated this has already been shared with the dean. It will go to the executive committee on February 1, 2022.  
• S. Kapoor asked what “operating effectively” means E. Chambers answered that the question is focused on the decision-making category. This is statistically low across UK as a whole. Some of this is based upon timing of decision making.  
• E. Chambers shared that “My department operates effectively” tends to be higher. It is 74 percent for the College of Medicine versus 50 percent at the decision-making level for the University.  
• S. Kapoor asked how wellness activities correspond with retention.  
• B. Verble discussed that for retention, 66 percent of people are not planning to leave UK. That means 34 percent of people want to leave or are maybe thinking about leaving.  
• H. Ballard was concerned that retention and well-being had results below 60 percent. Stress balance workload is near 56 percent. There has been a lot of dramatic work with COVID-19. He asked is the plan in terms of the workgroups and how this will be addressed and hopefully improved.  
• B. Verble shared that M. Sanger and C. Griffith would be the ones who will build on these results for improvement and next steps.  
• D. Jones questioned the aspect of where decisions are made. He knows there is discussion about this now. He asked if there are any examples about department versus University approval.  
• B. Verble shared one example of a hiring exception that went up to very high levels at the University. The college actually put in place their own processes to help with the creation and approval of hiring. He also stated that applicants are low in a lot of areas but high in a few. There is a decline in number of applicants across the University as a whole.  
• D. Toney shared that there is some overlap between UK@Work and Press Ganey surveys; the latter is conducted by UK HealthCare. It causes survey fatigue and sometimes it is hard to tell what the questions are talking about. |
| UK@Work Survey Results (cont.) (B. Verble/E. Chambers) | • E. Chambers shared that she works with L. Barber when putting together these surveys and recognizes some overlap.  
• B. Verble stated that Press Ganey is completed yearly and UK@Work is done every two years.  
• S. Kapoor mentioned that the software used by Human Resources rejects a lot of candidates. He asked how do we reach those who may be rejected when they should qualify.  
• B. Verble shared that there are ways to set up the IES application system to be more inclusive for candidates. One can set up scored questions or open response questions. These are chosen by the hiring officials or the hiring coordinators, not by Human Resources. Once the position is posted, ask for all the applicants or for those in the top 40, 50, 60 or 70 percent, etc. As a hiring official, one can see all or as few as applicants as preferred.  
• K. Campbell asked E. Chambers if can we make comparisons with other institutions or other big employer. He asked if comparisons were possible.  
• E. Chambers answered that Human Resources does have the ability look at other universities that take this specific survey. Our scores are on par or higher at the University-level overall compared to other universities. For corporate, we rate a bit lower. We rate higher at the benefits level. The survey vendor places the 75 percent cut-off as a strong score.  
• L. Tannock stated that Finance will present to the Faculty Council to show the improvement over the last couple years from the survey results and the new funds flow model with compensation changes.  
• C. Griffith stated his thanks to all faculty and staff for taking the survey. He feels very positive about the upward tick in the survey. He is very pleased with the overall results and glad we continue to move in an upward fashion despite the ongoing pandemic and challenges |
| Other Business | • Next meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2022. |
| Adjourn | • Motion to adjourn by H. Ballard. Seconded by D. Toney. Meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m. |