



Minutes

06/04/02 -- 230B McVey Hall -- 10:00 AM

ATTENDEES: Ren Bates, Jayna Cheesman, Kathy Hamperian, Kathy Johnson, Phil Latiff, Eric McWhorter, Sarah Nikirk, and T. Lynn Williamson

PRESIDING: T. Lynn Williamson

PROJECT COORDINATOR: Jayna Cheesman

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone was introduced. • Jayna explained this Committee was created by the Data Stewards to identify all issues related to a possible policy to require all employees of UK to have an email address. Jayna and Kathy Hamperian explained IT is getting an increasing number of requests to extract email addresses for campus departments wishing to communicate electronically. However, the quality of the email addresses in the UK directory is poor, because there is currently no policy requiring an employee to have an email ID, nor are employees required to update the UK directory with their current/preferred email address. (Kathy H. indicated 95% of the faculty currently have email IDs, but less than 50% of the staff and students have email IDs.) Due to these issues, electronic communication is not successful in reaching all of its intended audience. The consensus of the Data Stewards is the email ID should be a requirement for all UK students and employees. A separate committee has already given the Data Stewards recommendations on making the email ID a requirement for students. The Data Stewards want this Committee to identify and evaluate all the policy and procedure issues regarding the implementation of such a policy for employees, and to develop recommendations to the Data Stewards. IT will be responsible for identifying all of the technical issues related to this implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on which employees should be covered by this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Should the policy cover faculty and/or staff?</u> Recommendation 1: The policy requiring an email ID should be for both faculty and staff. • <u>Should the policy cover regular employees only, or temporary as well?</u> Kathy H. noted many temporary employees already get an email ID, as it is required in their work. Recommendation 2: The policy should cover regular and temporary employees. • <u>Should the policy cover full-time, part-time and/or half-time employees?</u> Recommendation 3: The policy should apply to full-time, part-time and half-time employees. • <u>Should the policy cover STEPS employees?</u> Recommendation 4: The policy should apply to STEPS employees. • <u>Should the policy cover post-docs?</u> Recommendation 5: The policy should include post-docs. • <u>Should the policy cover house staff (MC residents)?</u> Recommendation 6: The policy should include the house staff. • <u>Should the policy cover retirees?</u> Kathy H. mentioned there are software licensing issues that would need to be addressed with the email vendor before retirees can be added. This issue is similar to the one of giving all UK alumni

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>an email ID (or allowing them to keep the one they will be assigned as a student).</p> <p>Recommendation 7: The policy should apply to retirees, if financially viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eric asked how we currently decide who is listed in UK’s phonebook. Kathy H. said it was basically everyone who had a phone in their office, but the departments are allowed to modify this list before it is printed in the phonebook. ▪ Kathy H. indicated there are currently approximately 10,850 regular employees (non-students) paid through HRS, and used for the Microsoft software contract. This figure does not include house staff or temporary employees. ▪ T. Lynn said UK usually issues around 32,00 W2s per year. ▪ Kathy H. said there are currently 60,000 email accounts (IDs), but 25,000 of these are students. Many people have multiple email accounts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of process to create email IDs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The committee formed for the assessment of the requirement for all students to have an email ID, recommended UK automatically establish an ‘uky.edu’ email ID for all students. Kathy H. said the students would then be permitted to forward email received at this address to another they prefer. She indicated there would need to be a large communication/PR campaign to inform students and faculty about this, if the recommendation is approved. ▪ Kathy suggested we assign a UK email address to each employee at the time they are hired, and that the address be based on the system used by their hiring department. Recommendation 8: A UK email address should automatically be assigned to employees when they are hired. The address should be based on the system used by their hiring department. ▪ Jayna asked if there were certain documents or types of communication the Federal or State governments require UK to distribute via paper, rather than electronically. T. Lynn said some of the Federal requirements mandate a communication to employees, but as long as we inform them about their email address (uky.edu) and how to forward their email to another address, we will be in compliance with the regulations. ▪ Recommendation 9: Whatever decision is made about how the email IDs are established for employees, and how official communication with employees will be executed, UK needs to do a massive PR/education campaign to ensure all employees are informed of the process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of how to handle terminated and retired employees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kathy H. reported IT currently confirms the active student and employees twice and year, and then deactivates the email IDs for those individuals no longer either a student or employee of UK. She said she would like for UK to try to do this at least monthly. ▪ T. Lynn indicated his staff run a FOCUS Termination Report weekly. ▪ There was a general discussion of the problem regarding departments’ failure to notify HR and IT of an employee’s termination. T. Lynn said departments do not always send HR the Separation Sheets, which is the official notification of an employee’s termination. He indicated some departments simply quit paying the employee in HRS, but do not send in the Separation Sheet. Recommendation 10: A better means of ensuring departments complete the Separation Sheets for terminated employees needs to be developed. (Failure to do so could result in UK paying higher software fees.) Recommendation 11: A process should be implemented to delete terminated employees from the UK email directory on at least a monthly basis, but weekly is preferable. ▪ Kathy H. said our software licensing with Microsoft does not include alumni or retirees. She reported the Alumni Association would like to offer this service to alumni, and they are currently trying to find a vendor to “host” their email site for alumni.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kathy H. indicated IT is in the process of offering Microsoft Exchange to all employees included in the Microsoft

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<p>employee access to email communications.</p>	<p>Software contract. They are going to migrate employees a department at a time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ T. Lynn said we should prohibit hourly employees from reading work-related email at home, due to overtime issues. He indicated we would have to pay them overtime, even if their supervisor had specifically instructed them to NOT read such email at home. Recommendation 12: Communication concerning the email ID requirement should include instruction for hourly employees to not read work-related email during their “off-hours”. ▪ T. Lynn asked, “How do we give access to email to employees, if a computer is not required for their normal job functions? How much time per day do we give employees to check their email?” ▪ Sarah asked, “How do we train employees to use email?” ▪ Phil asked, “What do we do for employees who cannot read? Should the supervisor talk to the employee and relay the information contained in the email? What happens if the supervisor forgets?” ▪ Ren suggested making the department head and/or supervisor responsible for all official communication. Kathy H. indicated she has heard complaints from employees that their supervisors won’t let them have an email ID. Currently, the form requesting an email account has to be signed by the supervisor. ▪ Phil did not think it would be feasible to give employees access to computers, and time to read their email, if it was not part of their normal job functions. ▪ Sarah expressed concern that email not be the only means of communicating information. Kathy H. agreed we can only mandate employees have an email address, but not that all communication be done electronically. ▪ Ren asked if we could limit electronic communication by the level of a person’s position or to only supervisors. Everyone agreed there is not currently any way to identify all supervisors in HRS, as their levels and job titles vary. ▪ Kathy H. stated email allows us to communicate in a more timely fashion, and that it is typically more effective and efficient than paper communication. ▪ Phil thought requiring an email ID was fine, but does not want to be required to provide access (i.e., via public computers). He would like to decide which of his staff should have access to a computer at work to check the email. Phil does not want to have to guarantee all employees so much time each day to read their email. He expressed concern some people may use reading their email as an excuse when they do not complete their work. He will communicate via an alternate method to those who do not have access to a computer. ▪ Kathy H. said an email ID is deleted after 30 days of its user never having logged on to check his/her email. If the user has logged on to the email at least once, but has a period of 90 days in which there has been no email access, the email account is suspended, but not deleted. ▪ Ren asked if there is a UK policy that employees must be listed in the phonebook. T. Lynn said if a person’s job requires the use of a phone, then they must be listed in the phonebook. ▪ T. Lynn said we currently use multiple means of communicating with our employees (i.e., meetings, Communi-K, email, paper, etc.) He indicated email was the most effective means of communicating with large groups of people. He believes we can mandate each employee must have an email ID, but we do not have to guarantee him or her access to a computer during their work time to read the email, as long as they are also given the information in another form. ▪ There was a general discussion of wireless access to email. ▪ Jayna asked how we are currently handling communication with employees who do not normally work with computers. Phil said they normally stick the document in an envelope with the person’s paycheck. He indicated most of his employees do not read these documents in the office, but rather when they’re off work. ▪ Sarah reported they frequently have meetings with large groups of employees to discuss memos sent to the employees.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kathy Johnson said Toyota also communicates with their employees via closed circuit TV. ▪ Kathy H. said the current policy for employees to voluntarily provide their email ID to the UK directory needs to be changed. She said IT would soon be able to “harvest” the email address if we wish, so the employee does not have to provide the information on a voluntary basis. ▪ T. Lynn asked if we had checked to see if our benchmarks have a policy requiring all employees to have an email ID. Kathy H. and Jayna were not aware of such information for our benchmarks. Ren also suggested asking Gartner for their information on other universities’ policies in these areas. Kathy said her understanding is other institutions require email IDs for employees “down to a certain level” in the organization, then the other employees are either prohibited from having the access, or it is optional for them. ▪ There was a general discussion of how/if UK’s top administration would support this new policy. Given the President’s desire to improve communication with employees and his focus on workforce development, we think this policy will be viewed as a positive step. ▪ Kathy H. stated providing an email ID to all employees would generally be viewed as a benefit to the employees, since most would have to pay for such access if the University does not provide it. ▪ T. Lynn stated the only legal concern UK might have, is if the policies noted above disproportionately affect a minority group. However, we could legally say only employees at a certain level have an email ID. ▪ T. Lynn recommended that higher-level administrators make a decision on what level of access UK needs to provide to its employees to read email. ▪ Ren suggested that Phase I of this policy change could be providing the email IDs, and subsequent phases could focus on provision of public computers and other technical solutions for employees who do not normally use computers in their work. ▪ Phil indicated he did not think we could mandate that employees only check their email on their breaks. ▪ T. Lynn was also concerned about the time it would take some employees to get to a public computer, aside from the time it would take for them to actually read their email. He supported leaving the decision on the primary means of communication to the supervisors. ▪ <u>Recommendation 13:</u> While electronic communication is more efficient than paper communication, UK cannot solely rely on electronic communication. Others means of communicating with employees who do not have access to a computer or are unable to read should be developed. ▪ <u>Recommendation 14:</u> Supervisors should be responsible for determining what the official means of communicating with their employees should be. Use of individual or group meetings, bulletin board postings and/or inserting documents in paycheck or direct deposit envelopes are possible means to supplement electronic communication as needed. ▪ <u>Recommendation 15:</u> All employee email IDs should be in the UK email directory; this should not be a voluntary process. The employees should only be responsible for “forwarding” their email to a different email address if they wish. ▪ <u>Recommendation 16:</u> Higher-level administrators need to define what responsibility departments have to supply access to computers for employees, and when this access should be available. ▪ <u>Recommendation 17:</u> If email access to all employees is mandated by the University’s administration, then some method for training employees to read their email must be established. ▪ <u>Recommendation 18:</u> Training and/or documentation must be developed to instruct employees how to forward

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>their email to another address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ T. Lynn said that if/when the policy is approved, we could communicate the new email ID policy at employee orientation, and other normal channels. ▪ Kathy gave a brief update on a current IT project that will allow us to “mask” the employee’s actual email address, and it will only show a uky.edu email address in the directory.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of who will have access to the UK email directory and the ability to do mass mailings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kathy H. said we do not want the “outside world” to get our email IDs, and we need to limit junk mail. ▪ Jayna indicated the Medical Center centrally controls who can send out mass mailings, and recommended a similar policy for the Lexington Campus. Recommendation 19: In order to protect the UK email directory and control the mass email mailings, UK should appoint one office to process requests for mass email mailings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION: We need to determine the process for assigning email IDs to all of the current employees. ▪ ACTION: Jayna will get the next meeting scheduled. (See below.) ▪ ACTION: T. Lynn will ask Mary Carol to send out a reminder about the next meeting. ▪ ACTION: Kathy H. will establish a listserv for this committee. (Completed 6/5/02.) ▪ ACTION: T. Lynn will check with UK’s benchmarks to see if they have a similar email ID policy, and if so, how they implemented it. ▪ T. Lynn indicated switching from paper to electronic communication should not require any changes to the Administrative or Governing Regulations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEXT MEETING 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Originally scheduled for 6/18/02 at 10:00 in 230B McVey Hall. However, it was subsequently postponed until 7/10/02 at 2:30 in 230B McVey Hall.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •