



Minutes

07/10/02 -- 230B McVey Hall -- 10:00 AM

ATTENDEES: Darwin Allen, Nick Arnold, Jayna Cheesman, Toni Graham (for Pat Blair), Kathy Hamperian, Phil Latiff, Lee Meyer, Sarah Nikirk, Ed Tiemeyer 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"> ▪ New members were introduced.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 distributed information at this meeting on faculty and staff email ID policies at our benchmarks. These handouts included "Universities' Email Policies and Practices", information from the University of Georgia's web site www.emailinfo.uga.edu, and information from the University of Iowa's web site www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual. Policies varied according to which employees are required to have email IDs, if electronic communication is the only form required for official institutional communication, if email usage is monitored and time allocated for reading email.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussion of issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nick indicated a concern if all staff have email IDs that some employees may circumvent departmental procedures and send email directly to individuals. For example, there is a structured process for initiating job orders in the Physical Plant Division, but some people may send a request via email directly to a building operator, and bypass the normal procedures. Also, he is concerned about people responding promptly to email messages. ▪ Phil said we have similar issues with people placing a phone call directly to someone and/or leaving a voice message, and people returning the calls promptly. ▪ T. Lynn stated Human Resources is probably one of the biggest users of paper and electronic communication, particularly with our retirees (about 2,500).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief review of recommendations from previous meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion on which employees should be covered by this policy. ▪ Recommendation 1: The policy requiring an email ID should be for both faculty and staff. ▪ Recommendation 2: The policy should cover regular and temporary employees. ▪ Recommendation 3: The policy should apply to full-time, part-time and half-time employees. ▪ Recommendation 4: The policy should apply to STEPS employees. ▪ Recommendation 5: The policy should include post-docs. ▪ Recommendation 6: The policy should include the house staff. ▪ Recommendation 7: The policy should apply to retirees, if financially viable. ▪ Discussion of process to create email IDs. ▪ 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.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Discussion of how to handle terminated and retired employees. ▪ 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. ▪ Discussion of employee access to email communications. ▪ Recommendation 12: Communication concerning the email ID requirement should include instruction for hourly employees to not read work-related email during their “off-hours”. ▪ Recommendation 13: 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. ▪ Recommendation 14: 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. ▪ Recommendation 15: 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. ▪ Recommendation 16: Higher-level administrators need to define what responsibility departments have to supply access to computers for employees, and when this access should be available. ▪ Recommendation 17: 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. ▪ Recommendation 18: Training and/or documentation must be developed to instruct employees how to forward their email to another address. ▪ Discussion of who will have access to the UK email directory and the ability to do mass mailings. ▪ 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"> • Discussion of new directory project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kathy reported the goal of this project is for everyone to have a directory address (like Kathy.Hamperian@xxx.uky.edu) that is easily recognized by users (English-like), but there could be any email address behind that directory address. Creation of this directory record would not mean the person has an email address. However, this directory record would give you the ability to do remote access and download software (like U-Connect account). ▪ Kathy and Jayna also discussed another phase of this project, which will be to develop some efficient means for creating electronic email groups/lists. (This would be analogous to creating labels for mailings based on some set of defined criteria.) They asked the committee members to identify some of the criteria they would use to select a group of email addresses. For example, would we need to select based on title and/or rank and/or college and/or department? Kathy and Jayna have been asked to create another committee to define these criteria. (See further discussion of this committee below.)

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a general discussion on the problems associated with selecting an electronic email group based on the existing elements in HRS. For example, there is currently no element in HRS that identifies all supervisors or all directors, etc. HR only knows that a position is a supervisory position based on the information they receive from the departments on the position requisition. However, this “supervisor” flag is not in HRS, but in a database within HR. ▪ Nick said he thought people ought to be able to say they do not want to receive email via an electronic email list. Kathy discussed the “privacy flag” in SIS, and how that flag is used to ensure students names and addresses are not printed in the UK directories. However, the “privacy flag” being activated would not keep the student from receiving official mail/email from the University. She indicated the institution needs to balance privacy regulations in FERPA with the need to serve the students. ▪ T. Lynn said he knew of one staff member who had requested their information not appear in the UK directories. He told the person it was part of their job to be available for communication with other staff, so they had to be in the directory. ▪ Phil asked if employees who do not use computers as part of their job could indicate they do not want their email address published in the directories, or receive email via an electronic distribution list. T. Lynn said some benchmarks do not give the employees a choice; everyone must have an email ID to which all official communication is sent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of problems with termination data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lee asked if we could send something to the department heads if their employees were not paid for two consecutive pay periods. T. Lynn said some employees are “seasonal” and may legitimately go months without working, but we do not terminate these employees. For example, Athletics has many such employees. T. Lynn said we have to terminate employees at a minimum on the fiscal year (June 30). ▪ T. Lynn said there are hundreds, if not thousands, of employees who remain in active assignments, but have no hours reported in HRS. We are in violation of federal law if we do not do separation sheets on these people when they have really terminated, and notify the terminated employees of their rights and responsibilities for benefits, etc. In particular, COBRA gives them the right to continue their health insurance for a period of time. ▪ Kathy said there is a way to suspend email accounts if they have not been used for 18 months.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miscellaneous personnel issues with requiring all staff to have an email ID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ T. Lynn indicated the supervisors and managers would need to make sure hourly employees know they will not be paid overtime for reading email. ▪ There was a general discussion of what would be involved in providing “public access” workstations for people to view their email. Kathy indicated U-Connect is a web-based system, and therefore could require a low-end device for access. However, because of the email attachments that are possible, it would need the software for those attachments on the public workstation, in order for the employee to be able to open the attachment. For example, WORD software would need to be on the workstation in order for the employee to open a WORD attachment to their email. ▪ Lee said some employees may want to print their email, and asked if we should offer this ability. Maybe we should give employees the ability to request a printed copy of official publications, like the Staff Handbook. Kathy warned that “free” printing can be abused, and gave some information on the usage of “free” printing in the student micro labs and how the volume of printing had dropped dramatically since instituting the pay-for-print service for students. ▪ Ed expressed concern about giving STEPS employees an email ID, and the impact on Marilyn Szczygielski’s work. Kathy said she does not think assigning an email ID will change the operators’ database (AMCOM), but doesn’t know how it might affect the phone book publication. ACTION: Ed will talk to Marilyn Szczygielski about the current process used to update the operator’s database and create the phone book. He will determine which staff are included in both (i.e. regular/temporary, full-time/part-time).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was suggested “Managers and supervisors can choose when it is appropriate for their staff to read work-related

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<p>modifications to above recommendations</p>	<p>email during work hours.” should be added to Recommendation 12. Nick expressed concern the change could create inequities between staff and departments. Phil said there are already other possibilities of such inequities. Nick suggested it would be best to leave Recommendation 12 in its original form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said the main problem would arise if the supervisor chooses not to communicate official information in another way (than email), but does not give their employees time during work to read this email. ▪ Ed said it’s important to distinguish between “work-related” email versus “university-related” email. T. Lynn said he would define “work-related” as that which you require to do your job. “University-related” is of general interest to all UK faculty, staff and students, or large sub-groups of the community. ▪ Kathy stated the University is moving to more self-service applications for HR (i.e., changing benefits, etc.), and that requiring an email ID is the first step in this process. T. Lynn said they receive about 10,000 employment applications electronically per month, and only about 200 paper applications per month. ▪ Sarah suggested we add Recommendation 20 to acknowledge we are moving in this direction (of self-service applications). Recommendation 20: In an effort to improve institutional efficiency and enhance services to all faculty and staff, the University should take the necessary steps to create self-service applications where feasible. ▪ Lee suggested changing Recommendation 13 to “UK cannot solely rely on electronic communication at this time, but expects the dependence on electronic communication to increase. The University should develop a strategy to provide universal electronic access.” ▪ Darwin suggested our recommendations should include a deadline for their implementation. Everyone agreed. Jayna said Kathy (who had to leave the meeting a few minutes earlier), would need to be consulted before a deadline is established. Kathy can provide input on any technical issues that would affect reaching any target deadlines/goals. ▪ Lee suggested our core recommendations should include Recommendation 8 and Recommendation 15, where Recommendations 2 – 7 detail the employees to which the other recommendations apply. All remaining recommendations concern the implementation of the above three recommendations. ▪ Nick suggested we add another recommendation. Recommendation 21: “Faculty and staff will be responsible for reading all email concerning the policy and procedures of the University.” T. Lynn suggested using some of the analogous verbiage from the Iowa or Georgia policies. ▪ Lee suggested prefacing our recommendations with “In order to accomplish these goals (i.e. complete and timely communication, improved efficiency, reduced costs, consistent with the President’s philosophy of openness and transparency), we recommend: #8, #15 and #21.... In order to implement our core recommendations expeditiously and to capture the benefits and avoid negative consequence, we offer the following recommendations: rest of recommendations plus target deadline. ▪ Jayna reported Doyle Friskney’s target deadlines for completion of Phase I and II of the directory project discussed above are 12/02 and 08/03 respectively. Jayna indicated Phase I covers developing the “English-like names” for directory entries Kathy noted above, and Phase II the ability to easily create electronic email groups/listings. Darwin reminded everyone open enrollment for benefits is in 04/03. He suggested this would be a good opportunity to do a mass email in 01/03 to all faculty and staff to let them know to respond if they wish to receive the benefits information electronically, otherwise we would send paper. That way, HR will know how many copies of the benefits information needs to be printed in 02/03. Or, T. Lynn said we could ask them to contact us only if they wanted a printed copy. ▪ Jayna raised the issue of who would do training for employees who have never used email before, and/or those who will

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>need to forward their email to a different address. T. Lynn said HR would provide a “train the trainer” approach, where HR would do the initial training of departmental staff that would be responsible for training all others in their areas. T. Lynn indicated the Vice Presidents and Provost, or others they delegate, could decide who would provide training in their areas. Lee indicated he felt the supervisors should know who would require training within their areas.</p> <p><u>ACTION:</u> HR will provide training in a “train the trainer” approach on the use of email.</p> <p><u>ACTION:</u> IT will provide information on the process to forward email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>ACTION:</u> Jayna will develop a separate document with the formal recommendations as indicated above.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New committee to create selection criteria for email groups/listings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>ACTION:</u> Committee members should send Jayna any suggestions for employees who would be helpful serving on the committee to develop the criteria for creation of email groups/listings. ▪ Sarah volunteered to serve on this committee. Suggestions were made to have the following people included in this committee: Kelley Bozeman (Public Relations), John Sampson (Benefits), Bob Fehr (Agriculture), Susan Sponcil (Agriculture), Brenda Stamper (Post Office), Scott Wood (Payroll), James Patterson (Hospital Payroll), Diane Gagel (MCIS), and Ren Bates (LCC). We also will need representatives from the Registrar’s Office, Graduate School and research areas. <u>ACTION:</u> Jayna will ask the Data Stewards for representatives to serve on the committee to develop the criteria for creation of email groups/listings, particularly in the Registrar’s Office, Graduate School and research areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>ACTION:</u> We need to determine the process for assigning email IDs to all of the current employees. ▪ <u>ACTION:</u> T. Lynn will ask Mary Carol to send out a reminder about the next meeting. ▪ <u>ACTION:</u> Formal recommendations will be presented to the Data Stewards meeting on August 20, 2002.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEXT MEETING 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/1/02 at 1:30 in 230B McVey Hall.