



Minutes

08/01/02 -- 230B McVey Hall -- 1:30 PM

**ATTENDEES:** Darwin Allen, Andrew Blues (for Nick Arnold), Jayna Cheesman, Herman Collins (for John Tibe), Dave Elbon, Toni Graham (for Pat Blair), Kathy Hamperian, Phil Latiff, Lee Meyer, Ed Tiemeyer and T. Lynn Williamson

**PRESIDING:** T. Lynn Williamson

**PROJECT COORDINATOR:** Jayna Cheesman

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of draft recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>T. Lynn gave Jayna a copy of the draft recommendations with his suggested modifications.</li> <li>T. Lynn suggested making the first page of the recommendation into a memorandum format.</li> <li>Darwin asked how <b>Recommendation II (i.e. automatically assign an email address to all employees at the time they are hired)</b> would be done. T. Lynn said IT would have to develop a plan to implement this recommendation. Darwin asked if it was technically possible to do it within the requested timeframe of January 2003. Kathy said she believed the technical implementation could be completed by that deadline, and she thought the other aspects of the implementation (public relations campaign, education, etc.) would be more time consuming.</li> <li>Darwin asked how we would implement the recommendation for the retirees, since we cannot force them to use a UK email ID. Kathy indicated that retirees would need to pay an annual \$10 fee under our current contract with Microsoft. Darwin suggested the cost may be a “wash”, if UK covered the annual fee for the retirees and could discontinue much of their first class mailings to the retirees. T. Lynn agreed they should look at that possibility.</li> <li>Lee suggested corresponding with the retirees and asking them to sign a form to indicate they would be willing to accept email as the University’s official means of communication.</li> <li>T. Lynn suggested changing the last sentence in <b>Recommendation B to “Failure to do so could result in significantly higher costs.”</b> There are other possible cost consequences, aside from email licensing issues, primarily due to significant liability issues arising if terminated employees are not promptly notified of their benefits options. Darwin said the issue of the prompt processing of the Separation Sheets for terminated employees is related to the recommendations of this committee, but is also a significant problem that probably needs to be addressed as a separate issue.</li> <li>Darwin indicated that about 50% of the Hospital’s custodial staff are currently Hispanic. He thinks the University will continue to hire more Hispanics, and asked if we could produce Spanish versions of the documents we distribute electronically via email. Kathy said we could, but we would need to look at the cost/benefit of attempting to do so.</li> <li>There was a general discussion between Herman, Lee and Phil about the means of handling electronic communication, and verifying the confirmation of receipt of the original email, and/or receipt of any subsequent responses to the email. Phil said employees must be responsible for checking their email, and we would not necessarily need to be able to identify who has not read and/or responded to an email.</li> <li>T. Lynn asked about how we could get confirmation of who read an official email. Dave said there is no automatic way</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>to confirm who has read an email. Herman said the problem arises when you have multiple email systems involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lee said he sees two categories of communication: 1) information to all employee from Human Resources and 2) personal communication from HR to an individual employee/retiree. The first would not require confirmation, but the second might because of legal issues. T. Lynn said a third category would be communication to designated groups of employees.</li> <li>▪ Darwin asked if we really needed <b>Recommendation IV</b> (i.e. “...employees will be responsible for promptly reading any email they receive concerning the policy and procedures of the University.”). Jayna explained this was added at the last meeting to ensure employees continue to read official correspondence, regardless of its method of delivery. T. Lynn said some correspondence would have to continue to be done by paper (i.e. COBRA) and rely on first class mail.</li> <li>▪ Lee suggested changing <b>Recommendation I</b> to “<b>Email is the primary mechanism for official communication within the University, except for strictly personal communication, and is only supplemented by other forms of official communications as required.</b>”</li> <li>▪ Darwin asked if the University has any liability if we communicate electronically, but the person does not read it in time. Everyone agreed if the communication was critical and time-dependent, alternate forms of communication might be needed, especially for those who do not have easy and timely access to their email. Phil indicated we have always used multiple forms of communication under certain circumstances (i.e. emergency situations).</li> <li>▪ Jayna raised the issue of how and when we will know when an employee is hired in order to create their email address. Do we use the date the individual is notified by the department or HR they have been hired, or the date their information is entered in HRS? Kathy suggested the date of entry into HRS is probably the cleanest. Jayna stated we should reinforce to campus departments the importance of promptly entering data into HRS. T. Lynn said there is no official communication with new employees before they actually start their job and are on campus.</li> <li>▪ T. Lynn asked if everyone still felt the January 2003 deadline was reasonable. Everyone agreed it was, and Kathy suggested <b>Recommendation M</b> start with “<b>The institution should aggressively pursue the development of a project plan that details the communication, education and technical plan. This project plan should be developed in an attempt to fully implement the above recommendations by January 2003.</b>” Following this, the remainder of the original recommendation could be supplied as an example of what we could accomplish if that deadline is met.</li> <li>▪ Jayna asked if we needed to do a Project Request Form (PRF) for any of the technical implementation. Kathy said none of her applications or database personnel would be involved, so no PRF is required. The systems programmers would be the only technical staff involved.</li> <li>▪ T. Lynn recommended the Data Stewards appoint an implementation committee, and that someone from Public Relations should be on the committee.</li> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: Jayna will revise the draft recommendations with the above changes and send them to the members. Committee members will let her know if they have any final corrections. (Revised recommendations sent out on 8/7/02.)</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New committee to create selection criteria for email groups/listings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: 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. (Jayna indicated she had received no additional recommendations for members of this committee.)</b></li> <li>▪ Darwin asked if Mary Margaret Colliver would be doing all of the email lists, or just the “mass” email mailings. Kathy</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>said some of the group email mailings might be delegated further down within the organization, if the mailings go to smaller groups of people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kathy recommended Diane Gagel (LCC) and Cindy Todd (Senate Council) be on this committee.</li> <li>▪ Darwin suggested Jan Bates (Hospital) should participate.</li> <li>▪ Previous suggestions: Sarah Nikirk (Auxiliary Services), Kelley Bozeman (Public Relations), John Sampson (Benefits), Bob Fehr (Agriculture), Susan Sponcil (Agriculture), Brenda Stamper (Post Office), Scott Wood (Payroll), James Patterson (Hospital Payroll), and Ren Bates (LCC). We also will need representatives from the Registrar's Office, Graduate School and research areas. <b>ACTION: 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.</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miscellaneous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jayna asked if this committee's recommendations should be combined with the recommendations from the Student Email ID Requirement Committee. Everyone agreed they should be separate.</li> <li>▪ T. Lynn indicated he would not be at the August Data Stewards meeting when we discuss our recommendations, but he will ask Mary Ferlan to attend for him.</li> <li>▪ The committee members asked if they should attend the August Data Stewards meeting, in case anyone had questions concerning the recommendations. <b>ACTION: Jayna will ask Connie Ray if she wants the committee members to attend the August Data Stewards meeting.</b></li> <li>▪ Members agreed we do not need an additional meeting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other related Action Items</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>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). (Ed sent Jayna an email on 7/29/02: "AMCOM and the paper directory would not be affected by the assignment of email addresses unless the individual departments choose to take the actions to be included in the paper directory that are noted on Pages 74 &amp; 75. Marilyn indicates that many departments choose not to publish every employee's information. Therefore, since the assignment of an email address will not automatically impact AMCOM and the paper directory, my concern for the impact of high volume directory changes is mute.)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: HR will provide training in a "train the trainer" approach on the use of email.</b></li> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: IT will provide information on the process to forward email.</b></li> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: We need to determine the process for assigning email IDs to all of the current employees.</b></li> <li>▪ <b>ACTION: Formal recommendations will be presented to the Data Stewards meeting on August 20, 2002.</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NEXT MEETING</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None required at this time.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>