

**UCF Faculty Senate**  
Information Technology Committee

Minutes of **December 9, 2019**  
Business Administration I, room 230A

Melanie Guldi, chair, called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. The roll was called orally.

**In Attendance:** Mehmet Altin, Dawn Eckhoff, Sandra Galura, Melanie Guldi (Senate Liaison), Joseph Harrington (Steering Liaison), Athena Hoepfner, Pieter Kik, Viatcheslav Kokoouline, Heath Martin, Matthew Nobles, Sumanta Pattanaik, and Michael Sink (ex officio) and Sherry Andrews (guest, General Council).

**Minutes:** Motion and second made to approve the minutes of November 18, 2019. The minutes were approved.

**Old Business**

- E-mail for separated employees – Sherry Andrews from the UCF General Counsel's (GC) office was introduced, and a brief recap of the committee's prior discussion regarding e-mail access, archiving, and forwarding for recently separated faculty followed.

Andrews was asked whether the University could legally offer a longer period of access to e-mail beyond what was guaranteed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). She stated that UFF is the legal entity for bargaining, and UCF cannot extend benefits (i.e., e-mail access) beyond what is collectively bargained. Joseph Harrington suggested that paying more than agreed for contracted services was not a violation of contract per se. Pieter Kik noted that the CBA is a short document and many details of university/faculty relationships are not governed by CBA terms (i.e., offering @ucf.edu e-mail vs @knights.ucf.edu e-mail).

Several committee members identified standards for faculty at other universities to retain e-mail access beyond their date of separation. Andrews stated that the UCF Vice President of IT and UCF GC oppose extending e-mail access beyond separation. Andrews likened UCF faculty to employees for "any other company in the city or state." She cited IT security concerns as a reason for prohibiting permanent access, in addition to UCF accountability for compliance to Sunshine laws, UCF IT costs for data storage, and indeterminate legal authority to possess/access records under subpoena post-separation. Several committee members contrasted faculty roles to that of ordinary employees in a non-university corporate environment.

Andrews reiterated that a six month transition period post-separation is a courtesy to allow departed employees to notify senders of their new contact information. Joseph Harrington identified exceptions for department chairs and other administrators to retain e-mail access indefinitely, and Andrews stated that the GC was unaware of this exception. Several committee members outlined rationales for alternatives to current position, including providing faculty a choice to utilize services or not, or to tailor access to address specific goals, such as forwarding incoming @ucf.edu e-mail to an active account. Discussion of e-mail archiving and Sunshine Law compliance followed, and GC's position is that public records compliance applies only to current employees, while UCF employee e-mails are deleted upon separation.

Pieter Kik asked if the committee were to propose additional access to e-mail through a resolution to the UCF Faculty Senate, what legal hurdles would exist, presuming the Senate and the union are in agreement. Why not 2+ years if 6 months is already a functioning standard? Why not @ucf.edu if @knights is already a functioning standard? Andrews responded that this would require bargaining, and the Union and Board of Trustees (BoT) would need to agree to extend access. The alternative outcome would be an impasse and BoT would need to decide their position.

Several committee members noted that allowing e-mail access makes UCF more competitive in attracting excellent scholars, and that facilitating post-separation e-mail access follows higher ed best practices for many other universities. Andrews then stated that the CBA concerns retiree access but mid-career employees are not specifically addressed, therefore this would be a matter of UCF policy and subject to Faculty Senate processes as well as Microsoft licensing terms.

Joseph Harrington asked how UCF volunteers were categorized regarding @ucf.edu accounts, and suggested that this virtual role could be used as a model for departed employees (entailing access to e-mail, no software licensing).

Further discussion on UCF's reputation from the standpoint of federal granting agencies followed. Examples included NSF not being able to reach a former UCF faculty member after separation, which impacts future awards as well as UCF's external reputation. Melanie Guldi reasserted the need to do e-mail forwarding from an @ucf.edu address to a new/working e-mail address outside the UCF ecosystem. Forwarding would be decoupled from Microsoft software licensing and it would not feature e-mail storage/archiving on a UCF server. However, staff raised the concern that UCF address e-mail forwarding could adversely affect spam reputation scores.

Athena Hoeppner raised analogues to other, external types of continuity IDs (ORCID, etc.) as part of the "digital identity" of scholars employed by UCF. A compromise was suggested involving a forward from @ucf.edu to @knights along with a notification to an external address, to prevent spam score impact. From a technical perspective, is it possible to utilize the accounts licensed from Microsoft in this way?

Questions remaining on this issue: legal implications, licensing implications, implications for interacting with UCF Office of Research regarding grants/awards for separating employees. According to Andrews, CBA seems not to apply to separations for non-retirees, thus non-CBA provisions are a matter of UCF policy. These implications will be investigated by UCF IT. Policies from peer universities will also be researched.

#### **New Business**

- None

#### **Other Business**

- None

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:11 pm.