

UCF Faculty Senate
Information Technology Committee

Minutes of **February 3, 2020**
Business Administration I, room 230A

Melanie Guldi, chair, called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. The roll was called orally.

In Attendance: Thad Andeson, Anya Andrews, Lee Dotson, James Gallo, Sandra Galura, Steffen Guenzel, Melanie Guldi (Senate Liaison), Joseph Harrington (Stering Liason), Athena Hoepfner, Viatcheslav Kokoouline, Matthew Nobles, JP Peters (ex officio), and Francisca Yonekura (ex officio).

Minutes: Motions and second made to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2020 meeting. The minutes were approved.

Chair Announcement: The committee voted electronically on 1/29/2020 regarding on amendments to the Resolution regarding broadcast and no-reply E-mail and amendments to the Resolution regarding E-mail for separated employees. The committee voted in favor in each case.

Old Business

- We discussed **cloud storage** (e.g. dropbox, google drive, one drive) and UCF's **data classification policy**. Currently one drive is the only UCF sanctioned cloudstorage. JP Peters provided an update from UCF IT. He indicated that there was a meeting last week regarding dropbox to explore adding it as an additional sanctioned provider. [A sanctioned cloud storage provider is one that UCF sanctions for restricted and highly restricted data to be stored via their service.] Second, JP said that there are ongoing discussions with UCF's Information Security Office (ISO) regarding a matrix that conveniently explains what level of data restriction applies to different categories of data, as well as the recommended storage instruction for each type of data. They are also working revising the policy to provide additional clarity. The committee asked about Google Drive and whether it is also being considered. Currently UCF is not in discussions, but the committee also raised the point that google docs are integrated with Canvas, so to some degree it is sanctioned by UCF. Another committee member asked whether employees could be given permission to install applications (like dropbox) if, under the new policy, these applications are ok to use as long as no restricted data are stored. JP indicated it should be ok once this application is sanctioned. Last, JP suggested we invite Chris Vakhordjian from ISO to one of our upcoming meetings for further discussion on data/IT security. JP also indicated he would email us with information about Google Drive for our next meeting.
- Next, we tabled our discussion of the Mission of the IT committee, which we will discuss next time.

New Business

- We discussed **Linux and current faculty email**. Joseph Harrington led this discussion and stated that accessing email is challenging. Athena Hoepfner indicated that there are also operation issues, for example when open source software (like Coral) cannot be used due to the lack of support/access to Linux. Committee members suggested that it might be good to have a matrix to help faculty & staff to understand what the best path is under given circumstances (or an FAQ: If you want to do x, you could consider y1, y2, or y3.) JP indicated that the best solution might also be 3rd party in some cases. Joseph Harrington agreed that it might be good for people to realize you don't always have to do everything on your own. JP said that the Business

Relationship Manager (BRM) is a good point of contact for these types of questions. The committee indicated that it is not straightforward to find/determine who this person is. JP indicated that general IT questions bubble up to the BRM when they are not easily solved by the general service response (IT Support Center). The committee also indicated that it would be good to have a matrix of the type of problems that would be good to get in touch with the BRM. **Regarding Linux on a desktop**-JP indicated that email can be accessed via webmail and evolution (clients currently supported by UCF IT), but that POP and iMap protocols were being deprecated by Microsoft (our university email provider), which could raise issues going forward. He suggested Chris Vakhordjian (ISO) would be a good person to ask about the particulars, including issues related to security of email. The committee said that all emails are public record, so the issue may be different for email. Joseph Harrington asked about any alternatives to evolution, as evolution had been very buggy in the past. Joseph Harrington also agreed to draft a resolution regarding Linux and email access for our upcoming meeting and we agreed that the operational issues raised by Athena should be a part of a different (future) resolution.

Other Business

- None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:59 pm.

1 **Resolution 2019-2020-20 Automatic and Broadcast Email**
2

3 **Whereas**, it is sometimes necessary for recipients of automatically generated email messages
4 to obtain additional information before responding or taking the action requested in the
5 message, and
6

7 **Whereas**, some automatically generated messages do not provide a means of obtaining more
8 information, and some do not even identify the actual sender or responsible office, requiring
9 faculty to spend time seeking the appropriate contact information, and
10

11 **Whereas**, some faculty may wish to receive certain non-critical broadcast information that
12 other faculty may not wish to receive, such as announcements of certain types of events, health
13 advice, and topical news, and
14

15 **Whereas**, the volume of non-critical broadcast messages is now sufficient to make a more
16 efficient way to manage subscriptions desirable; therefore
17

18 **BE IT RESOLVED** that UCF Policy 4-006.2 “Broadcast Distribution of Electronic Mail” be
19 amended as follows:
20

21 At the end of the “Procedure” section on page 3 add the following:
22

23 *Each broadcast or automatically generated message shall include the name, position, and*
24 *contact information of the person responsible for broadcasting the message and, if*
25 *different, an actively monitored email address for responses including questions about the*
26 *message’s content.*
27

28 **Be it Further Resolved**, that all public, non-essential broadcast lists, such as health advice and
29 departmental public newsletters, must include a method to opt in and opt out. UCF IT, in
30 conjunction with other relevant parties, shall explore approaches and implement an opt-
31 in/opt-out tool, such as a dashboard in my.ucf.edu.

Approved by the Information Technology Committee on January 29, 2020.

1 **Resolution 2019-2020-21 University Email Access for Faculty**
2 **Leaving the University**

3
4 **Whereas**, a faculty member’s scholarship, teaching, and community and professional service
5 are life-long efforts that transcend employers, and

6
7 **Whereas**, access to colleagues through email is critical to a faculty member’s execution of these
8 missions, especially given the permanence of email addresses on published research articles
9 and elsewhere, and

10
11 **Whereas**, a permanent forwarding address for separated faculty (including researchers) is
12 standard practice at most US research universities, and

13
14 **Whereas**, the competitiveness of UCF in attracting top-quality faculty depends on facilitating
15 an individual’s life-long missions in scholarship, teaching, and service, and

16
17 **Whereas**, colleagues and administrators at UCF have an interest in maintaining contact with a
18 separated colleague to conduct research, transfer grants, transfer knowledge from the former
19 employee to UCF, and for many other reasons, and

20
21 **Whereas**, there are no mechanisms in place or available to advise every interested party of the
22 new email address of a separated employee, therefore

23
24 **BE IT RESOLVED** that:

25
26 Faculty members who separate from the university shall be allowed the following:

- 27 1. At the former employee's option, one of the following actions:
28 a. forwarding of email sent to the university email address(es) they were known by to
29 an address of the employee's choosing, forwarding to a Knights email address, or
30 b. an auto-reply to senders indicating a change of address, or
31 c. discarding all messages.

32 The action must be maintained by the Administration for two academic years after
33 the academic year of termination. The former employee may opt to change actions
34 during this time.

- 35 2. Access to or copies of all the email sent to the former employee's UCF accounts and still
36 stored on UCF servers, as tagged and organized into folders by the employee, in an open
37 standard format that can be read by standard email client software. Also, all contacts,
38 calendar entries, files, and other information stored by the employee on UCF servers or
39 on computing hardware provided for the former employee's use by UCF, except for
40 information the former employee may no longer legally access, due to confidentiality,
41 privacy, license, or similar reasons. Data related to the former employee’s non-academic
42 functions (e.g., staff or administrative work) is excluded. The former employee must
43 specifically identify the material to be given and provide the storage media to be used or
44 access to online storage outside UCF that will receive the data. At UCF's option, the

45 former employee may be required to do the copying themselves and within a
46 reasonable time.

47 The Provost or President may restrict or alter a former employee's access to protect the
48 interests of the university. In such cases, the reason, manner, and duration of restriction must
49 be written and reported to the former employee. Such cases should be rare. A summary report
50 of the number, nature, and reasons for such restrictions in the past academic year shall be
51 delivered within 60 days after the end of the academic year to the Chair of the Faculty Senate
52 Personnel Committee.

53 Since the Collective Bargaining Agreement preempts the Resolution process, the
54 Administration may, at their option, restrict the access of groups of faculty whose post-
55 employment email access is covered in the Collective Bargaining Agreement to the rights
56 negotiated therein, without restricting the access of other groups.

Approved by the Information Technology Committee on January 29, 2020.