1. Approval of November 2019 Minutes – approved

2. Action Item Follow-up

3. Informational Items:
   a. Software Finding Application Project (Tito)
      Tuan Bui presented an update on a software finding application project. The goal is to provide campus-wide visibility to software that is currently in use on campus. License and purchase information about the software will be included. It will enable software purchasers (e.g. PIs) to communicate, collaborate, and coordinate when making decisions about software purchases. The project timeline is:
      
      Phase 1, 2020: Visibility for purchased and developed software
      Phase 2, Jan 2021-June 2021 – Develop communication and collaboration mechanism
      Phase 3, June 2021 – December 2021 – Expanded rollout to campus, PIs and non-PIs
      
      Tito advised the initial work has been focused on identifying all databases, licenses, and software available across main and HSC campuses.

   b. APLU Public Data Availability Meeting (Patrick)
      About a week before the end of winter break, APLU sent an e-mail requesting information for the February 2020 APLU meeting. This is a follow-up to last year’s meeting discussing best practices for managing and sharing publicly available data as outlined by federal guidelines. One representative from each university will attend the February meeting. Jon Wheeler will attend for UNM and update the committee at the March meeting.

   c. Electronic Research Administration Working Group
      The working group has been identified to evaluate UNM’s requirements for electronic research administration software to inform RFP development. This group will complete an initial assessment on RFP responses. The working group’s charge and membership was provided to the committee and will be included in the January minutes. Once the evaluation and a proposal are completed, given the size of the
purchase, it will be reviewed by the advisory boards, finance, VPR, and controller’s office and then will likely be sent to the Regents for review. It is expected additional funding relative to the current cost for Cayuse will be needed.

Duane asked if the committee has evaluated the HSC system, Click. Patrick confirmed that Naren has met with HSC and an evaluation of Click will be included in the review. Patrick outlined the pros for staying with Cayuse are its affordability relative to other options and the cost of transitioning to a new system. Cayuse is in the process of developing a new product that will not be compatible with the existing system. Given the limitations of the current version of Cayuse and the likelihood of a significant transition even if UNM elected to continue using Cayuse, it makes sense to complete a more comprehensive evaluation of other options.

Sylvia asked if there is a need for an internal system to track proposal submissions. In addition to proposal development, Cayuse allows for tracking of approvals, integration with IRB, compliance, budget, and reporting functions. The ability to consistently track and have visibility into sponsored project work is also useful for deans, department chairs and other administrators who oversee research activities. Duane suggested asking Rosa to add a brief statement about the needs for a research administration system. This will help contextualize the project as it is reviewed by other groups. The committee agreed this would be useful. Grace advised the committee will also add a timeline and preliminary assessment to the charge documents at their next meeting. Even if advisory in nature, Duane suggested including someone from HSC who is familiar with their system; this may provide opportunities to leverage economies of scale and process efficiencies with the selected tool. Laura recommended Stacy with HSC Sponsored Projects whose role is equivalent to Rosa’s.

Cayuse currently costs around $150K, and the contract is up in 15-16 months. The basic version of Click is $250K. This process is expected to move quickly given the short timeline for selecting and rolling out a new system before the Cayuse contract is up. Given the length of the current contract and time to implementation, Duane recommended a proposal be developed to include in the FY21 budget request. Tito asked about evaluating how much of the reporting functions available in these systems is being used. Patrick and Karl advised the reporting functions in Cayuse are less than optimal. The estimates above are for a basic system. Bringing together the tracking needs of IRB, OSP, finance, compliance, budgeting for all sources (NIH, NSA, private, etc.) would require a more comprehensive system which should be considered as part of the evaluation process.

**Action Item:** Grace will ask Rosa to add a needs statement to the committee’s charge document.

**Action Item:** Laura will facilitate requesting Stacy participate in the committee.

4. **Decision Items:**
   a. **Walk Through Strategic Tab of Campus Research Computing Capability Tool (Patrick, Grace)**
The worksheet was provided to the committee in advance of today’s meeting. The other tabs Researcher, Data, Software, and System will be completed by the subcommittees.

The committee completed portions of the Strategy and Policy Facing tab. The remaining questions for this section will be completed by the strategic working group. All responses will be reviewed at the February meeting.

**Action Item:** Committee members who would like to participate in completing the Strategy and Policy Facing tab should e-mail Patrick and Grace.

Duane advised that UNM IT has a research technology partnership with New Mexico Tech and New Mexico State. This is in part how ABQG, the Western Regional Network and Argon as networking projects were developed. This may be worth exploring as a future meeting topic to look at areas for expansion of this multi-institutional partnership.

**Action Item:** Duane will coordinate with Patrick, New Mexico Tech, and New Mexico State to discuss the existing research technology partnership at a future meeting.

i. Assign Remaining Campus Research Computing and Capabilities Sections to Working Groups – completed above

5. Security Updates (Jeff Gassaway)
   a. Policy Related Issues for Privacy and Security
      Jeff advised a high-level draft policy and program has been developed to address privacy and security issues. It was based on the practices from a review of 20 institutions. It will be reviewed by the advisory boards and then presented to senior leadership. They have worked with HSC in development of the policy. Their goal is to have approval by July 1.

      **Action Item:** Draft policy will be provided to this committee.

      Jeff advised that tactical security issues were discussed with senior leadership. Based on that meeting, senior leadership has requested a formal proposal for addressing concerns raised. Jeff and Brian discussed the incident that necessitated the banner that was added to e-mails on an emergency basis. The malware that impacted Highlands with a 3-week shutdown was found on UNM e-mail threads. Virus software was not picking this up so it did necessitate an emergency response. Based on feedback, IT is evaluating adapting the message to allow viewing on phones and adding additional users to white-lists. Duane expects to have a broad communication in January or February around the approach for mitigating phishing. Duane advised that new students are the largest group that get phished. Senior leadership is supportive of proposed training to prevent users from being phished.

      The committee expressed concerns that users will start to ignore the banner. Brian, Duane, and Jeff agreed the banner is one part of a broader solution. Brian discussed they are looking at 3rd party filtering tools that find spam, phishing, malware, etc.; the challenge with implementation is that it can quarantine e-mails that shouldn’t be quarantined. Brian discussed MFA; the challenge with MFA is legacy and Android
clients that don’t support MFA. Single sign-on with one point of authentication is also being reviewed. Single sign-on with MFA is the most effective approach. Denial at the edge is another tool being explored. IT will fund the 1st year of training. Recurring funding needs to be identified. The approach will be that all current students, faculty, and staff will complete a training. After the initial training, any new students, faculty, or staff will complete a training. Some ongoing training will be needed, but the right balance for refresher training versus yearly training will be determined after initial roll-out. Duane asked the committee to support all the mitigation and training initiatives and help the campus community understand the importance of these controls. He also asked the committee to provide and encourage others to provide input that helps improve the effectiveness of these efforts. Grace said the VPR requested the banner be changed to an image so it could be removed when replying to colleagues; the challenge with this approach is Outlook defaults are set to not download images. While Duane appreciates concerns expressed about how external users may perceive the banner, he expects this type of preventative measure to become more common across higher education institutions.

6. Open Floor/Announcements
7. Meeting Adjourned – 10:30 am

Next Meeting:  
*February 19, 2020, 9-10:30 am, Scholes Hall, Roberts Room*
The University of New Mexico (UNM) Research Information Technology Advisory Board hereby initiates the formation of an ad hoc Subcommittee on Electronic Research Administration for Evaluation and Recommendation of a Research Proposal Submission System. The purpose of the Subcommittee is to assess institutional needs in this area and evaluate on a needs vs features basis both UNM’s current Cayuse SP and 424 systems and determine whether there is sufficient need for recommending a new proposal submission and/or management system. The report may include recommendations for improving the current system or a proposal for acquiring a new proposal submission system.

**Background and History of Current System**

The current Cayuse proposal submission system was adopted and implemented at UNM in 2012 and has been continuously revised and improved at UNM since then.

- FSM and OSP re-engineered the Cayuse deployment from the ground up in 2016 to better meet the needs of the UNM research community. This effort took about 2 years from inception to completion.
- In 2017 OSP/FSM rolled out the Sponsored Research Portal, a reporting interface, that contains up to date information that PIs and departments can use to run reports on proposals, awards, expenditures, and F&A generated on each sponsored project.
- From 2014 to present
  - Actively participated in Cayuse Change Advisory Board (CAB) to influence their product direction for UNM’s needs.
  - After 5 years of engagement, Cayuse is extremely slow in addressing current concerns and their product road map is still not in alignment with UNM’s needs. In addition, Cayuse’s customer service has deteriorated over the years.

**Gaps with Current System**

- Cayuse424 does not always align well with grants.gov solicitation and does not currently consider the difference between errors and warnings. This makes it difficult for OSP personnel and proposal authors to assess the risk of a proposal being returned without review or submitting ill-formatted proposals that are unlikely to be funded.
- Cayuse lacks high-quality, customizable reporting that makes it difficult, for example, to generate reports on all proposals with cost share or for PIs to monitor expenditures and encumbrances on awards. Because of this, UNM has developed custom reporting systems, and each custom report requires significant development effort by UNM personnel.
- Lack of customizability, flexibility, and integration with other systems
  - Cayuse lacks flexibility in the definition of proposal submission workflows
Cayuse does not support needed UNM custom fields for, for example, tracking CUI compliance, Cost share, Data Management plans, and other needs

- Cayuse has limited security roles and administrative capabilities
- Cayuse provides no integration capabilities between Banner and Cayuse, complicating the transition from pre-award to post-award

- Cayuse has offered minimal support for data migration, either to other systems or potential new versions of Cayuse. This complicated the deployment of Cayuse at UNM and has made it UNM’s previous proposal submission system transition incurred significant transition disruptions and costs, and the costs of any potential next transition must be properly managed and minimized.
- Cayuse offers limited training support for OSP personnel and proposal authors. As a result, both deploying the system and training new OSP personnel and new proposal authors on best practices in using the system is cumbersome.

**Charge to the Subcommittee:**

The Advisory Board hereby charges the Subcommittee to prepare a report for the Advisory Board in support of improving the current proposal submission system or acquiring a new system. Specifically, the Subcommittee shall:

1. Identify the relevant UNM needs in this area to support the creation of a Request for Proposals (RFP) by UNM Purchasing by:
   a. Assessing UNM’s needs for proposal submission and contract/grant management software as determined by members of the subcommittee
   b. Identifying gaps in UNM’s current Cayuse-based systems to meet these needs
   c. Identifying alternative systems that may potentially meet UNM electronic research administration needs and their capabilities

2. Evaluate high-level capabilities of responses to the RFP by performing an in-depth assessment of the features, functionality, and costs of responses to the RFP. This assessment should include both one-time acquisition/transition/training costs and recurring costs to the institution which form the basis of a Request for Proposal (RFP).

The subcommittee shall present reports of the needs assessment and evaluation of RFP responses to the following:

- The Research IT Advisory Board
- The Administrative Advisory Board
- The Vice President for Research, Associate Vice President for Research and the Assistant Vice President for Research
- The University Controller

**Subcommittee Membership: (see appendix for list of names)**

Below is the cross-campus and cross-discipline representation by department.

- Representative from the Office of Sponsored Projects,
• Representative from Contract & Grant Accounting,
• Representative from the Faculty Research Development Office,
• Representatives from the Major Colleges; Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, College of Education, Anthropology, and Center for Water Resource,
• Representative from Financial Services IT,
• Representative from UNM Purchasing,
• Representative from IT Applications,
• Representative from the Office the Vice President for Research- Project Manager

Activities of the Subcommittee:

The Subcommittee is requested to provide:
1. A timeline to the board with the time it will take to accomplish the charge at February RIT Board Meeting.
2. Thereafter, monthly progress update to the board.

Subsequently, the Subcommittee is requested to present to the Administrative Advisory Board to ensure alignment with institutional infrastructure. The Research Advisory will make final recommendations and the Chair will present to the Executive IT Leadership for final approval.
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