1. Approval of Minutes – approved with amendments already provided by Grace

2. Action Item Follow-up
   a. NCURA review process (Patrick)
      OSP completed the national Council on Research Administration’s NCURA peer review process. The reviewers met with a variety of ADRs and other groups involved in research at UNM. Patrick and Grace represented this committee. The questions were useful and insightful. The report based on the review will be provided to OSP in January.

   b. Research Infrastructure Requirements Collection Results (Mark and Tito)
      Mark and Tito shared compiled information and results from 4 colleges and 3 centers. This will also be sent to committee members with the draft minutes. Responses did not identify clear priorities that are needed for most areas. Where possible, common needs were aligned with existing infrastructure. Next steps for the committee would be to identify initial action items, form a new committee to formulate an approach, or meet with the other research committees to identify areas of overlap. Mark and Tito recommend working with the other research committees to identify areas of overlap. Duane commented many of the items identified are being worked on in some way. He asked if the committee is looking to identify a cohesive infrastructure that is well understood, well vetted, and specific to research. Patrick commented and others agreed it would be inclusive of research needs, not necessarily specific to research needs only. Mark agreed that some items units are needing are at the initial stage and others are quite robust; the need where services exist is linking units who have needs with services that are available. Karl commented that some items that are needed will require additional funding so existing services can be scaled to meet campus-wide needs. Patrick suggested this item be discussed further after discussing item 3.a.

      **Action Item:** Deirdre will distribute infrastructure subcommittee’s results with this meeting’s minutes before winter break.

3. Informational Items:
   a. Presentation of the Campus Research Computing Capability Tool (Patrick, Grace and Karl)
      This is a tool developed by the research community for institutions to assess research computing maturity on campuses. Areas such as infrastructure, policy, data sharing, software and security are assessed in a detailed way to provide information about capability, maturity and how systematic approaches are in each area. The version
demonstrated at EDUCAUSE could provide useful information from a strategic perspective relative to policy and structure which could guide prioritization of input received from this group’s subcommittees. Patrick proposes some items could be completed as a group or by the subcommittees with a goal to complete all areas by March 2020. This is for internal university purposes to identify gaps both in individual areas and at the institutional level. The information collected may assist with identifying priorities for the subcommittees. This is separate from the DOD CyberSecurity analysis; it might provide some useful input, but the DOD analysis is mostly orthogonal. Mark wanted to confirm this tool will help assess research needs in ways that are different from the activities the subcommittees have been engaged in. Patrick believes this tool will identify large and/or currently unidentified gaps to guide the approach for defining priorities of the subcommittees. It would pull the work of the subcommittees together in a cohesive report. There is no cost to complete the assessment. Karl sees it as a complement to the bottom-up information collected by the subcommittees. While the Research Strategic plan goes through 2020, it is likely updates will be postponed until there is a new VPR and the President’s leadership team has further defined the University’s strategy going forward. Tito asked if the goal is to move all units to the same level or identify activities to prioritize for addressing. Duane commented that having identified priorities will allow IT to support seeking funding for initiatives that will meet broad research needs.

**Action Item** – Grace will send Deirdre the assessment survey tool link to include with the draft minutes that will be sent to the committee.

4. **Decision Items:**
   a. Decide on whether the working groups should be assigned action items to fill out the assessment tool starting January 2020.

   **Decision:** Committee members will review the assessment survey tool, item 3.a., with plans to complete the strategic questions at the January committee meeting. Other areas will be assigned out at the January meeting.

   b. Decide on whether the whole board should fill out the Strategic Initiative & Policy tab of the Campus Research Computing Capability Tool.

   See item 4.a.

   c. Request Approval of Electronic Research Administration Subcommittee

Rosa from OSP had requested input on potential replacements for Cayuse. This committee and others have suggested input from faculty and staff across campus who are involved in research at different levels would be helpful. Patrick worked with Rosa to identify potential committee members, mostly FRSOs, staff from financial services and OSP, and researchers from A&S and Engineering who are heavy users of Cayuse. They will work with Rosa and Naren to identify software to be evaluated further and develop a plan for evaluating the software. Patrick asked if the committee approves the membership and approach for this subcommittee. After the group is approved, Patrick and Grace will work with them to develop the charter. Duane will work with Alesia to have an IT representative work with the committee.
**Decision:** The committee membership and approach approved.

d. **Adjust day/time of 2020 Meetings (Duane)**
   Duane requested the committee move the meeting to another day/time. This year’s capital projects meetings and other financial/budgetary meetings are in conflict with the current day time. The committee agreed to see if the 3rd Wednesday of each month from 9-10:30 will work for the majority of members.

   **Action Item:** Deirdre will survey the committee and based on responses send updated invitations for 2020 or look for a different day/time.

5. **Open Floor**
   - Duane shared an update on the Community Colleges proposal for information technology funding for NM Higher Ed institutions. HED has recommended $25M Higher Education infrastructure technology funding which would result in just under $7M coming to UNM. If funding is approved, the technology advisory boards would be involved in decisions about funding allocations. The request was written to allow flexibility for how each institution would use their funds. Shared initiatives for 4-year institutions could potentially be in the areas of expanding network capabilities across the state and information security.
   - Tito updated the committee that the software finding application project is progressing. They would like to present at the next meeting for input and review timelines for the project.

   **Action Item:** Include in January 2020 agenda.

   - Jeff Gassaway reported the CyberSecurity Maturity Model Certification will be required for DOD contracts. OSP owns most of the processes associated with contracts that would need to meet these requirements. Conversations have been initiated to determine how to meet these compliance requirements and complete a peer assessment to see how mature UNM’s approach is relative to the requirements. Patrick commented that traditional export CUI work is likely to be at level 3. Levels 4 and 5 are substantially more rigorous. The benefit to pursuing level 4 and 5 certification relative to the number of UNM research contracts needing this level of certification will have to be weighed. The cost for level 4 and 5 certification is significantly higher. Jeff suggests a sustainable approach for all researchers to meet level 3 requirements would meet most needs.

6. **Meeting Adjourned – 2 pm**

   **Next Meeting:** January 15, 2020, 9-10:30 am, Scholes Hall, Roberts Room