UNM IT Research Technologies Advisory Board
Wednesday, June 17, 2020

Zoom Meeting
9:00 am – 10:00 am

Chair: Patrick Bridges
Attendees: Karl Benedict, Sylvia Celedon-Pattichis, Mark Emmons, Kathryn Jacobson, William Michener, Laura Putz, Edl Schamiloglu, Robert Rhatigan, Mary Tsiongas, Tom Turner, Jonathan Wheeler, Duane Arruti, Grace Faustino, Jeff Gassaway, Brian Pietrewicz

Guest Presenters: NA

Notes: Deirdre Markham
1. Approval of Minutes (May 2020 minutes approved)
2. Action Item Follow-up
   a. Update on the Electronic Research Evaluation Committee (Edl Schamiloglu, Chair)
      Edl advised Cayuse has responded to the subcommittee questions developed in their
      review process. The subcommittee will review the responses and meet with Cayuse
      next week. HSC has provided the committee an overview of Click, and the committee
      will meet with Michelle for a more in-depth demonstration of its features. Sylvia
      asked if the work completed through this committee is being aligned with the
      recommendations of the NCURA review visit. Patrick confirmed the OVPR office
      received the NCURA report, but he didn’t have specific information about next steps
      for using the information. Sylvia asked if the efforts of this group should be aligned
      with the recommendations. Patrick’s recollection is that the recommendations were
      broad to say more support was needed but specific recommendations were not
      provided. Everyone agreed it would be helpful for this committee to review the
      NCURA report.

      **Action Item:** Patrick will follow-up with Gabriel to access the report and see if it can
      be distributed to ADRs and other committees as needed.

      **Action Item:** Sylvia advised the survey to assess what software titles are needed by
      faculty and students will be distributed to COE shortly.

3. Informational Items:
   a. Feedback from committee on the summary report
      Based on the results of the working groups, Grace, Karl, Mark and Patrick
      summarized the sub-findings from each area a draft executive summary. The draft
      maturity report – executive summary was provided to the committee and reviewed.
      The list of recommendations consolidates the subgroup recommendations. They
      would like committee members to review the current version with their faculty and
      staff so it can be amended as needed. The goal is to complete reviews and updates
      and approve the final version at the August meeting. After final approval by this
      committee, it will be sent to the IT Executive Committee for feedback and to guide
      their work for 20/21. Duane asked if discussions that were supportive of leveraging
      enterprise licensing agreements to support research computing should be included as
      a specific recommendation. The committee agreed. This was added to the draft
      document.
Duane asked how to incorporate discussions about a system that supports collaborative, cross-area, and cross-disciplinary initiatives in different sectors, such as an “expert location system”. Karl advised item 6 expands on this in the appendices. Everyone agreed adding it to the high-level summary as an explicit goal would be helpful.

Sylvia asked if there is additional information about plans for explicitly incorporating diversity, equity, and inclusion in the research area. Mark advised this is included in item 1 since the intent is to incorporate this at a strategic plan level. These issues were not highlighted in the survey tools. Given the importance of these issues, committee members agreed incorporation in the strategic plan is considered the best placement.

Bill Michener shared suggestions to tie the list of 10 recommendations more closely to the 3 overarching recommendations and to consolidate the 10 recommendations further. Mark and Patrick agreed it is likely the IT Executive Committee will focus on the summary document more than the appendices. The appendices would guide committees once the IT Executive Committee has approved the approach detailed in the summary. Bill’s input for additional refinement and alignment of the summary document is appreciated. Additional definition of terms and ensuring consistency in terms throughout the document will be helpful.

**Action Item:** Mark asked the committee to review the document. Please e-mail input to Mark, Patrick, Grace, and Karl.

**Action Item:** Mark will work with Bill to incorporate his suggestions.

Bill asked about recommendations for policy in the summary document that is less substantiated in the appendices. Additional detail may be needed to make the policy needs clearer relative to the strategic plan and what such a plan should include. Karl asked if the structure/grouping of the recommendations as a proposed organizational structure of a strategic plan would be helpful. Bill agreed that would be helpful and could also guide consolidation and alignment of some of the 10 specific recommendations.

4. **Decision Items:**
a. **Nomination and Approval of New Chair or Co-Chairs**
   Patrick opened the nominations the 20/21 chair position. The year starts in July 2020. Mark advised that he and Karl are willing to serve as co-chairs; if others are interested, they are glad to step aside.

   **Decision Item:** The committee accepted the nomination for Mark and Karl to serve as co-chairs. **Approved.**

The committee discussed whether the July meeting should be held. With the number of attendees who will be unavailable, Mark and Karl suggested if the July meeting is cancelled, committee members would provide all comments on the summary document before mid-July so approval can be completed in August.
Duane thanked Mark and Karl for volunteering to be co-chairs for the committee. He also greatly appreciates Patrick’s leadership as chair to move this board’s ideas and recommendations forward and support IT’s effective alignment with the research mission.

Sylvia asked how the IT research strategic plan aligns with the larger OVPR research strategic plan. Grace advised the current plan does have an IT research strategic objective. Since the new VPR will be reviewing and updating the current OVPR research strategic plan, this committee had agreed it would be useful to provide information from the committee’s work and responses from the research maturity survey as input for the VPR’s review.

5. Security Updates (Jeff Gassaway)
   a. Security Related Issues for Privacy and Security

   b. Security Issues, Emerging and Existing
      Jeff advised MFA is in place for Touchnet (Bursar’s Suite). The same MFA Microsoft solution will be placed in front of current systems such as benefits and direct deposits. Brian advised they hope to move from Duo to Azure MFA by the end of the month. Azure MFA will be single sign-on. They are working to have Azure single sign-on MFA in front of all accounts; date for rolling this out is to be determined.

      Jeff discussed the return-to-work surveys and forms that will be associated with implementation plans for on-campus work. They are working closely with HIPAA privacy offices to confirm requested information is not protected data. University Counsel has also reviewed and confirmed the requested information is employment related so it doesn’t fall under protected data guidelines. Jeff confirmed that all appropriate protections and privacy issues are addressed in what is collected and how it will be used. He wanted to confirm for committee members that as technologies are implemented for new services, privacy issues are being evaluated and addressed.

   c. Security Strategy (none)

6. Open Floor/Announcements
   - Duane shared the Governor’s Emergency Relief Fund request. The primary focus is to support online learning. Higher Education across the state would receive $4M of a $22M package. Higher Education Institutions are collaborating on a proposal that focuses on a prioritized list of needs shared by all institutions. Current priorities are ensuring connectivity, augmentation of staff and/or student employees to support online learning, updating classrooms to support hybrid approaches, and ensuring remote participation is accessible. CHECS which represents all IT Higher Education units is working on this. The current funding proposal is broken out by FTE and STEM area curriculum. It has been used previously by the Legislative Finance Committee, other Higher Ed budget offices and government relations committees. If the proposals are accepted, UNM main campus would receive approximately 25% of the funding. Branch campuses get approximately 1%. Gallup with a larger number of FTE would get ~2%. HSC also receives funding. They will accept proposals from any institution or combination of institutions; one criteria for proposals is to demonstrate
collaboration between and benefit to multiple institutions. Duane shared the allocation model which was developed by the Council of University Presidents (CUP) and NM Independent Community Colleges. The model is based on student FTE, faculty/staff FTE, STEM FTE and Career/Technology Education. It does not credit research institutions. This has been raised as a concern by research institutions. Marc Saavedra with CUP acknowledges this needs to be reviewed for future funding models. The current model does not include tribal colleges. Duane has reached out to the IT areas at the tribal colleges to see if they would like to participate in the initiative.

Next Meeting: July 15, 2020, 9-10:30 am, Zoom