UNM IT Research Technologies Advisory Board  
Wednesday, October 16, 2019  
*Tech 230, College of Education, Building 64*  
1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

Chair: Patrick Bridges  
Attendees: Karl Benedict, Tito Busani, Trish Henning, Kathryn Jacobson, Brian Kimura, Mark Servilla, Jon Wheeler, Elisha Allen, Duane Arruti, Jeff Gassaway, Brian Pietrewicz, Melissa Sanchez

1. Approval of Minutes (Minutes approved)  
2. Data Use Agreement Approvals for PIs (Jeff Gassaway and Melissa Sanchez, Office of Sponsored Projects)

Jeff and Melissa shared the history of ISPO-OSP shared compliance processes based on 2011-2013 audits. These include purchasing compliance, OSP-risk, security, and privacy assessments against contractual and regulatory standards. Multiple offices can have a roles in UNM contract review. Currently, compliance, privacy, risk, and security assessment are managed via Help.UNM and through e-mail. ISPO participation in these processes adds value in terms of risk/compliance assessment and remediation recommendations. OSP participation adds value through protecting faculty and staff rights by ensuring compliance requirements are met and documented as needed for reviews. Jeff and Melissa shared the updated PSQ and reviewed changes that should substantially shorten the review process. The updates provide a simple form with high-level questions to make the process more straightforward and only identify projects that need additional oversight early in the process. Karl asked if this is in Cayuse. Melissa advised that when any data use, data sharing, or data transfer comes into play, the form would be completed. Information coming into or out of UNM would also be required to complete the form. As contracts are reviewed, OPS and IT will determine if the form needs to be completed. Karl asked about pre-sponsored or non-contract projects and where they will be captured so compliance requirements are met. Jeff agreed there may be gaps and incremental improvements on process that they would like to add before this is sent to ADRs. They are committed to ensuring the process streamlines processes for researchers. With the addition of some version of “not applicable/none of the above”, the committee agreed the draft is a positive improvement.

The ticket submission process has been improved to address issues with lost tickets. The document management process has been moved to SharePoint so all parties can see the most current versions of documents and review status. They are developing a survey for ADRs and PIs who have had contracts reviewed in the last year. The goal is to understand what is working and what isn’t. the respondents will be re-surveyed in 6 months to see if the recent changes have been helpful. They are committed to finding standardized processes as much as possible. They will bring additional process improvements to this group.

**Action Item:** Jeff and Karl will meet to discuss any groups that may not be captured with the currently identified entry points.
Jeff and Karl will review currently identified entry points to determine if there are other groups not captured that should be included.

They are developing a short survey for ADRs and PIs who have had contracts that have undergone review in the last year to identify what is working and what is not. They will resurvey after 6 months to see how improvements are working. Jeff advised that SharePoint will provide opportunities for a workflow approach after these first steps are implemented.

**Action Item:** Jeff and Karl will follow-up to present results of the survey to the research technologies advisory board.

3. Action Item follow-up (None)

4. Informational Items:
   a. Working Groups Update and fiscal year goal discussion
      i. Research Data Management – Karl advised committee members have been working independently. They meet next Monday to start synthesizing their insights from the data management plan reviews which will inform the gap analysis.
      
      ii. Service Catalog (Demo of service catalog – Jon and Patrick)
          Grace and other groups have been working on the draft service catalog. It can be viewed at researchit.unm.edu. The tracking mechanism for service requests is in development. They would like to deploy once the option for requesting more services is clarified.

          **Action Item:** Patrick asked the committee members to review and provide input. Send comments to Grace and Patrick.

      iii. Scorecard – Patrick reviewed the draft scorecard for feedback. Grace is working to have this posted on the IT dashboard. Duane asked about the question on training. Patrick advised it is intended to identify usability without significant training or support when resources may not be available to provide that support. Jon agreed this information is necessary to understand the impact on existing services and if support is already available; this was something they grappled with when looking at service level agreements to detail in the service catalog. Trish asked if understanding the expertise level of the requestor would be useful. Patrick commented the requests this committee will review would be for more than one user. Tito asked how the scores were assigned. Patrick and Grace assigned and glad to have feedback on questions, scores, and weighting of scores. The organizational readiness helps to address the familiarity or expertise aspect of the previous question. Tito suggested giving a point for each center that would be supported. For Q.2. Patrick said they are trying to capture both breadth and depth of impact. They are open to scaling this to some degree.

          **Action Item:** “Support” will be added to the technical deployment question.
iv. Infrastructure – Tito advised they have information from 5 colleges and will receive information from 2 more. They are hoping to receive input from SOE. The internal committee has been formed to review this information and develop a draft for the committee to review.

v. Electronic Research Administration – there were discussions about helping with the NCURA review but assistance wasn’t needed. Rosa and Patrick are meeting with Naren regarding Cayuse to ensure staff and faculty who use the system have appropriate input. Duane asked if it would be useful for this committee to participate in the process. Patrick agreed that would and ensuring that staff input is part of the review process is essential.

vi. Research Compliance and CUI – Jeff advised they have talked with HSC to see if a representative can participate as Ari did.

5. Decision Items (None)

6. Open Floor
   - Duane advised that UNM Purchasing signed an Enterprise agreement with AdobeSign to provide electronic signatures to interested parties. Duane asked if anyone has current users of DocuSign in their areas. Nadir Khalil is heading up the transition project. He and his team can reach out to current users of DocuSign and assist with training as needed. Tito asked if a current process for electronic signatures has to be moved. Duane commented there should not be a need for change to established processes to use AdobeSign.
   - Based on minutes from the September meeting, Jon commented that Driad is a tool that could be part of the solution to meet compliance requirements for reviews. Generally, data management plans are unlikely to meet deep, compliance needs. Karl also had concerns that the notes don’t reflect that Driad and data management plans are tools to support meeting compliance requirements. For compliance activities to be effective, a comprehensive approach and process for managing data that is followed consistently is necessary.

7. Meeting Adjourned – 2 pm

Next Meeting: November 27, 2019 1-2:30 pm Scholes Hall, Roberts Room