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Welcome

Mike Schilling
CSU, Chico Security Program Maturity
# Gartner IT Score for Information Security: 5 Stage Maturity Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Defined</td>
<td>Managed</td>
<td>Optimizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc activities</td>
<td>CISO appointed</td>
<td>Policies and processes defined</td>
<td>Governance body established</td>
<td>Information owners accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial executive awareness</td>
<td>User awareness outreach</td>
<td>Security organization defined</td>
<td>Information-centric approach</td>
<td>Risk-aware culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-centric approach</td>
<td>Formal program initiated</td>
<td>Improving user awareness</td>
<td>Effective metrics</td>
<td>Refinement for changes in business, technology, compliance and economic environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU, Chico Information Security Program Maturity

- Security governance
- Planning and budgeting
- Organization
- Controls framework
- Architecture and engineering
- Process operations
- Communications and awareness
- Event detection and response
- Threat and vulnerability management
- Risk controls assessment

Maturity 2014

Maturity 2016
PhishMe Anti-Phishing Tools
• **91% of breaches** start with an email

• **More than 3000 CSU, Chico accounts were compromised last semester**
PhishMe
Real-World Phishing Simulations

Who:
• IRES employees
• All campus students and employees

What:
• Starting with a simple phishing message
• Anyone the clicks the link in the message will be directed to a short remediation video

When:
• IRES employees in 2 weeks
• All campus students and employees later this semester
Cloud Security
**Cloud Overview**

**Software-as-a-Service (SaaS):**
In the Software as a Service (SaaS) model, users gain access to application software and databases. Cloud providers manage the infrastructure and platforms that run the applications. SaaS is sometimes referred to as "on-demand software" and is usually priced on a pay-per-use basis or using a subscription fee including, but not limited to, Dropbox, Google Apps for Education, Microsoft Office 365.

**Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS):**
A category of cloud computing services that provides a platform allowing customers to develop, run, and manage web applications without the complexity of building and maintaining the infrastructure typically associated with developing and launching an application. Example: Salesforce.com

**Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS):**
IaaS clouds often offer additional resources such as a virtual-machine disk-image library, raw block storage, file or object storage, firewalls, load balancers, IP addresses, Virtual Local area Networks (VLANs), and software bundles. Example: Amazon Web Services (ASW) Microsoft Azure, VMware.
Cloud Security Standard Published

Standard Published
Updated document published on the ISEC website

Cloud security standard communication
The updated standard will be communicated with:
Deans, Chairs, IRES Staff, Data Owners, Academic Senate

4.2.1 Use of unapproved public cloud services for storage, communication and productivity involving University Level 1 data is **prohibited**. Examples include but are not limited to Dropbox, Google Apps for Education, Office 365.

5.2.1 Use of Cloud Computing **Platform as a service environments** must be formally authorized in writing by The Information Security Officer and the Director of Contracts and Procurement through the IT Procurement Review Process.

5.3.1 Use of Cloud Computing **Infrastructure as a service environments** must be formally authorized in writing by The Information Security Officer and the Director of Contracts and Procurement through the IT Procurement Review Process.
IT Service Management with TeamDynamix
What is TeamDynamix?

• Enterprise Service Management solution
  • IT Service Management (ITSM)
  • Project & Portfolio Management (PPM)
  • Service Asset & Configuration Management (SACM)
• Initial ITSM implementation in July 2015
  • All IRES, some BITS services

• Over 250 services available in the Service Catalog

• Completed over 50,000 tickets
What’s New?

• 45 new services so far in 2016
• Bomgar integration – ITSS
• Ticketing application for Faculty Affairs
Want to know more?

• Check out the Service Catalog
  • http://support.csuchico.edu

• Open to questions, comments, and further discussion
  • jdonnell@csuchico.edu
Year End Financial Review
• **IRES Funding Sources**
  
  • General Fund Allocation
  
  • Enterprise Budget Allocation
  
  • Cost Recovery Service Centers
  
  • Miscellaneous Trust Funds
  
  • Project Specific Funds
IRES Funding Sources

IRES FUNDING

- General Fund: 54%
- Enterprise: 24%
- MISC TRUST: 3%
- T8715 Wireless Project: 1%
- Cost Recovery: 18%
IRES General Fund distribution

- EADS: 20%
- IASC: 3%
- IRES: 15%
- ISEC: 1%
- ITCS: 3%
- ITSS: 19%
- CMT: 24%
- CCSV: 15%
## Final Actual Budget

**Year Ended June 30, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>CMT</th>
<th>CCSV</th>
<th>EADS</th>
<th>IASC</th>
<th>IRES</th>
<th>ISEC</th>
<th>ITCS</th>
<th>ITSS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encumbered Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>12,736</td>
<td>17,796</td>
<td>23,872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>105,247</td>
<td>$234,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255,561</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$293,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Allocation</strong></td>
<td>1,654,693</td>
<td>1,244,327</td>
<td>1,724,600</td>
<td>312,032</td>
<td>665,015</td>
<td>111,912</td>
<td>264,222</td>
<td>1,057,280</td>
<td>$7,064,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Study Allocation</strong></td>
<td>38,340</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>3,122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$72,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 4 Student Fees</strong></td>
<td>83,976</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$83,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Recovery Income/Income</strong></td>
<td>89,676</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,915</td>
<td>$264,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One time Budget Transfers</strong></td>
<td>241,333</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>-141,032</td>
<td>-21,809</td>
<td>373,337</td>
<td>-20,234</td>
<td>-21,373</td>
<td>376,826</td>
<td>$789,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$2,126,754</td>
<td>$1,284,628</td>
<td>$1,745,557</td>
<td>$293,354</td>
<td>$1,360,193</td>
<td>$91,678</td>
<td>$243,235</td>
<td>$1,690,580</td>
<td>$8,847,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>CMT</th>
<th>CCSV</th>
<th>EADS</th>
<th>IASC</th>
<th>IRES</th>
<th>ISEC</th>
<th>ITCS</th>
<th>ITSS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>1,228,070</td>
<td>1,238,880</td>
<td>1,281,277</td>
<td>264,270</td>
<td>333,898</td>
<td>90,176</td>
<td>234,594</td>
<td>851,786</td>
<td>$5,518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>112,693</td>
<td>20,539</td>
<td>106,026</td>
<td>15,040</td>
<td>10,987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236,357</td>
<td>$501,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>6,687</td>
<td>14,402</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>15,776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>$48,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td>37,135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142,826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>$194,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hardware and Software</strong></td>
<td>330,866</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>258,833</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>372,410</td>
<td>$1,185,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Expense</strong></td>
<td>17,476</td>
<td>8,067</td>
<td>206,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179,746</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>27,556</td>
<td>$441,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies and Services</strong></td>
<td>117,867</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>47,425</td>
<td>8,159</td>
<td>74,396</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>150,864</td>
<td>$407,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$2,050,709</td>
<td>$1,284,365</td>
<td>$1,666,280</td>
<td>$293,221</td>
<td>$1,016,562</td>
<td>$91,678</td>
<td>$243,231</td>
<td>$1,651,335</td>
<td>$8,297,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net | $76,044 | $262 | $79,777 | $133 | $352,631 | $- | $4 | $42,246 | $550,597 |

| Year End Encumbrance | $74,788 | $- | $61,083 | $320,835 | $- | $4 | $37,303 | $494,059 |

| Net minus commitments | $1,256 | $262 | $18,194 | $133 | $31,746 | $- | $4 | $4,943 | $56,538 |
Enterprise Budget Distribution

- EADS: 60%
- CCSV: 23%
- ISEC: 13%
- Enterprise Other: 2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Enterprise Budget</th>
<th>Michael Schilling, Vice Provost &amp; CIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>Enterprise Other</td>
<td>EADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbered Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$ 54,901</td>
<td>$ 1,098,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$ 54,901</td>
<td>$ 1,098,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Allocation</td>
<td>$ 4,062</td>
<td>$ 926,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery Income/Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 250,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time Budget Transfers</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 76,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$ 58,963</td>
<td>$ 2,351,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>Enterprise Other</td>
<td>EADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 693,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 42,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 226,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware and Software</td>
<td>$ 2,294</td>
<td>$ 22,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing &amp; Maintenance Expense</td>
<td>$ 11,882</td>
<td>$ 675,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td>$ 1,370</td>
<td>$ 70,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ 15,546</td>
<td>$ 1,747,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>612,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net minus Encumbrances</td>
<td>43,417</td>
<td>-8,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAM Status Update
The Long Road to Identity & Access Management

STATUS UPDATE
What We’ve Accomplished So Far…

New dev domain - csuc
New AD dev environment
New LDAP dev environment
New AD and LDAP group structures

New O365 dev environment
New Google Apps dev environment
New CAS dev environment
Continued...

New Google Apps dev environment
New CAS dev environment
New password policies to address audit findings
New affiliations to automate the provisioning and de-provisioning accounts
Employee onboarding process redesigned
Why Are We Telling You This....

To acknowledge the accomplishments and hard work of all involved in the Identity & Access Management Initiative to date
IRES Contributors

- ESYS – Jim Kelly, Paul Teagarden, Ray Quinto, Sam Hillaire, Scott Claverie, Steve Krok
- NOPS – Dennis Partington, John Bracey
- EAPP – Beth Kissinger, David Fuhs, Greg Coates
- ADS – Jim Nelson, Richard Wilkerson, Ryan Richter, Tom Rosenow
IRES Contributors Continued...

- CMT – Anna Harris, Francie Devine, Gail Vanderhoof, Mike Magrey, Scott Johnson
- IASC – Ginny Baxter, Kristin Lemire, Teresa Miller
- ITSS – Keith Adams, Kelli Trnka, Liz Connors, Scott Kodai, Scott Cory
- ISEC – Chris Witthans, James Gordon, Mark Hendricks, Scott Dickerson
Stakeholder Contributors

Human Resources & BITS
- Becky Cagle
- Yvonne Bealer
- Doug Wilson

Faculty Affairs
- Tammi Toon

Regional & Continuing Ed
- Dana Mazetti

Registrars Office
- Daniel Parks
- Mariah Dyson-Smith

Admissions
- Kim Guanzon
- Mary Kay Bringham
- Wendy Needels

Graduate Office
- Judy Rice
IAM – Implementation Testing

Objectives:
- Review initial configurations, workflows, policies w/vendor
- Deep dive learning on Fischer admin interfaces

Aug 8, 2016 - Aug 22, 2016
Initial Technical Review

Aug 22, 2016 - Sep 12, 2016
Technical Testing

Dev System Locked
No Major Changes

Sep 12, 2016 - Oct 8, 2016
Functional Testing

Objectives:
- Engage Enrollment Management (student data/processes)
- Engage HR (employee data/processes)
- Engage Faculty Affairs (faculty/instructor data/processes)
- Engage ITSS (user support processes)

Objectives:
- Multiday migration from dev to prod
- Provisioning/de-provisioning
  - Accounts for: students, employees, & non-members
  - Target systems: LDAP, AD, O365, Google Apps, Bb Learn
  - Affiliations and group membership
- Password management
  - Aging for employees begins mid-November
  - Aging for students begins early February 2017

Objectives:
- Load full set of legacy data
- No system changes
- Stable system for 2 weeks immediately prior to go live
- Test downstream configuration with test users in production

Objectives:
- Deep technical testing on provisioning, de-provisioning, password management
- Engage downstream system owners (LDAP, AD, O365, Google Apps, Bb Learn)
- Engage ITSS
- Fischer engineer on campus working with us 8/22 – 9/12. It will be highly critical that IAM team and downstream system owners are quickly available during this window (active problem solving will require quick response with little lead time)
RFQ/RFP for Enrollment Management System
RFQ/RFP for Document Management/eSignatures
New Employees

- IRES
- ISEC
- ITCS
- ITSS
- CMT
- CCSV
- EADS
Employee Satisfaction Survey, Focus Groups, & Action Planning

2015-2016
Results Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Groups

• Opportunities for Promotion
  • 2 groups, 12 people total
  • August 10th and 17th

• Workload
  • 2 groups, 9 people total
  • August 8th and 9th
Focus Group Highlights

• Opportunities for Promotion
  • Need career paths that are more clearly defined
  • Higher positions seem to go to off campus people
  • Managers do not typically bring up the discussion of promotions
  • Unclear how you get “promoted” - What and where are the opportunities? Seems as if you have to apply for new positions rather than be promoted
  • The In Range Progression and Reclassification processes are cumbersome and unclear
  • Often employees are ‘stuck’ because they are the only person that knows the job
  • The campus doesn’t help employees learn lead/managerial skills
Focus Group Suggestions

• Opportunities for Promotion
  • Increase awareness about the IRP and Reclassification process, perhaps offer workshops
  • Create clear pathways/goals
  • Staff and managers should make time for training
  • Employees should be recognized for their training efforts
  • Managers and employees should have short weekly meetings to discuss the work being done and new opportunities
• Workload
  • Employees feel a great sense of responsibility related to their work and understand the criticality of what they do for the University. This greatly increases stress
  • Deadlines, milestones, and priorities are unclear
  • The amount of technical debt is being underestimated
  • Resources could be better allocated given workload
Focus Group Suggestions

• Workload
  • Better transparency and visibility of current projects
  • A process for new projects such that we evaluate technical debt and prioritize
  • Better communications between groups and departments
2015/2016 Actions
• TechTalks
• Engagement Discussions

2016/2017 Themes
• Engage campus Human Resources to discuss career paths
Questions & Answers
Thank You