Attendees: Tim Calhoon, Gary Bird, Russell Grant, Bob Hughes, Ben Seaberry, Paul Bishop, Anna Stirling, JC Sales, Jorge Burrick (Foundation), Jorge Mata, Dan Borges, Jeff Holden, Bruce Racheter, and Caryn Albrecht.

Call to Order:

Tim Calhoon called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm and took attendance.

Minutes:

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes for January 26, 2017. The committee approved the minutes.

System Updates:

About a year ago SAC had a presentation from Alcatel-Lucent and being able to use a Foundation contract. JC explained the contract now falls under the ATT contract which was competitively bid. After passage of AB363 the Foundation for CCC was able to adopt the same level of discount, about 70%. ATT had some issues with their own bureaucracy but it should be available in the next month or so. Tim explained the company asked about coming back to present again now that the contract will be ready, but their two new tools are not on SAC's list of targets. The committee agreed they are not interested in a new presentation at this time.

Action Item:

JC will provide a write up regarding the new contract to be sent out.

SAC Charter Update:

Tim sent the Charter out to the group there were only two minor changes that needed to be made in names of groups.

Action Item:

The committee liked the changes and had no concerns. Tim will take the revised Charter up to TTAC.

CENIC Update:

There are currently about 231 circuits in production. There are 193 in the queue for upgrade and preplanning. Additionally 60 circuits are in progress and 25 are complete. The process involves working first on upgrading saturated circuits to

10 Gig. After saturated districts, they will work with large districts and then move out to everyone else with need.

The Technology Center is also talking to CENIC about seeing if more can be done with fiber acquisition, especially in larger districts. They are also looking at better connectivity for the far flung centers. There was a lot of work in getting Del Norte connected. Needles, Palo Verde, and others are still in need of work.

Overall, everyone is head down in the middle of upgrading across the board. Contact Mike Tucchillo with specific circuit questions; he is tracking those details.

Technology Center

CCCApply is on a regular release schedule and is at code freeze and testing for their big annual release in March. That update includes new questions for homeless youth for AB 81. Another big item is working with the California Department of Education to attach a web service to bring over the K-12 identifier, the SSID.

A member asked if colleges needed to re-opt in for multiple measures with the new release. Tim explained the settings colleges have prior to the new release will be maintained. There were some questions about "making the application longer" prior to the inclusion of the optional multiple measures questions, but sixty-nine colleges have now elected to use them.

Study of CCCApply data shows that the duplication count has been driven down to two-tenths of one percent. They have also been studying how many students abandon completion of the application and have found the abandonment rate is 5% and a lot seems to occur more in urban areas than rural ones. Most students complete setting up the account and application in about fifteen minutes and about 80% within one-half hour. The application process is not arduous.

CCCApply and the MyPath portal have an RFP out for software development and are looking for SAC members available for online scoring. They are expecting three to five vendors to respond; scoring will take about three to five hours. Paul and Anna agreed to help with scoring.

CAI:

The project is busy working on collecting 10,000 to 15,000 test results for item validation. They are still looking good for a fall release to pilots. CAI is also releasing an RFP for the Scored Writing Sample for English/ESL.

EPI:

MyPath is up and running at Santa Rosa Junior College. The team is working on implementing at State Center, San Francisco City College, Kern, and possibly

Evergreen. Career Coach is now built into MyPath to assist students with self-assessment in career interests and help them find careers and programs at colleges they are interested in. Some changes to the interface are being made for the Chancellor's Office version.

Hobsons/Starfish implementations are continuing with pilot colleges and there are forty-eight colleges in the pool of prospects. They expect to have about seventeen colleges up and running by the end of the fiscal year.

The Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (CO-CI) product is on track, as is the new C-ID product.

OEI:

There are 104 colleges now on Canvas. The Course Exchange is live at two colleges and testing at a number of others to get ready to go live very soon.

Chancellor's Office:

Russell, Debra and Gary are working on the renewal of the TTIP North and TTIP South grants. They are due back on March 23rd and the Notice of Intent to Award should be posted in April.

Foundation:

A while back SAC talked about looking at electronic signatures and products that are available. At that time there was an agreement with Adobe Sign (formerly EchoSign), but it wasn't a particularly good one. Jorge from the Foundation will send out a summary of the new contract with two different pricing models now in place. One is $18 annually per FTE for faculty and staff, so if a campus has 1,000 faculty and staff, the cost would be $18,000 annually. That would allow all of the faculty and staff to have access. The other model is $1 per transaction with a $5000 minimum within the campus or externally.

Tim reported electronic signatures are used extensively at the Technology Center. They use them for travel forms, intra and extra-district contracts. They also use them for approving invoices internally.

There is also system interest in DocuSign and the Foundation is working with them on possible special pricing. Apparently DocuSign does cost more than Adobe Sign. The Foundation hopes to have more information at a future meeting.

Action Item:

Tim suggested the Foundation contact Sandoval about getting the Adobe Sign information out to the field.

Security Center and ISAC:

InCommon Membership and SSL Certificates:

The InCommon security certificates are now available to all InCommon members. The membership is also paid for through TTIP funds, non-member colleges can fill out the MOU for InCommon on the CCCSecurity.org website.

Jeff is still working on getting the extended validation. It has been a bit bureaucratic, since a legal letter was needed to prove the Chancellor's Office is a legal entity. Information about InCommon membership and free SSL certificates is sent out directly to IT departments.

Splunk:

Splunk is up and running in Amazon Web Services (AWS) and about six colleges now have it up and running. Splunk will work with all of the college's logs. Jeff is trying to add in as many apps as possible: Palo Alto, Windows, Linux, etc.

The colleges have been separated into separate indexes so each college only has access to their own information. Additionally, data is encrypted in transit.

Currently the contract is for 750 GB per day, so if everyone went onto it, there would only be about 10 Gigs per college. So volume may need to be increased in the future. Right now Jeff is benchmarking as colleges try to figure out what they might need.

There is a configured server on the Technology Center side, so Jeff and his staff just need the address for config server at the college and it can be pushed down. It is possible to give access to each college and also provide district aggregation. Colleges just need to fill out the form on the website.

Tenable Security Center:

Tenable Security Center is still an upcoming process. It got held up by the Statement of Work and other contract language. Jeff thinks they are now pretty close to getting that finalized.

Jeff noted they are using a multi-tenancy server so colleges will only be able to see their own college and/or district data. The team also plans to put in a separate scanner so colleges can scan their own networks. There are currently about 100,000 IP addresses and the team will see how that goes and hopefully increase as needed.

Tenable Security Center is a great product and is what the Technology Center's security team uses when they do college security assessments. It can be set up to automatically scan the college's networks for the CIS standards. It is then possible to compare to the standard and tell if the system is out of spec and if

there is vulnerable software in the system. The reporting also allows colleges to prioritize based on areas of greatest risk. A lot of colleges focus on Window patches so those are usually kept pretty up to date. However, other areas may be at higher risk and could be prioritized for scanning.

Security Assessments:

The security team continues to do one or two security assessments per month; the team is booked for the rest of the fiscal year with nine more colleges signed up. Those assessments have been pretty valuable at finding risk areas. The plan is to put in a request for one-time funding for next year and to identify vendors to help provide security assessments. Right now the team can only hit about 12-20 colleges each year, in order to meet the need there will need to be additional staffing or resources.

SAC members suggested since security assessments are critically important, Jeff put in a request based on being able to do security assessments for every college every year, as well as what it would cost to do half of them every year.

Jeff is also looking at getting extra servers to send out prior to assessments. That will decrease the time the team needs to be on campus. He has now done enough assessments to also be able to set up a template to streamline the process. He is also looking at a tool called Faraday for turning around reports, since that is a bottleneck for the process.

ISAC:

ISAC has been working on aligning the existing Security Standard with CIS Critical Security Controls to key back each section with the critical control it covers. Jorge suggested also aligning the numbering or providing a table at the beginning of the document mapping to the CIS Controls. ISAC should be adopting the revised standards in the next month or so.

One difficult to address area is Document Retention. It is hard to reconcile the disparity between what is legally required and what each college wants to keep. Colleges are not required to have a policy, but if they do have one, they must follow it. Colleges can keep documents longer than the policy requires, but if documents are deleted sooner, a judge may think the college is trying to hide something. There are different standards for student records, which must basically be kept for life. Other records, like documentation for Financial Aid, may not legally be required for retention and for PII security with respect to tax returns, Driver's License, etc., it might be better not to. In those kinds of areas, legal counsel is probably needed. Lazaro has been used in the past.

Tim asked if it would make sense to have images of hardened servers that colleges could use, but Jeff cautioned they would have to be kept up to date. He suggested hardening scripts colleges could run manually could be offered.

ISAC held the Winter Workshop in January with 30-40 participants which doubled last year's attendance at the same time. The Summer Workshop last year had 60-65 participants and Jeff is looking toward 100 this summer. Long term he is also looking to coordinate with CSU on a larger combined CSU/CCC workshop.

The CSU has quarterly CISO meetings. Jeff attended the last one and will go to the next one in April as well. It is helpful to find out what the CSU is doing and products and services they are using. They are using Beasley for security insurance and Identity Finder to find PIO. An Identity Finder demo has been set up for next month at ISAC.

Tim suggested it would be useful to get an inventory of CSU contracts to look at piggybacking on. Jorge Mata was interested in privilege access management, like CyberArk. Tim will check into getting a demo for SAC.

Action Item:

Tim will see if CyberArk can do a demo for SAC.

Next Meeting:

Members who are able to, will meet at CISOA at the cocktail gathering rather than having a breakfast meeting.

The next SAC meeting will be on March 23, 2017 at 1:30pm.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:34 pm.