

Blake R. David
Chair

T. Jay Seale III
Vice Chair

Sonia A. Pérez
Secretary

Kim Hunter Reed, Ph.D.
Commissioner of
Higher Education



Randy L. Ewing
Stephanie A. Finley
Robert W. Levy
Phillip R. May, Jr.
Charles R. McDonald
Darren G. Mire
Wilbert D. Pryor
Gary N. Solomon, Jr.
Terrie P. Sterling
Collis B. Temple III
Felix R. Weill
Judy A. Williams-Brown
Cameron T. Jackson, Student

BOARD OF REGENTS

P. O. Box 3677
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677
Phone (225) 342-4253, FAX (225) 342-9318
www.regents.la.gov

Cybersecurity Education Management Council (CEMC) Meeting

July 14, 2021
10:00 AM

The CEMC met on Wednesday, July 14, 2021, by Virtual Zoom.

Council Members/Representatives Present

Rick Bateman
William (Bill) Bradley
Les Guice
Brian Landry
Susana Schowen
Greg Trahan
Tavares Walker
Daphne Williams

Council Members Not Present

Gabriel Fagbeyiro
Commissioner Kim Hunter Reed
Luke Purdy

Staff Members Present

Randall Brumfield
Clint Coleman
Dwayne Lacombe
Jennifer Stevens

Welcome, Roll Call, and Updates

Mr. Trahan welcomed the Council, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and provided information for public commenting and live viewing of the meeting. Next, Dr. Coleman completed the roll call, and determined that there was a quorum. Mr. Trahan and Dr. Brumfield introduced Dr. Clint Coleman as the new Program Administrator for LaSTEM and Cybersecurity Initiatives for the Board of Regents. Mr. Trahan asked the Council if there were any questions regarding the meeting minutes from the last meeting and opened the floor for a motion to approve.

There was a motion from Mr. Bateman to approve the April meeting minutes and a second from Ms. Schowen. With there being no opposition, the amended minutes were approved.

Council Discussions

Mr. Trahan moved into the next topic, the Cybersecurity Talent Management Fund Distribution Update, noting that Dr. Brumfield previously provided a summary of all the projects and distribution of funds to the Council. Mr. Trahan stated they will be placing the distribution on the website as well as some of the metrics that will be used to measure success and show impact across the state. In addition, Dr. Brumfield stated that all the interagency agreements to the institutions are processed and completed. He also noted that after the awarding, the remaining balance of \$2,929.00 (\$366.12 per program) was distributed as supplemental across the eight

programs that were awarded. Dr. Guice noted his institution has started work on their project. Last, Mr. Trahan stated he will put together a scoring sheet to be circulated within the Council in advance of the next meeting, so that all agree on the same numbers and provide a set of easily readable metrics to show what types of projects the Council supports and the type of student populations the Council hopes to impact.

Mr. Trahan transitioned into the next item, Priorities for Fiscal Year 2021-22 Allocation, stating the Fund has received an additional \$1 million in funding. Dr. Brumfield noted the executive summary provided to the Board of Regents that was placed in the meeting materials. This summary encapsulates how the funds were purposed across the institutions and what the institutions are doing to expand and improve cybersecurity workforce development across the state. Next, Mr. Trahan provided a few funding options for deliberation and consideration including: (1) revisiting existing proposals to see if there are additional opportunities for funding, (2) revisit/reopen the Request for Applications (RFA) process, and (3) quick-strike RFA, which would be a separate reserve of funds pushed through the STEM Centers.

Mr. Bradley asked if there was a date requirement for using the \$1 million? Dr. Brumfield stated it would be consistent with this past year and funds should be allocated by the end of fiscal year 2022. Dr. Guice noted sustainability of efforts over a period of time are often needed for projects like these to be successful, and he suggested institutions submit a plan of what they will do beyond what they have initiated. He would like to see these programs be sustained across the state and to also add new programs. Dr. Brumfield stated that if the RFA process was to be reopened, the application timeline would include a period of 45 days and circulated to the institutions and systems. He recommended posting an RFA no later than the end of December. Mr. Trahan agreed with Dr. Guice stating sustainability is critical but noted concern regarding measuring performance this early into the programs. He also stated he was partial to the idea of opening the RFA process. Dr. Bateman noted he liked the quick-strike approach to moving the needle quickly and appreciated the conversation around performance.

Regarding a quick-strike approach, Mr. Trahan asked Dr. Coleman how the regional STEM Centers might be utilized in this effort. Dr. Coleman suggested to first identify the amount and then send it out for feedback from the directors. He then provided a brief update of the regional STEM centers and some of the work they do. Mr. Trahan suggested circulating a proposal among the group, to allocate some dollars for sustainment of existing awardees and to set aside some dollars towards a targeted quick-strike RFA process, possibly through the regional STEM centers. Dr. Guice noted the regional STEM centers would need to ensure they understand the terminology of cyber that was included in the legislative language. Dr. Williams asked for clarity regarding the quick-strike approach. Mr. Trahan clarified that they are proposing a portion of dollars be allocated to institutions they did not reach in the original round (institutions that were not funded or did not have an opportunity to submit) due to the timing process of the RFA. Dr. Williams stated she did not understand why that would be separated out since they would have an opportunity to apply this year as there can be more time given to the RFA process than last year. Everyone would have the same opportunity to apply. Mr. Trahan noted the discussion revolves around this process and what it may look like year over year to

best target the spirit of the legislature and satisfying requirements. He also noted that some of the institutions have more resources to do proposal development and he thought this would be an opportunity to make sure others have a chance. Dr. Coleman shared a similar experience when he was Dean of STEM at Fletcher Technical Community College. Mr. Trahan suggested for next steps to circulate a couple of options/ideas and have the Council take a vote, for which all agreed. Dr. Brumfield added that we can make arrangements for a special meeting if necessary. Mr. Trahan stated they would share a working document, like they did with the RFA, to generate and gather ideas. Once a decision is made by the Council and it is ready to formally declare its intentions, then they could move forward with a meeting.

Mr. Trahan moved into the next agenda topic, performance assessment, noting he pulled together a document summarizing the metrics the institutions stated they would use to measure their performance and that he would circulate it among the Council. He stated the metrics are different among the institutions and if anyone has questions about the metrics, they can revisit it. Dr. Brumfield added the legislation requires a report to be submitted to the legislature regarding how the funds are used, distribution method, list of degree and certificate programs that are supported by the fund, final distribution amounts, number of jobs created as a result of the distribution, and the method and data that is used to determine the number of those jobs created. He stated further clarification would be needed for consistent reporting year to year. Ms. Schowen noted the industry partnerships were an impressive component that should be recognized. Other items noted were cost sharing and the time, energy, and engagement of the industry partners in terms of working directly with the colleges.

Other Business

The Third Quarter CEMC Meeting will be held Tuesday, October 12, 10-11:30 a.m.

With there being no other comments or business, a motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Guice and a second by Ms. Schowen. With all in agreement, the meeting was adjourned at 10:49 a.m.