

TechHelp Strategic Plan FY2018 – 2022

MISSION STATEMENT

TechHelp will be a respected, customer-focused, industry recognized organization with strong employee loyalty, confidence of its business partners and with the resources and systems in place to achieve the following sustained annual results in 2021:

- 80 manufacturers reporting \$100,000,000 economic impact
- 180 jobs created
- > \$20,000 and < \$50,000 Net Income

VISION STATEMENT

TechHelp is Idaho’s Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) center. Working in partnership with the state universities, we provide assistance to manufacturers, food and dairy processors, service industry and inventors to grow their revenues, to increase their productivity and performance, and to strengthen their global competitiveness.

“Our identity is shaped by our results.”

GOAL 1

Economic Impact on Manufacturing in Idaho – Deliver a quantifiable positive return on both private business investments and public investments in TechHelp by adding value to the manufacturing client and the community.

Objective A: *Offer technical consulting services and workshops that meet Idaho manufacturers’ product and process innovation needs.*

Performance Measure:

- I. Client reported economic impacts (sales, cost savings, investments and jobs) resulting from projects**

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017) Q1-Q4	Benchmark
\$163,426,070 277 New Jobs	\$34,142,000 154 New Jobs	\$182,258,168 340 New Jobs	\$33,022,678 100 New Jobs	\$100,000,000/180 New Jobs

Benchmark: *Reported cumulative annual impacts improve by five percent over the prior year achieving \$100,000,000 and 180 new jobs annual reported impact by 2021ⁱ.*

Objective B: *Offer a range of services to address the needs of Small, Rural, Start-up and Other manufacturers Idaho.*

Performance Measure:

- I. **Number of impacted clients categorized as Small, Rural, Start-up and Other as reported in the MEP MEIS system**

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017) Q1-Q3	Benchmark
N/A	N/A	N/A	17 Small	15 Small
N/A	N/A	N/A	39 Rural	20 Rural
N/A	N/A	N/A	4 Start-Up	10 Start-up
N/A	N/A	N/A	25 Other	35 Other

Benchmark: Number of clients served by category exceeds MEP goal as follows by 2021ⁱⁱ:

15 Small,
20 Rural,
20 Start-up,
35 Other

Objective C: *Ensure manufacturing clients are satisfied with services.*

Performance Measure:

- I. **Customer satisfaction reported on MEP survey**

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017)	Benchmark
8 out of 10	10 out of 10	9 out of 10	9 out of 10	8 out of 10

Benchmark: Customer satisfaction score is consistently > 8 out of 10ⁱⁱⁱ

Goal 2

Operational Efficiency – Make efficient and effective use of TechHelp staff, systems, partners and third parties, and Advisory Board members.

Objective A: *Increase the number of client projects and events.*

Performance Measure:

- I. **State dollars expended per project/event**

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017)	Benchmark
\$867	\$1,769	\$1,139	\$774	> Prior year's total

Benchmark: Dollars per project/event expended is less than prior year's total^{iv}

Objective B: *Offer services to numerous Idaho manufacturers.*

Performance Measure:

- I. **Number of impacted clients per \$ Million federal investment as reported on MEP sCOREcard^v**

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017)	Benchmark
48 Clients Surveyed	45 Clients Surveyed	56 Clients Surveyed	69 Clients Surveyed	80 Clients Surveyed

Benchmark: Number of clients served exceeds federal minimum with a goal of 80 clients surveyed (i.e., 110 clients per \$ Million) by 2021^{vi}

Goal 3

Financial Health – Increase the amount of program revenue and the level of external funding to assure the fiscal health of TechHelp.

Objectives A: *Increase total client fees received for services.*

Performance Measure:

I. Gross and Net revenue from client projects

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017)	Benchmark
\$728,284	\$668,217	\$615,117	\$593,940	\$1,200,000 gross annually
\$334,798	\$354,763	\$454,672	\$409,175	\$700,000 net annually

Benchmark: Annual gross and net revenue exceeds the prior year by five percent achieving \$1,200,000 gross and \$700,000 net annually by 2021^{vii}

Objectives B: *Increase external funding to support operations and client services.*

Performance Measure:

I. Total dollars of non-client funding (e.g. grants) for operations and client services.

FY14 (2013-2014)	FY15 (2014-2015)	FY16 (2015-2016)	FY17 (2016-2017)	Benchmark
\$785,000	\$825,000	\$910,236	\$885,236	\$1,300,000

Benchmark: Total dollars of non-client funding for operations and client services exceed the prior year's total achieving \$1,300,000 by 2021^{viii}.

Key External Factors

I. State Funding:

Nationally, state funding is the only variable that correlates highly with the performance of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership centers. State funding is subject to availability of state revenues as well as gubernatorial and legislative support and can be uncertain.

II. Federal Funding:

The federal government is TechHelp's single largest investor. While federal funding has been stable, it is subject to availability of federal revenues as well as executive and congressional support and can be uncertain.

III. Economic Conditions:

Fees for services comprise a significant portion of TechHelp's total revenue. We are encouraged by current economic activity and believe it will support the ability of Idaho manufacturers to contract TechHelp's services.

Evaluation Process

The TechHelp Advisory Board convenes its membership, which is made up of representatives from leaders of manufacturing companies, professional services companies, and Idaho's three universities, to review and recommend changes to the center's planning, client services and strategic plan.

Recommendations are presented to the Advisory Board and the Executive Director for consideration. Additionally, as part of the NIST MEP cooperative agreement, the Advisory Board reviews and considers inputs that affect its strategic plan. Plan changes may be brought to the Advisory Board or TechHelp leadership and staff during the year. Review and re-approval occurs annually and considers progress towards performance measure goals, which are formally reviewed quarterly.

Performance towards meeting the set benchmarks is reviewed and discussed quarterly at both TechHelp staff meetings and at Advisory Board Meetings. The Advisory Board may choose at that time to direct staff to change or adjust performance measures or benchmarks contained strategic plan.

ⁱ This benchmark is based on current and projected resources and established best practices based on those resources.

ⁱⁱ This benchmark is based on current and projected resources, resource geographic location and established best practices based on those resources.

ⁱⁱⁱ This benchmark is based on analysis of customer survey feedback for types of services offered.

^{iv} This benchmark is based on analysis of available resources, types of services and program investment.

^v Methodology using a balanced scorecard.

^{vi} This benchmark is based on federal requirements and projections of federal investment.

^{vii} This benchmark is based on existing average performance levels and a 5% annual increase.

^{viii} This benchmark is based on existing average performance levels and a 5% annual increase.



Doug Ooley, CISSP

Chief Information Security Officer/Director

IT Governance, Risk, Compliance and Cybersecurity

Office of Information Technology - Boise State University

NIST Cybersecurity Framework and Critical Security Controls 1-5 Adoption

For the past 5 years, the Office of Information Technology (OIT) has utilized the Educause Security Maturity matrix as our security framework to identify, measure and mitigate security risks associated with Higher Education information technology. Over the last 5 years OIT has been able to improve the Educause Security Maturity Index from 1.75 to 2.56 with the long term goal of raising Boise State's Index to 3.0 or better. We feel to move beyond our current Index to an Index of 3.0 would require additional resources (software, hardware, and staff).

When Executive Order 2017-02 was published as a State of Idaho directive the Office of Information Technology proceeded with adopting the NIST Cybersecurity Framework in lieu of our existing Educause framework and began implementing Critical Security Controls 1-5 across the University's critical network infrastructure systems.

Progress to Date:

- An initial Prioritize and Scope (Gap) analysis was completed in April 2017 for Critical Security Controls 1-5 against all network systems, critical or otherwise.
- The initial Gap analysis is currently under review to Orient (correlate) our existing cybersecurity program based on the Educause Security Maturity Framework to the methodology and rigor of the NIST Cybersecurity Framework.

Planned Activities thru FY2018:

- Once the initial Gap analysis has been fully reviewed and agreed upon, a Current Profile for Critical Security Controls 1-5 will be created and used as the baseline for monitoring program improvements and measuring maturity going forward.
- The agreed upon Current Profile will be sent to the State as a matter of record by June 30, 2017 in accordance with EO 2017-02.
- Identified gaps in technology will be reviewed and developed in collaboration with State agencies to create a statewide purchasing plan to reduce costs. Additional funding will be necessary to effectively close the gaps.
- Non-technology related deficiencies in policy, procedures, standards and reporting for

Critical Security Controls 1-5 will be created or updated where practical.

Note: Adopting and implementing the Critical Security Controls 1-5 will be an ongoing process with the realization that it is not practical to achieve 100% compliance. To balance risk and investment Boise State will seek to achieve a reasonable low risk compliance level.