

President Saar, Members of the Governing Board, Members of CEC, guests:

My name is Miguel Corzo and I have worked for Maricopa for nearly 3 decades. I am here today to defend myself against wrongful termination by the Maricopa Administration. Others who were blamed by the Administration have resigned. The reason I am in front of the Board today is because I decided to fight this injustice rather than go silent into the night.

Let me be perfectly clear, "Members of the Executive Leadership in this Administration were informed and knew of major security issues in 2011 and 2012."

The FBI notified the Administration that data was for sale on the Internet. If that does not tell you how grave the situation was, I do not know what will. The Administration sent internal communications to all Maricopa employees with their knowledge of the situation. The VC of ITS was given the security report from Stach and Liu with supposedly all the details. The Chancellor was told repeatedly of the conditions that existed in the Department in 2012 which ultimately led to the 2013 security breach. It is in writing. You will find the warnings in the IT grievance that was filed, the Security Oversight report given to Administration and the many emails and letters sent to the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor. This documentation is available for your review. Members of the ITS Leadership involved in the investigation in 2011 and 2013 are available to testify if you need real facts. The Vice-Chancellor of ITS in 2013, John Webster, is available to be interviewed by the media, the Board and the Hearing Committee. Why wasn't the testimony of these key players considered in the investigation? I provided their names as my witnesses.

The Chancellor says that he was never told about the severity of the issues. He was informed via a formal ITS Grievance. It was addressed to him. He should have been informed by his direct report as well, the Vice-Chancellor of ITS.

I should remind the Governing Board that even if the Chancellor wants to claim he was never shown the Stach and Liu report, which I cannot comment on because I never saw it, how can he try to gloss over state audit reports that year after year pointed out issues that MCCCCD had failed to address?

I went above and beyond my responsibilities. When I realized that security fixes were not getting done, I filed a formal grievance in 2012 alerting the Chancellor that data could be exposed. The Administration had plenty of time to take action and prevent the bigger breach of 2013.

I was not in charge of any of the compromised systems at MCCCCD in 2011 and 2013 or the security associated with those systems. That was someone else's job.

I never obstructed any investigation. Maricopa has no prove of this ever happening because I never did such thing. I was not leading the investigation at the time as directed by my Supervisor (see below).

I did not fail to protect Maricopa's data. The data I was assigned to protect by Maricopa was secure in 2011. The data that was compromised belonged to another department.

The hearing committee claims that they received all the information I provided and that is correct. What they do not say is that I requested 100s of public documents to defend myself and prove my innocence and Maricopa never gave them to me before my hearing. What the hearing committee does not say is that I was never allowed to bring my witnesses to the hearing. Why is the input of highly respected IT leaders like John Webster who ran the ITS organization being dismissed?

This entire incident could have been avoided had the Administration taken action on information provided to them over and over again in 2012.

The Maricopa Administration is accusing me of not doing a job that wasn't mine to do, being responsible for systems that I wasn't responsible for, knowing about a security document that was never shared with me, not communicating upwards when I repeatedly did so, not protecting Maricopa data when the data that was stolen was not my responsibility to protect, being the database administrator for databases I had no control over, being responsible for compromised systems that were not under my supervision, performing below standards when my supervisor evaluations pointed to the contrary, not doing enough during an incident in 2011 when I was onsite, working with my staff and others to help Maricopa address a small security breach. Why is the Administration turning a blind eye on all these facts? Why did the hearing committee ignore all these when making their recommendation?

In 2013 when the second and larger breach took place, I was no longer assigned to any supervisory or database duties. Yet, I am here today being blamed for what happened in 2013.

Let me be perfectly clean again, "I was in charge of many systems at Maricopa but I was never in charge of security or networking. I certainly was not in charge of any of the compromised servers or their data"

Security is everyone's job, however, there were people in the department specifically assigned to security. These individuals reported to the Vice-Chancellor, who in turn reported to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor is accusing me of not alerting him when I became aware of the content of the Stach and Lie report. First of all, that was not my job at the time. Secondly, this is a report I have never seen and has never been given to me as testified by Martin Gang in a signed statement to the Governing Board.

Mr. Gang says:

The 2011 security incident report from the consultant was sent to Earl Monsour ... After receiving the report... Earl forwarded a copy of the entire report... to George Kahkedjian, Rod

*Marten and me. At the time the report was received, and while in the presence of George Kahkedjian, I asked why a copy of the report was not sent out to the entire IT leadership team. George firmly stated that he did not want to involve individuals who had no responsibility for the compromised systems. That meant that ... **Miguel Corzo.... was not provided a copy of the report.***

Why is the hearing committee insisting that I've seen that report and that I should have acted on it? How can I warn the Chancellor about the contents of a report that I have not seen?

The chancellor doesn't want me to hold him accountable for a report he claims he never saw, but he wants me to be held accountable for the same report that I never saw, either. How fair is that?

Gang goes on to say in his letter:

*The server that was proven to be compromised was the main Maricopa public web server. The data on the web server belonged to Marketing. Marketing and the server team had sole responsibility for the content and this server was never considered part of the protected student data systems for which Miguel had responsibility... **Given Miguel Corzo's job assignment at that time, Miguel had no responsibility for the information on that server as it was Marketing's data.***

Why is the Administration accusing me of being responsible for a database that wasn't my responsibility?

I hope this Governing Board takes the time to ask all these questions. My career and reputation are on the line after 3 decades with this District.

In order to defend myself, I requested a hearing per MAT policy. My hearing was completely rigged and I was denied due process. My chosen representative was replaced by the Administration without my approval. I was not allowed to have any of my witnesses. The records I requested from Maricopa to defend myself were never provided to me. This represents a violation of MAT policy 15.2 in the employee manual and a violation of my rights to due process. Needless to say, this was not a fair hearing. The outcome was sealed from the beginning.

As you can see, the Administration has made every effort to keep me from being able to defend myself. They violated Board policies, created new policy and applied it retroactively, denied me of due process in my hearing, and failed to ask my supervisor in 2013, John Webster, for his input during the hearing.

The Administration was told and Dr. Glasper was informed. The Administration knew that

Maricopa was at risk. They became complacent, took a chance and something major happen.

We warned the organization, not once, not twice, but over 12 times in 2012 alone. Now, the same employee who warned them is being thrown under the bus.

The Administration denies knowing how grave the situation was. They claim that the ITS Grievance does not mention data security, however, the section on security in the grievance is several paragraphs long and it reads.

A security oversight report was delivered to George Kahkedjian by his security officer in the Spring of 2012. This report pointed out several risks and deficiencies in the organization. Most of the recommendations were ignored by George Kahkedjian. The list of recommendations included:

- Resolution of web server compromises. Months passed and none of the agreed upon steps were resolved. This represented a high risk to the organization that could expose personal information.

If a grievance itself is not a call to action, I am not sure what is. If this message doesn't make someone take action, I don't know what will. We filed this grievance in 2012. It was sent to Dr. Glasper at least twice prior to the 2013 incident. The Administration never responded to it, which represents yet another violation of policy.

It has been my intention to always do what's right to the best of my abilities. Maricopa has recognized that over the years with multiple awards, promotions and excellent employee evaluations. Never in my entire career have I performed below standards. Never in my entire career have I received a bad evaluation.

The lack of care, concern and mistreatment from the Administration over the last several years is what caused the 2013 incident. The organization lost a tremendous amount of institutional knowledge. Nearly 50% of the department has left the organization. Losing a team of educated, trained and productive professionals left Maricopa compromised.

I never turned a blind eye on anything related to my job at Maricopa. I did not take the chances I took to save my job. On the contrary, I put my career and reputation on the line trying to save Maricopa from this embarrassment. Now, the organization is sparing no expense to end my career.

I encourage the Board to own their own findings and ask questions. If the Board fails to make the investment, they will be leaving themselves open for litigation and the courts will tear us apart. The time is always right to do what is right.

Please take the following into consideration as you make a decision tonight

1. In order to make an informed decision, the Board needs to listen to the only legal sworn testimony about the security incident that is available to date. This is the testimony of Earl Monsour available for purchase from the courts. Has the Board heard his testimony?
2. In order to make an informed decision, the Board needs to hear from George K. Where is George? He was my supervisor. He did my evaluations and gave me marching orders. He knew about the Stach and Liu report. He knew the organization was at risk and security work had to be completed to fully protect Maricopa. Why didn't he report this to the Chancellor or did he?
3. I made a public records request 6 months ago and I just received last week a partial list of records that I am still reviewing. Why has the Maricopa Administration denied me access to information that is not confidential and is public record? My own employee records were denied to me prior to my hearing.
4. The letter of termination wrongfully assumes that I have seen a critical document, the Stach and Liu report of 2011. That document was never shared with me. Why was this critical fact missed by the committee?
5. I have been denied due process in a hearing that has been one-sided and heavily stacked in the Administration's favor. Nearly all sections of the MAT dismissal process in the MAT policy manual (15.2) have been violated. Who is holding the Administration accountable?
6. Please consider all my contributions to Maricopa over the last 3 decades. Many of the systems that Maricopa still uses today are systems my teams developed and put in place. For years, I supervised one of the largest ERP systems and identity management systems in an educational institution in this country. None of these systems were compromised in 2011. Can someone performing below standards do this?
7. Please consider the fact that a letter of termination was presented to me last Thursday and I was given absolutely no time to respond. This is unfair and inhumane. I didn't even know my name was on the Board Agenda until yesterday.

Honesty, integrity, responsibility, stewardship and transparency have always been at the forefront of our organization. This incident has made us forget some of these core values.

Please join me in my fight to bring our core values back to the organization. Some of you have fought injustice before and understand what it feels like to be in my position tonight.

I am shocked and ashamed of the behavior of the Maricopa Administration.

I don't understand the need to make me a scapegoat.

I am a victim of this Administration's attempt at avoiding accountability.

Why are you spending so much time and money to throw me under the bus?

This is a systemic problem that will be here long after I am gone if you allow things to continue

this way. Miguel is not the problem. I was just a middle manager trying to do the best I can in a place I love.

The chancellor doesn't want the buck to stop with him. But it does stop with him and not with those of us whose job responsibilities had nothing to do with 2011 breach or the 2013 breach. This scapegoating is dishonest and should be unacceptable to the board.

I love my job at Maricopa. I am very sorry for what happened in 2013 and I am very sad for what's happening to Maricopa today, however, this wasn't my fault. This is a great injustice. This truly is 'to sin against hope'

Please take the time to do a proper investigation. The 2.5 million who have been at risk of identity theft deserve no less. The taxpayers and students of Maricopa County who are now paying more tuition because of the breach deserve better.

I am asking you today to remove my name from the separation list and hold the Administration accountable. I went above and beyond to save Maricopa from this embarrassment.

I can summarize my speech with a few recorded words from the mouth of Kroll's Lead investigator hired by Maricopa **"You did nothing wrong!"**

As a well-known leader once said

Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully submitted,

Miguel Corzo