To-Be Process Analysis of UNF Cyber Competition Team Preparation and Competition Execution

1. Purpose of the To-Be Analysis

The as-is phase documented the current preparation and competition processes used by UNF cyber competition teams and identified several recurring weaknesses. These included limited practice frequency, rare mock competitions, weak workflow training, low readiness depth, inconsistent leadership continuity, and undertraining in core enterprise defensive skills such as Windows hardening, Active Directory, triage, and recovery.

The purpose of this to-be phase is to define what new processes and procedures the team should be using in order to become more successful. This phase also identifies how current weaknesses can be translated into strengths through a realistic future-state model. Because this study is constrained to recommendations that do not require new funding, new staff, or direct institutional effort, the to-be process focuses on **student-run process changes, governance changes, and training structure improvements**.

This phase is also informed by the **2023 OSEC Constitution**, which is important because it shows that some problems are not caused by the total absence of rules. The constitution already assigns the Team Captain responsibility for organizing the competition team, registering for competitions, coordinating strategy, and conducting weekly practice meetings for CCDC. It also expects competition members to commit at least five hours per week to extracurricular cybersecurity study. However, the survey findings indicate a significant gap between these written expectations and actual team practice. This suggests that underperformance is caused not only by missing rules, but also by weak implementation, weak competition-specific governance, and insufficient accountability.

In addition, anecdotal information about stronger programs, particularly UCF, suggests several important differences. UCF is reported to train at much higher weekly intensity, to have coursework that aligns with competition material, and to maintain year-round officer continuity. Even if every detail is not formally verified, these reported differences align with the weaknesses identified in the survey and provide a useful directional benchmark for what a stronger process looks like.

At the same time, the survey's long-form responses also indicate that multiple participants view financial and infrastructure limitations as meaningful contributors to underperformance. Respondents referenced the need for improved lab equipment, more server capacity, hosted mock environments, paid training resources, and external coaching.

These responses suggest that stronger schools may benefit not only from stronger internal processes, but also from greater material support. Therefore, this to-be analysis distinguishes between **resource-related gaps** and **process/governance gaps**. While the recommendations in this paper prioritize changes that can be implemented without new funding, the financial and infrastructure issues reported by participants remain relevant contextual factors.

---

2. Future-State Design Principles

The future-state model for UNF should be based on a small number of clear principles derived from the as-is findings, the long-form survey responses, and the governance structure defined in the constitution.

2.1 Preparation Must Be Continuous, Not Seasonal

The current model appears to lose momentum between semesters and outside the active competition season. A successful team process should treat preparation as year-round, with fall and spring connected as a single development cycle rather than two disconnected efforts.

2.2 Training Must Resemble Competition Conditions

The current process relies heavily on labs and lecture-style activity but rarely uses mock competitions or tabletop workflow practice. The future state must include repeated simulation of real competition conditions, including time pressure, role assignments, injects, reporting, and recovery work.

2.3 Team Performance Must Be Prioritized Over Individual Performance

Several issues raised in the survey, long-form responses, and discussion indicate that current incentives sometimes favor individual machine performance or individual reputation over team resilience. The future-state model must define leadership and competition procedures around shared critical assets, coordinated triage, and team-first decision making.

2.4 Leadership Must Be Selected and Evaluated Based on Leadership, Not Individual Technical Performance Alone

The constitution formally defines the Team Captain as the competition leader, but the current officer nomination process only requires candidates to answer broad questions about qualifications and goals. It does not require demonstrated coaching ability, planning skill,

practice reliability, or team-first behavior. Because of that, the future-state process must address not only leadership duties, but also leadership selection criteria and accountability.

2.5 The Team Must Develop Depth, Not Just a Small High-Skill Core

Survey results indicated that only one to two people were often seen as truly competition-ready before events. A strong future-state process must build a larger bench of trained members through role pipelines, mentorship, and readiness standards.

2.6 Governance Must Support Fairness, Continuity, and Accountability

The constitution gives the Team Captain authority over competition participation and allows the captain to remove team members for consistent absence or Code of Conduct issues. That authority can be useful, but in its current form it provides limited procedural safeguards. The future-state model should preserve leadership authority while adding clearer standards, documentation, and shared oversight.

2.7 Limited Resources Must Be Used More Efficiently

The long-form responses indicate that some participants believe stronger schools benefit from better equipment, more lab capacity, and greater access to structured training resources. Even if those differences cannot be fully eliminated under the constraints of this study, the future-state process should make better use of the resources already available by emphasizing structured practice, internally developed scenarios, repeatable simulations, and shared documentation.

---

3. To-Be Process Documentation

This section describes the future-state process the team should be using.

3.1 To-Be Preparation Process

Year-Round Team Structure

The team should operate on a full academic year cycle rather than treating fall and spring as separate resets. Officers, especially the captain, should remain in place for the full school year. Core team members should carry over across semesters, and new members should be integrated into an existing structure rather than replacing it. In addition, while other teams

are able to return from winter break and continue with the same structure they had before, UNF often spends that same period forming a new team and restarting training from the beginning. This creates a major disadvantage going into the spring season.

This recommendation fits the existing constitution better than it may initially appear. The constitution already treats officers as formal positions with yearly elections during the spring semester, but the survey and discussion suggest that the competition team still experiences a practical reset problem. Therefore, the needed change is not the invention of continuity from nothing, but the stronger operational use of the continuity the constitution is already supposed to support.

Leadership Structure

The team should move from a single loosely defined “captain” model to a more operational leadership structure within the existing officer system. At minimum, the future-state model should include:

- **Team Captain / Operations Lead**
  Responsible for practice structure, scheduling, accountability, and competition coordination.

- **Deputy / Captain-in-Training**
  Responsible for succession support and preparation to lead the following year.

- **Technical Leads**
  Leads for major areas such as Windows/AD, Linux/services, networking, and reporting/injects.

This does not require eliminating the Team Captain role defined in the constitution. Instead, it clarifies how that role should function operationally.

Captain Selection Process

The team should stop treating captain selection primarily as a reward for prior individual competition performance. The constitution currently allows any voting member to run and only requires candidates to explain why they are qualified and what their goals are. That is too broad for a role with major influence over team preparation, competition execution, and member retention.

The future-state process should evaluate Team Captain candidates using additional competition-specific criteria such as:

- consistent attendance,
- willingness to teach and support others,
- ability to organize practices,
- demonstrated team-first behavior under pressure,
- professionalism and fairness in handling conflict,
- reliability across both semesters.

A simple student-run process could require candidates to submit a brief competition plan in addition to the current nomination questions. This preserves the constitutional election structure while making the role selection more aligned with actual team needs.

Practice Cadence

The future-state process should use a structured weekly cadence. Even if total hours cannot match schools like UCF, UNF can still improve substantially by redesigning how its current time is used.

A recommended cadence is:

- **One technical build session per week** focused on platform skills
- **One competition workflow session per week** focused on scenarios, roles, injects, and communications
- **One recurring mini-simulation or timed drill per week**, even if short

If three sessions per week is unrealistic, then one existing weekly practice should be split into distinct segments:

1. technical skill drill,

2. timed scenario,

3. debrief and documentation update.

This recommendation also helps close the gap between constitutional expectation and practice reality. The constitution already states that the Team Captain should conduct weekly practice meetings for CCDC and that members should commit five or more hours per week to extracurricular cybersecurity study. The problem is therefore not merely the absence of a formal expectation. The problem is inconsistent operationalization of that expectation.

Training Format

The to-be process should replace overreliance on loosely structured labs with a progression model:

1. **Skill Drill**

    - Focused practice on a specific topic such as Windows hardening, AD recovery, Linux service restoration, firewall rules, or triage.

2. **Applied Scenario**

    - A short timed problem requiring members to use the skill under pressure.

EX: Windows Host Triage Under Time Pressure (30–45 minutes)

- **Starting state:** A Windows Server VM has slow authentication, high CPU, and intermittent RDP.
- **Objective:** Restore stability while preserving evidence.
- **Constraints:** 30 minutes timed. No reboots unless approved by Incident Command.
- **Success criteria:**

1. Identify top 2 suspected causes (malicious or misconfiguration) with supporting evidence,
2. Stabilize the system (CPU, auth latency, RDP reliability),
3. Produce a short incident note (what happened, what changed, rollback plan).

- **Artifacts:** one-page incident log entry + screenshot/command outputs.

Example Applied Scenario 2: Linux Service Restore + Change Control (30 minutes)

- **Starting state:** A scored web service is failing health checks.
- **Objective:** Restore service without breaking dependencies.
- **Constraints:** Every change must be logged (who/what/why/rollback).
- **Success criteria:**
    1. Service restored,
    2. Change log complete,
    3. Root cause explained in 3–5 sentences.
    -

3. **Role-Based Simulation**
    - Members perform within assigned competition roles, including communications, inject handling, and evidence gathering.

4. **Debrief**

    - Team identifies what failed first, what caused delays, and what should change next time.

This future-state model directly translates the survey's weaknesses into training objectives and makes better use of limited practice time and limited resources.

Readiness Pipeline

The team should define what "competition-ready" means. Instead of allowing readiness to remain informal, the future-state process should require each member to demonstrate core competencies before competition selection.

Example readiness checkpoints:

- restore or harden a Windows host,
- assist with Active Directory triage,
- restore or secure a Linux service,
- document changes clearly,
- respond to at least one inject/report task,
- function effectively in a timed simulation.

This creates a larger ready bench and reduces overreliance on one or two people.

Resource-Conscious Training Design

Because multiple respondents identified financial and infrastructure issues, the future-state process should also explicitly account for limited resources. This means:

- reusing internally built practice scenarios,

- storing debriefs and playbooks so training compounds over time,
- using free or already available tools whenever possible,
- prioritizing repeatable environments over one-off improvised practices,
- designing drills that can still work even when lab infrastructure is limited.

This does not eliminate the disadvantage of having fewer material resources than stronger schools, but it can reduce waste and make current resources produce more training value.

3.2 To-Be Competition Execution Process

Incident Command Model

The future-state competition process should use a clear incident command structure. During competition, one person must have authority to prioritize tasks and reassign help based on team risk rather than individual preferences.

This directly addresses the team-first failure pattern discussed earlier, where a critical system owner requested help and leadership refused because it did not benefit the leader's own machine. In a strong process, this behavior would be disallowed by design.

Shared Critical Asset Rules

Critical infrastructure such as the domain controller, core firewall, central authentication systems, or scoring-relevant services should be treated as shared team assets. If those systems are in danger, the team must prioritize them regardless of whose machine is directly affected.

This should be formalized in the playbook with a rule such as:

- if a shared critical asset is degraded, other roles assist as directed by incident command.

Change Control and Documentation

The future-state process should require a lightweight but consistent documentation system during competition. Every significant change should record:

- who made the change,
- what was changed,
- why it was changed,
- how to roll it back if needed.

This can be done with a shared document, markdown log, or ticket-style note system. The goal is preventing self-inflicted outages and making recovery faster.

Monitoring and Detection Workflow

The future-state process should establish a consistent detection workflow rather than relying mostly on ad hoc manual checks. Even with minimal tooling, the team should define:

- who monitors logs,
- who watches services,
- who verifies restorations,
- who escalates suspected compromise.

Inject and Reporting Integration

Injects and reporting should not be treated as optional tasks handled only after technical fires calm down. The future-state process should assign explicit inject/report responsibility at the start of each event, with backup support if the primary owner becomes overloaded.

This strengthens one of the weakest areas identified in the current state: non-technical tasks are often deprioritized when systems become unstable.

4. Detailed Gap Analysis

The following gap analysis compares the current state to the future state and identifies how present weaknesses can be translated into strengths.

Gap 1: Written Expectations Exist, but Operational Follow-Through Is Weak

As-Is:
The constitution already expects the Team Captain to organize weekly CCDC practices and expects competition members to commit five or more hours per week to extracurricular cybersecurity study. However, survey results show that most respondents experienced only one short structured practice per week, mock competitions were rare, and overall readiness remained low.

To-Be:
Operationalize the existing constitutional expectations through a published practice calendar, recurring drills, weekly simulations, and a documented readiness pipeline.

Example: 4-week practice cadence (repeatable and realistic)

- **Week 1:**
  - Session A (Technical): Windows hardening baseline + AD fundamentals (drill + checklist)
  - Session B (Ops): Inject workflow tabletop + report QA checklist walkthrough
  - Session C (Mini-sim): 60-minute timed “keep services up” scenario with role assignments
- **Week 2:**
  - Session A: Linux services restore drill + evidence capture practice

- Session B: Incident command tabletop (triage priorities + escalation)
- Session C: 90-minute mini-sim with 2 injects + change log enforcement

- **Week 3:**
  - Session A: Firewalling/segmentation drill + “break/fix” lab
  - Session B: Report writing sprint (findings → evidence → mitigation → validation)
  - Session C: 2-hour mock block simulating first half of competition

- **Week 4:**
  - Session A: AD incident response drill (GPO rollback, account triage, logs)
  - Session B: Full hot-wash rehearsal + playbook updates
  - Session C: 2–3 hour mock competition block (roles + injects + score tracking)

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The team moves from informal or inconsistent compliance with written expectations to a repeatable and enforceable preparation process.

Gap 2: Seasonal, Low-Continuity Team Structure → Year-Round Team Continuity

As-Is:
The team appears to operate with limited continuity, especially between fall and spring. Leadership and roster structure may reset in practice, causing loss of momentum, weaker role development, and repeated onboarding.

To-Be:
Use one Team Captain and one core competition structure across the full academic year. Add a deputy role for succession and keep a stable core across semesters.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Instead of restarting each semester, the team compounds experience over time and enters spring with developed roles, shared procedures, and stronger trust.

Gap 3: Captain Chosen by Broad Popular Election or Prior Performance → Captain Chosen by Competition Leadership Criteria

As-Is:
The constitution's nomination process asks only why a candidate is qualified and what their goals are. In practice, captain selection may be influenced by reputation or prior technical performance rather than leadership, teaching ability, attendance, or fairness.

To-Be:
Keep the constitutional election structure, but add competition-specific selection criteria such as practice reliability, leadership maturity, team support, conflict handling, and planning ability.

Example Team Captain Candidate Scoring Sheet (student-run)
Rate each category 1–5. Total possible: 30. Suggested minimum: 22.

1. **Reliability:** attendance history; shows up prepared
2. **Planning:** can publish agendas; runs structured practices
3. **Teaching/mentorship:** builds others; does not gatekeep
4. **Team-first behavior:** prioritizes shared assets; supports roles under pressure
5. **Conflict handling:** fair, professional, not personal
6. **Operational judgment:** triage and prioritization under time pressure

Tie-breaker: written "season plan" quality (schedule, drills, mock cadence, readiness plan).
Notes section: examples of observed behavior (positive/negative), kept anonymous if needed.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Leadership becomes a stabilizing force rather than a risk factor. Practice quality, morale, and accountability improve.

Gap 4: Captain Duties Are Defined, but Accountability Standards Are Too Broad

As-Is:
The constitution gives the Team Captain significant responsibilities, including registration, strategy coordination, and weekly practice leadership, but it does not define specific performance standards for how those duties should be carried out.

To-Be:
Add operating expectations for the Team Captain such as publishing practice plans, maintaining readiness tracking, enforcing team-first competition procedures, and conducting debriefs.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The leadership role becomes operationally measurable instead of only formally defined.

Gap 5: One Short Weekly Practice → Structured, Layered Practice Cadence

As-Is:
Most practices occur once per week and last one to two hours.

To-Be:
Use a weekly cadence that includes skill drills, scenario work, and mini-simulations, even if overall hours remain limited.

Example: 2-hour practice agenda (works even if only 1 session/week exists)

- 0:00–0:10 — Briefing (roles assigned, objectives, scoring criteria)
- 0:10–0:35 — Skill drill (one focused technical skill)
- 0:35–1:35 — Timed scenario (mini-sim with role execution + change log required)

- 1:35–1:55 — Debrief (“what failed first”, “what fix prevents it next time”)
- 1:55–2:00 — Assign take-home (one microtask per role)

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The same limited time becomes more effective because it is structured around competition outcomes instead of passive exposure.

Gap 6: Labs and Lecture Dominate → Simulation and Workflow Training Become Routine

As-Is:
Guided labs, independent labs, and lectures are common, while mock competitions and tabletops are rare.

To-Be:
Make simulation, inject handling, communications, and reporting a routine part of training.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Members become prepared not only to know technical material, but also to operate effectively in real competition conditions.

Gap 7: Small Ready Core → Readiness Pipeline and Bench Development

As-Is:
Only one to two people are often seen as truly competition-ready before events.

To-Be:
Define minimum readiness standards and use mentorship plus repeated role practice to build depth.

Example: “Competition Ready” baseline (pass/fail checklist)
A member is eligible for competition roster consideration when they can do **all** of the following in a timed drill:

- **Service survival:** restore a broken Linux service or Windows service and verify it
- **Documentation:** produce a valid change log entry (who/what/why/rollback)

- **Triage:** identify highest-risk issue within 10 minutes and justify priority
- **Role execution:** perform assigned role for 30 minutes without needing step-by-step direction
- **Inject support:** complete one inject response draft with evidence references

Role specialization add-on (pick one): Windows/AD lead, Linux/services lead, network/firewall lead, logging/monitoring lead, inject/report lead.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The team becomes more resilient, less dependent on a few individuals, and better able to handle competition stress.

Gap 8: Weak Triage, Recovery, and Change Control → Standardized Competition Playbook

As-Is:
Respondents described weaknesses in triage, response/recovery, and avoiding self-inflicted outages.

To-Be:
Use a simple team playbook covering first-hour priorities, critical asset rules, role responsibilities, and change logging requirements.

Example: "First 30 Minutes" playbook page (competition day)

1. **Incident Command assigns roles** (IC, Windows/AD, Linux/services, network, logging, inject/report, scribe)
2. **Critical assets list confirmed** (DC, core firewall/router, scoring services)
3. **Service health check snapshot** (what is up/down, baseline)
4. **Immediate hardening tasks** (credential reset policy, disable obvious exposures, backups/snapshots)

5. **Logging plan activated** (who watches what; where evidence goes)
6. **Change control starts** (scribe logs every change)
7. **Inject lead establishes workflow** (inbox, priority, deadlines, submission format)

Rule: no reboot, firewall overhaul, or major change without IC approval + rollback plan.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Competition execution becomes more organized, which reduces avoidable losses and improves response speed.

Gap 9: Technical Fires Overwhelm Injects and Reporting → Dedicated Role Ownership

As-Is:
Injects and reporting often suffer because technical incidents take priority.

To-Be:
Assign inject/report ownership from the start and integrate those tasks into competition workflow.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The team captures points that are currently lost due to overload and poor prioritization.

Gap 10: Broad Captain Removal Authority Over Team Members → Fairer Competition Governance

As-Is:
The constitution allows the Team Captain to remove a team member for consistent absence or Code of Conduct issues. While this may be intended to preserve team standards, it provides little procedural detail regarding documentation, review, appeal, or shared oversight.

To-Be:
Preserve leadership authority, but require documented reasons, attendance evidence where

relevant, and review by at least one additional officer or advisor for non-emergency removals.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Governance becomes more consistent, fair, and less vulnerable to misuse or perception of personal bias.

Gap 11: Team Rules Exist, but Member Development Is Underspecified

As-Is:
The constitution expects commitment and communication from competition members, but it does not define how inexperienced members progress into competition-ready roles.

To-Be:
Add a member development pipeline: shadowing, backup-role practice, role rotation, and readiness checks.

Example: 3-step pipeline per role

- **Shadow (Week 1–2):** observe a lead during mini-sim; take notes; learn checklist
- **Backup (Week 3–4):** perform tasks with lead oversight; own documentation
- **Primary (Week 5+):** run role in a mini-sim independently; evaluated by readiness checklist

Weakness Translated to Strength:
The team creates a sustainable internal talent pipeline instead of relying on chance or self-selection.

Gap 12: Resource Limitations and Practice Environment Constraints

As-Is:
Multiple respondents identified financial and infrastructure limitations as barriers to building realistic practice environments, expanding lab capacity, accessing structured training resources, and obtaining external coaching. These concerns suggest that stronger schools may benefit not only from better internal processes, but also from greater material support.

To-Be:

Because this study is constrained to no-cost recommendations, the future-state process should maximize existing free tools, student-built scenarios, shared documentation, repeatable drills, and internally reusable practice material. At the same time, the team should formally recognize that some differences between UNF and stronger schools may remain partially resource-related.

Weakness Translated to Strength:
Even without new funding, the team can improve how it uses limited resources by emphasizing structure, repeatability, and shared learning rather than improvised or inconsistent preparation.

---

5. Resource and Financial Constraints as Contextual Gaps

Survey long-form responses indicate that some participants view financial and infrastructure limitations as meaningful contributors to underperformance. Respondents referenced the need for improved lab equipment, additional server capacity, hosted mock environments, paid training resources, and external coaching. These responses suggest that stronger schools may benefit not only from better internal processes, but also from a higher level of material support.

At the same time, the findings of this study indicate that not all major weaknesses are resource-dependent. Several of the most prominent gaps identified in the as-is phase, including weak continuity, limited simulation, poor workflow discipline, uneven leadership quality, unclear readiness standards, and weak governance safeguards, can be improved without requiring new funding. Therefore, while financial limitations should be recognized as a real contextual disadvantage, the to-be recommendations in this study focus on no-cost process and governance changes that remain feasible within current constraints.

This distinction is important because it avoids two oversimplified conclusions. The first would be that UNF underperforms only because it lacks money. The second would be that resources do not matter at all. The survey data does not support either extreme. Instead, it suggests that both resource-related and non-resource-related gaps exist, but that the process and governance gaps are the most immediately actionable within the limits of this project.

---

6. How Current Weaknesses Translate into Strengths

The central insight of this gap analysis is that many of UNF's current weaknesses are not purely resource problems. Some resource differences with stronger schools may be real, but the survey data, long-form responses, and constitution together indicate that several of the most damaging problems are **process and governance problems**.

The constitution is especially important here because it shows that formal expectations already exist. The Team Captain already has defined duties. Competition members are already expected to communicate and commit time. Elections already occur on a yearly basis. However, those formal rules do not automatically produce strong practice structure, strong captain selection, fair roster governance, or strong operational discipline.

The translation from weakness to strength can therefore be summarized as follows:

- **written expectations without consistent execution** become **operationally enforced routines**
- **seasonal reset behavior** becomes **year-round cumulative development**
- **captain chosen without strong competition-specific criteria** becomes **captain chosen and evaluated as a leader**
- **formal duties without measurable standards** become **clear leadership accountability**
- **lecture/lab-heavy practice** becomes **competition-like simulation**
- **informal readiness** becomes **defined readiness standards**
- **reactive firefighting** becomes **structured triage and coordinated recovery**
- **inject neglect** becomes **integrated role ownership**
- **small ready core** becomes **a trained bench**
- **broad removal power** becomes **fairer competition governance**

- **limited resources used inconsistently** become **limited resources used deliberately and efficiently**

This is important because it means success does not depend only on becoming identical to a school like UCF in resources or formal academic integration. Instead, success can begin with adopting the right operating model within the structure the organization already has.

---

7. Proposed To-Be Process Map

Preparation Phase (To-Be)

Inputs: student members, officer structure, Team Captain, weekly practice time, existing lab access, shared playbook
Process:

1. Maintain year-round captain and core team structure
2. Run structured weekly training with a defined agenda
3. Conduct technical drills on core competition skills
4. Conduct recurring scenario-based and timed simulations
5. Reuse internal practice materials and debrief outputs to reduce wasted effort
6. Update playbook and debrief after each session
7. Evaluate member readiness against defined role standards
8. Build bench depth through mentorship and role rotation

Outputs: larger competition-ready pool, stronger workflow familiarity, improved continuity, more consistent training quality, better use of limited resources

Competition Phase (To-Be)

Inputs: stable roster, assigned roles, incident command structure, shared playbook, competition environment

Process:

1. Establish incident command and critical asset priorities
2. Assign role ownership for systems, injects, reporting, and monitoring
3. Perform initial triage and stabilization using playbook
4. Log major changes and coordinate rollbacks if needed
5. Reassign support to critical assets as threats emerge
6. Maintain parallel reporting/inject workflow during technical response
7. Conduct structured post-event review and feed lessons back into training

Outputs: more stable services, stronger coordination, improved inject/report completion, reduced self-inflicted failures, stronger team performance

---

8. Conclusion

The future-state model for UNF cyber competition teams should not simply aim to do more of the same. It should replace the current loosely structured, low-continuity, technically narrow preparation process with a year-round, leadership-stable, simulation-driven model that treats cyber competition as a team operation rather than a collection of individual technical tasks.

The constitution makes this conclusion stronger, not weaker. It shows that the organization already has a formal competition structure, officer roles, and participation expectations. The problem is that those formal structures do not yet translate into a consistently effective competition process. The gap analysis therefore shows that the major differences between

the current state and a stronger future state are not limited to money or staffing. Many of the most important improvements are internal process and governance changes that students can implement themselves: year-round continuity, stronger captain selection criteria, operational leadership expectations, simulation-based practice, readiness standards, incident command, change logging, inject ownership, fairer roster procedures, and more deliberate use of limited resources.

Financial limitations should still be acknowledged honestly. The survey data suggests that stronger schools may benefit from better infrastructure, more robust practice environments, and other material advantages that UNF may not fully share. However, the presence of those disadvantages does not remove the need for internal improvement. If adopted consistently, the process and governance changes proposed in this paper would directly convert several of the team's current weaknesses into operational strengths and create a realistic foundation for stronger performance in future competitions.