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Executive Summary

The Gold Standard was adopted by the Board of Trustees in May 2016 after substantive dialogue and input from stakeholders across campus and the excellent work of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. To inform the development of the Gold Standard 2020, risks and opportunities generated from constituents across campus, and reviewed and discussed by senior leadership and the Enterprise Risk Management Tactical Action Committee, were considered. In fall 2016, WMU’s senior leadership further identified 44 priority strategies across the 24 strategic plan objectives within the five broad goals of the Gold Standard 2020 that would serve to focus WMU’s resources and tailor new initiatives for the 2016-2017 academic year.

WMU has adopted a Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRÖM) approach to help identify and respond to any risks or opportunities that may impact achievement of the University’s priority strategies. In July 2016, President Dunn provided direction to move into the CRÖM implementation phase of the strategic planning process by authorizing the vice presidents to convene as a Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) of the Senior Leadership Team for the purpose of oversight and communication. Seven CRÖM Action Teams were developed to serve as work groups designed to monitor, coordinate, and stimulate response to identified risks or advance opportunities in implementation of the Gold Standard 2020. The CRÖM Action Teams are constructed around the identified risk/opportunity areas impacting the 2016-2017 priority strategies of the Gold Standard 2020, but also given the latitude to further identify specific risk/opportunities throughout their risk assessments.

The CRÖM process includes a preparation phase, risk identification phase, response and action phase, and future integration phase. The preparation phase began in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 through a comprehensive, University-wide risk assessment conducted by Internal Audit. The risks were further refined by the senior leadership and informed the thinking and action of the Gold Standard 2020 Strategic Planning Committee and ultimately the seven CRÖM Action Teams. The purpose of the risk identification phase was to generate a comprehensive list of risks based on those events, circumstances, or processes that might create, enhance, prevent, degrade, accelerate, or delay the achievement of the Gold Standard 2020. The response and action phase of the CRÖM process, commenced in fall 2016, involves synthesizing the knowledge from SMEC and CRÖM Action Teams to create a risk map that prompts coordinated action to improve implementation of the Gold Standard 2020. The goal of the integration phase is to further align the CRÖM process into the operations of the University, ensuring that risk/opportunity identification and response should become part of all units across campus.

SMEC identified the enterprise-wide risk categories of Organization Culture, Resource Deployment, and Strategic Prioritization, and 16 risks to address at the senior leadership level. CRÖM Action Teams reported 214 risks across seven risk categories. An initial meeting between SMEC and CRÖM leaders resulted in the following risk types being identified for immediate response:
Priority Risks Identified by CRŌM Action Teams for Immediate Response

Team #1 Learner Success
- Fear Changes in General Education
- Inadequate Graduate Student Infrastructure
- Under-Delivering on Diversity Initiatives

Team #2 Enrollment Management
- Decentralized Recruitment and Retention
- Policies and Structures as Roadblocks to Student Equity
- Reactive Planning in Retention Efforts

Team #3 Learner Support
- Decentralized Accountability for Student Advising
- Uncoordinated and Duplicative Tutoring Programs
- Lack of Utilization of Program Reviews for Continuous Quality Improvement

Team #4 Enhancing Discovery
- Insufficient Infrastructure
- Lack of Research Recognition
- Decentralized Accountability for Centers and Institutes

Team #5 Steward of Place
- Lack of Brand/Communication Consistency and Continuity
- Little Succession Planning Across Employment Lines
- Labor Intensive Data Sharing and Data Management, Access

Team #6 Campus Safety
- Insufficient Awareness of Title IX Sexual Misconduct Policies
- Resistance to Being Responsible Employees and Campus Security Authority
- Climate of Fear and Retaliation Employee Complaints

Team #7 Institutional Planning and Compliance
- Unclear Direction for Decision-Making
- Lack of Documentation and Transparency in Budget Decisions
- Lean Investment in People
- Nonintegrated Data Systems
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**Introduction**

Western Michigan University, a premier, comprehensive, public research university, is learner-centered, discovery-driven, and globally engaged. The Gold Standard 2020, WMU’s updated strategic plan adopted in March 2016, sets forth goals, objectives, and strategies to achieve the University’s mission and the campus-wide commitment to academic rigor, service, inclusivity, collaboration, economic development, sustainability, and good stewardship of institutional resources. In fall 2016, WMU’s senior leadership further identified 44 priority strategies across the 24 objectives within the five broad goals of the Gold Standard 2020 that would serve to focus our resources and tailor new initiatives for the 2016-2017 academic year.

Built into the Gold Standard 2020 are 108 specific strategies that directly address challenges or opportunities identified in the planning process. Since these challenges affect all aspects of Western Michigan University’s mission and operations, they should be a critical tool in the implementation and oversight of the plan. Such an approach integrates risk management into the strategic deliberations of senior leaders and board members, positioning the University to accomplish its long-term goals and objectives. WMU has begun implementing the Gold Standard 2020 by focusing on how the identified risks and opportunities may impact achievement of the University’s priority strategies.

To that end, WMU has adopted a Collaborative Risk/opportunity Management (CRÕM) approach to help identify and respond to any risks that may impact the successful implementation of the Gold Standard 2020. CRÕM is an overarching process that provides a methodology, a common language, and a set of standards to identify, evaluate, prioritize, and manage risks; risks also include opportunities. WMU’s framework for CRÕM is based on ISO 31000 (2009), an international standard, but tailored to integrate risk management into the strategic deliberations of senior leaders and board members, positioning the University to accomplish its goals and fulfill its mission.

**Presidential Direction**

In July 2016, President Dunn provided direction to move into the CRÕM implementation phase of the strategic planning process by authorizing the vice presidents to convene as a Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) of the Senior Leadership Team. The purpose of the SMEC is to provide oversight in implementation and communication of managing risks and opportunities impacting the implementation of the University strategic plan: Gold Standard 2020. The president charged SMEC to monitor progress, provide assistance, make recommendations, and take action as appropriate through a Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRÕM) process throughout implementation of the Gold Standard cycle. The responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

1. Monitor and advise University leadership of the progress being made in the implementation of the University strategic plan as a result of the Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRÕM) process;
2. Recommend and take action as appropriate to assist in removing barriers to achieving high-priority initiatives;
3. Design and appoint leadership for CRÖM Action Teams addressing identified CRÖM strategic priority areas. Monitor work team progress, sequencing and action plan timelines, framework for decision-making, and establishing assessment criteria for each of the identified strategic management risk areas;
4. Receive CRÖM Action Team reports, and advise University leadership on mitigation of strategic risks;
5. Incorporate input from all University division strategic plan annual reports in support of University strategic priorities;
6. Conduct periodic evaluations of the University strategic plan, CRÖM progress to determine what resources are needed to support recommended CRÖM actions or strategic initiatives;
7. Minimally, hold bi-monthly meetings to fully implement the proposed CRÖM approach to strategic management; and,
8. While SMEC will deliberate as a council and act when consensus has been reached, all vice presidents reserve primary authority over their division responsibilities.

Seven CRÖM Action Teams were developed to be work groups designed to monitor, coordinate, and stimulate mitigation of identified risks or advance opportunities in implementation of the University strategic plan, the Gold Standard 2020. The CRÖM Action Teams are constructed around the identified risk/opportunity areas impacting the 2016-2017 priority strategies of the Gold Standard 2020, but also given the latitude to further identify specific risk/opportunities throughout their risk-status assessments. Duties include, but are not limited to:

1. Conduct risk assessment and analysis to determine status of current risk areas and further delineation of strategic risks as they impact implementation of the Gold Standard 2020;
2. Encourage new efforts or initiatives where needed to mitigate challenges impacting achievement of University strategic goals;
3. Report to the Strategic Management Executive Council progress in risk mitigation and achievement of related strategic goals; and,
4. At a minimum, hold monthly meetings to implement stated roles and responsibilities.

Approach and Timeline

Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC)

*Fall 2016*

- Consider and appoint membership for the various CRÖM Action Teams
- Decide on CRÖM purpose and common language, reporting process, and timeline for implementation
- Align CRÖM process with other planning structures (i.e., faculty senate Committee on University Strategic Planning (CUSP))
- Communicate CRÖM process in alignment with strategic plan reporting
- Begin discussions of enterprise-wide risks and opportunities from a senior-level perspective
**Spring 2017**
- Continue to define architecture and process for CRÖM, including communication plan
- Initiate discussion of connecting budget process with strategic planning and CRÖM
- Review risk analysis with CRÖM Action Teams
- Conduct all-hands meeting for the purpose of assessment and training on Phase II: Response and Action

**CRÖM Action Teams**

**Fall 2016**
- Populate CRÖM Action Teams
- Receive charge to relative to risk areas
- Begin training of CRÖM purpose and common language, reporting process, and timeline for implementation
- Begin CRÖM Action Team meetings to reinforce training and further explain charge to teams

**Spring 2017**
- Initiate CRÖM process on risk/opportunity area
- Complete Phase I: Risk Identification and Evaluation
- Evaluate and improve CRÖM process and materials

**Summer 2017**
- Analyze data for risk prioritization and subsequent action
- Integrate report into end-of-year strategic planning

**Process and Protocols**

WMU’s framework from CRÖM is based on ISO 31000 (2009), an international standard. The framework outlines the elements necessary to facilitate successful achievement of the University strategic plan, the Gold Standard 2020, and achievements of WMU’s mission.
Preparation and CRŌM Development

Establishing the Context
The purpose of establishing the context for risk assessment is to set the stage for risk identification. Since “risk” is defined as “a possible occurrence or influence that can significantly affect an outcome that matters, including the inability to seize opportunities,” defining WMU’s objectives is a prerequisite to identifying risk.

The preparation phase was completed over the course of two years, spanning the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. A comprehensive, University-wide risk assessment was conducted by Internal Audit in 2014-2015. Those risks were further refined by the senior leadership and informed the thinking and action of the Gold Standard 2020 Strategic Planning Committee. The findings from the 2014-2015 audit were used to identify top risks and opportunities facing WMU resulting in the seven risk/opportunity areas that form the work of the CRŌM Action Teams. In spring 2016, the Gold Standard 2020 was approved by the Board of Trustees. The items in the Gold Standard 2020, along with WMU’s mission and vision, form the context in which WMU’s CRŌM process is moving forward.

The preparation phase of the project had three components:

1. Affirm a preliminary list of the general areas of risk/opportunities that the University faces, and align with University strategic priorities (developed in 2014-15 and 2015-2016);
2. Create CRŌM Action Teams comprising campus-wide mid-level employees to facilitate discussions with subject-matter experts in each of the identified risk areas; and,
3. Develop tools, methodology, and processes for evaluating risks/opportunities in a collaborative strategic management environment.

Phase I: Risk Identification and Evaluation
The purpose of the risk identification step was to generate a comprehensive list of risks based on those events, circumstances, or processes that might create, enhance, prevent, degrade, accelerate, or delay the achievement of the Gold Standard 2020. The overarching questions at this stage were: What could affect WMU’s ability to achieve or fulfill the priority strategy, either positively or negatively? What uncertainties are at-play that create risk or opportunity impacting the achievement of the WMU mission and goals?

Phase I: Identification and Evaluation had five components:

1. CRŌM Action Teams and SMEC training in a collaborative risk/opportunity assessment. Information was provided on the overall CRŌM purpose and architecture. Participants had the opportunity to engage in demonstration activities aligned with their respective risk/opportunity assignments.
2. CRŌM Action Team meetings to clarify strategic strategies assigned to their risk area and identification of risk and or opportunities. Each CRŌM Action Team was tasked to discuss and operationalize the three to seven Gold Standard 2020 strategies assigned to their risk area.
3. SMEC identification of high-level enterprise-wide risks and opportunities that impact strategic planning. Enterprise-wide risks aligned with CRÖM Action Team risk areas.

4. Analysis of identified risks and opportunities. Each strategy assigned to a CRÖM Action Team was evaluated as to type, impact, likelihood, rationale, and possible ownership, using the risk identification, assessment, and proposed response process.

5. After the risks and opportunities were identified, CRÖM Action Teams generated a report of a prioritized list to be shared with the Senior Management Executive Council for consideration in strategic planning and response to mitigation of risks.

**Phase II: Response and Action**

The second phase of the CRÖM process involves synthesizing the knowledge from SEMC and CRÖM Action Teams to create a risk map that prompts action to improve implementation of the Gold Standard 2020. While Phase II is still in development, the following steps have been proposed:

1. CRÖM Action Teams and SMEC review Phase I: Risk Identification and Evaluation after receiving further clarity and training on risk statements and classifications;

2. CRÖM Action Team data is analyzed into risk map, and aligned with end-of-year strategy plan reporting;

3. SMEC responds to risk map and end-of-year strategic plan reporting as part of budgeting and strategic reprioritization continues for 2017-2018;

4. SMEC and CRÖM assign risk owners to priority risks/opportunities with charges to outline what is already in place to mitigate risk or generate an action plan, including timeline, resources needed, expected outcomes, progress toward completion, and report using CRÖM architecture.

**Phase III: Integration**

The goal of the integration phase will be to further align the CRÖM process into the operations of the University, ensuring that risk/opportunity identification and response become part of all units across campus. In order to promote greater integration into the fabric of WMU, CRÖM will be the structure used in preparation for the 2020 Higher Learning Commission (HLC) reaccreditation comprehensive visit planned for fall 2020. The following steps are proposed:

1. SMEC and CRÖM Action Teams will be charged with reviewing the HLC Assumed Practices and Criteria for Accreditation within their risk areas for further identification of risks/opportunities that would hinder WMU’s reaccreditation;

2. SMEC and CRÖM will continue to monitor progress of established actions plans and Gold Standard 2020 priorities.

3. SMEC continues to develop integrated strategic management process and structures that facilitate decision-making and resource allocation that supports strategic priorities.
Preliminary Outcomes

The analysis and response to the submitted risk/opportunity identification and evaluation is currently underway and will be integrated into the end-of-year reporting for the Gold Standard 2020. The following outcomes are initial findings that will be shared in the CRŌM all-hands meeting on May 8, 2017. In addition, a formal evaluation is underway to gain feedback from all participants on the CRŌM process. Reports of this survey will also be shared at the meeting.

SMEC identified the following enterprise-wide risks, in the context of implementing priority strategies in the Gold Standard 2020.

Table 1. Crosswalk between SMEC list of risk/opportunities and CRŌM risk areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMEC Enterprise Risks</th>
<th>CRŌM Risk Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating an organizational culture of performance and accountability</td>
<td>The ability to maintain a positive and constructive campus climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing demands placed on employees is impacting morale and performance</td>
<td>The ability to develop organizational practices and operations that allow flexibility, compliance, and sustainable infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership needs to own morale issues to make change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Imbalance of centralized and decentralized management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation of senior leadership needs to reflect a culture of performance and accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operating in a shared governance environment seems out-of-balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of data integration – too many steps to report or use for decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Deployment and Strategic Prioritization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient funds for entrepreneurial growth</td>
<td>Maintaining academic excellence in a changing marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing demand placed on employees is impacting morale and performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Imbalance of centralized and decentralized management creating inefficiencies, slowing assessment of impact and cost analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of succession planning for faculty, staff, and administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact of enrollment trends on curricular program demands requires realignment of human and fiscal resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource allocation should stem from analysis of what is needed for success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMEC Enterprise Risks</th>
<th>CRÔM Risk Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Enrollment Dependent Financial Model</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adapting to the changing cultural make-up of students</td>
<td>The ability to meet enrollment goals and maintain affordable access for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to focus on net tuition, not just numbers of students</td>
<td>The ability to improve the level of discovery, especially funded research to compare more closely to the median of our peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment of resources to match current mission of an open-access, globally focused residential campus; higher research activity</td>
<td>The ability to maintain a healthy and safe living-learning environment that supports student success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRÔM Action Team Findings**

Over 70 subject-matter experts throughout the University participated on the seven CRÔM Action Teams. The initial risk identification and evaluation yielded important insights into both the current level of understanding of the Gold Standard 2020 strategic priorities, and the risks the University currently faces. The broad risk classifications used in this initial training and subsequent evaluation provided an introductory identification and prioritization of risk/opportunities. Further review and clarification of classifications will provide greater discrimination for prioritization in the coming months. However, the quadrant heat map on page 9 indicates which risks are most likely to occur, and which are most likely to have a significant impact on University strategic planning at this stage of understanding.

Through thematic analysis based on the “risk classification” categories, “risk type” subcategories, and sample risks provided in the Office for Audit and Advisory Services “Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview,” 1/7/13, Table 2 lists the 10 identified risks with the highest occurrence frequency.

Table 2. Top 10 Risks, using “Risk action” as the subcategory variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 risks in terms of Impact and Likelihood</th>
<th>Risk Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Failure to recognize or remove barriers to success</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Failure to acquire or retain effective staff</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Insufficient policies or procedures</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Insufficient organizational communication</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Insufficient project management</td>
<td>Reputational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Failure to retain students</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic quality is reduced</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Campus and event safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Failure to prevent costly and inefficient use of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Failure to provide adequate facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 219 risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Teams in their Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheets. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=2.98) and likelihood (m=2.87). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 1. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score

Sources:
Data comes from “CRÔM Action Team Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheets,” Action Teams 1 through 7, submitted April 21, 2017
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013”
document, provided by Northwestern University

Chart 2, on page 9, diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 219 risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Teams in their Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheets using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.
Chart 2. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact

Key:

- Red = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- Orange = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- Yellow = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- Green = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

Sources:
Data comes from “CRÔM Action Team Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheets,” Action Teams 1 through 7, submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes

(See Appendix D for Action Team-specific matrix plots, containing “risk action” labels, and heat maps.)
Priority Risks identified by CRŌM Action Teams

**Team #1 Learner Success**

1. General education track
   - No major change since 1996; general education courses currently organized by content; needs to be outcome-based. Lacking intentional advising. Many general education graduates lack the skills and knowledge needed to be career ready. Faculty are working on this.
   - Many students take general education courses at community colleges. How those courses will transfer is often a factor in what University is chosen for degree completion.
   - Faculty fear of sweeping change fueled by links to faculty lines and program viability.

2. Graduate student infrastructure
   - Infrastructure and support for graduate assistants does not make WMU competitive for graduate students.
   - Lack of mentor training for faculty, including systems and best practices, often delay graduation, or lead to student attrition.

3. Diversity on campus
   - Under-delivering – Lots of talk, but need more action. Need more conversations to gauge perceptions, and more input from students to see if we have met their expectations for campus diversity.
   - We over-sell our diversity – Many underrepresented groups on campus, but not aligned with perceptions of new students.
   - Lacking shared value of what a *quality educational experience* means among faculty, staff, and administrators. Promote student success as an attitude.

**Team #2 Enrollment Management**

1. Decentralized recruitment and retention
   - Focus of many recruitment and retention efforts is too narrow and program-/college-focused. Need to “sell” WMU as a whole experience.
   - Financial difficulty is the number one recruitment and retention issue for students. One financial hiccup can result in a student leaving the University before degree completion.
   - Decentralized services have also lead to decentralized accountability. What is the balance in shared responsibility vs focused accountability?

2. Student equity
   - Is the student experience equitable? Some students don’t think they have access to everything they should have access to.
   - Possible current policies and structures are biased.
   - Data collection—current methods and systems are not disaggregating underrepresented populations.

3. Intentional planning
   - Services might be better offered in a decentralized way, but part of a larger success program.
• Need to shift resources to high-demand areas in a more nimble process.

**Team #3 Learner Support**

1. Student advising
   • Students come to WMU with complex problems and fewer resources. Today’s students need one-stop, holistic advising covering academic, financial, health, engagement, etc., concerns.
   • Advisor qualifications and training—lacking campus-wide standards and training opportunities. Fewer faculty involved in advising.

2. Tutoring programs
   • Many tutoring programs on campus, but little or no coordination resulting in redundancies and strains when allocating resources. Lacking a campus point-person to synchronize programs and to assist with evaluation of effectiveness.
   • Best practices are not followed regarding mandatory advising due to current capacity for one-on-one meetings. IS WMU using maximum efficiency in reaching students who need advising the most?

3. Program reviews for continuous quality improvement
   • Results of the recent Academic Program Review and Planning and Learner Support Program Review and Planning are not being utilized in resource planning.

**Team #4 Enhancing Discovery**

1. Infrastructure
   • Research equipment—very little funding available to buy new or to replace existing equipment. Lack of common-use charges that could provide revenue. Lack of human resources to provide training for running and maintaining equipment.
   • Lack of centralized discovery space or cluster hires mandate researchers assume management duties that take away from time on discovery and limits innovative interdisciplinary inquiry.

2. Research recognition
   • Many faculty would like to see more recognition for research, especially that which is non-funded. All forms of scholarship, research, and creative activities elevate the University.
   • Lack of a clear definition of what constitutes “good research” on campus; varies from one academic program to another. No metrics established for return on investments or accountability to mission.
   • Incentives to conduct high-quality discovery are biased toward large funded research. No culture of high-research, especially post-tenure.

3. Centers and institutes
   • No metrics established for return on investments or accountability to mission.

**Team #5 Steward of Place**

1. Brand and communication consistency and continuity
   • Many units are still not aligning with established brand messages and design guidelines, diffusing marketing efforts. Lacking clear voice for the University.
• Internal communication occurs in silos, so people do not get the full picture; especially a problem with part-time staff and faculty, impacting overall staff morale.

• Under-empowered University Relations team.

2. Succession and vacancy planning

• Often no second or third person to step-in when vacancies occur, so gaps in service or overload on remaining employees; no overlap time for training. This is true for staff and faculty (one-person offices and programs).

3. Data sharing, data management, and access

• Lack of integrated systems; current systems require too much manual effort to collect and interpret data for decision-making.

**Team #6 Campus Safety**

1. Insufficient student/faculty/staff awareness of policies for implementation and sustainability of recommendations from Title IX Sexual Misconduct and Safety Survey.

• Need for sustainable financial and human resources to implement programming and marketing/communication plan. OK to partner with other units for support but should not be dependent on good will of other divisions to provide essential services to this initiative.

2. Resistance to being responsible employees and campus security authority

• Some resistance to being responsible employees and campus security authority so not fully complying with their duties.

3. Climate of fear and retaliation

• Climate of fear of retaliation is a major issue for reporting for some employees, which causes lateral transfers or loss of employees, lowers morale and effectiveness.

**Team #7 Institutional Planning and Compliance**

1. Need to have clear statement of priorities—a North Star

• People are looking for more direction, clear priorities that will help align decision making and resources; this may lead to competing resources, projects.

2. Need for documentation and transparency in budget decisions.

• People are generally uninformed of how decisions are made regarding resources, especially capital investments. Need to explain and demonstrate return on investments.

3. Investment in people and integrated data systems

• Lean staffing often leads to loss of institutional knowledge or inability to gather data for decision making; don’t have time to think strategic or solve problems. Invest in human resources and integrated data systems to improve efficiency and outputs.

**General Consideration Points**

• Leadership to direct-line staff is critical in communication issues.

• Scoring categories for impact and likelihood in analysis need to be more concretely refined and defined.

• Supervisor issues are part of the larger issue of not having an organizational culture of performance and accountability, including human resource skills.
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CRŌM Architecture

CRŌM Purpose
The purpose of WMU’s Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRŌM) program is to embrace an enterprise-wide process to collaboratively identify and respond to strategic and operational risks and opportunities that may affect achievement of WMU’s strategic plan, the Gold Standard 2020.

With intentional interaction of cross-functional, cross-organizational participants, CRŌM will prioritize key risks and opportunities that will have the greatest impact on the achievement of the strategic plan, while simultaneously and intentionally instilling risk consciousness into strategic planning and decision-making.

Operating with the assumption that integrative planning reduces siloed decision-making, and leads to improved coordination and communication of strategic and operational actions on University priorities, CRŌM has the following goals:

• Position WMU to more effectively manage change toward a shared mission and vision for the future;
• Strengthen WMU’s competitive position as a value-added higher research university;
• Mitigate risks that threaten achievement of WMU strategic goals;
• Proactively embrace opportunities that add value to the enterprise and respective stakeholders;
• Ensure stewardship of resources is consistent with best practices in implementation of the Gold Standard 2020;
• Increase alignment and demonstrate outcomes of division plans that move achievement of the strategic plan forward;
• Increase institutional ability to identify campus structural and cultural influences that make it risk adverse, and work to remove or reduce the impact of such barriers;
• Enable the institution to further articulate a risk appetite required to move the University forward;
• Foster integration of budgeting and the strategic plan; and,
• Promote a risk-aware culture without creating a risk-averse climate.
Model 1. SMEC, CRŌM, WMU Leadership Model
Appendix B

Enterprise Risk Priority Areas and Strategies

Built into the Gold Standard 2020 are a number of specific strategies that directly address risks identified in the planning process. Since these risks affect all aspects of Western Michigan University’s mission and operations, they should be a critical tool in the implementation and oversight of the plan. This approach integrates risk management into the strategic deliberations of senior leaders and board members, positioning the University to accomplish its long-term goals and objectives. The Gold Standard 2020 Steering Committee will be developed in alignment with the following priority challenge areas:

**Maximizing Learner Success**

*Risk: The ability to sustain academic excellence in a changing marketplace.*

1.2b. Enhance career preparation services, and provide more opportunities for professional development to boost post-graduation student success.

1.2d. Promote greater involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research and creative activities.

1.3a. Develop and implement the Signature Designation to support student engagement and distinction.

1.4a. Increase feasibility of broad-based participation in study abroad programs and other globally focused learning opportunities.

2.1b. Revise general education curricula to respond to the needs of the 21st-century student.

4.2a. Understand and work to remove systemic institutional barriers for recruitment, retention, and degree completion of students from historically underrepresented groups in higher education.

**Providing Learner Support**

*Risk: The ability to provide student services in a vibrant living-learning environment that supports student success.*

1.1b. Develop advising and retention efforts appropriate to the needs of sophomore, junior, and transfer students.

1.1c. Improve support programming to help students with varying levels of academic preparation.

1.3b. Continue implementation and development of programming to increase student financial literacy.

1.4c. Provide enhanced living-learning support for the growing number of international students at WMU.
2.3d. Incorporate early-alert technology and holistic advising to support student success.

4.4b. Identify and appropriately resource staffing levels in critical areas to support quality learner-centered service.

*Enrollment Management*

*Risk: The ability to meet enrollment goals and maintain affordable access for all students*

2.2a. Promote academic excellence and innovative discovery through strategic investment in personnel.

2.5a. Expand and optimize WMU’s recruitment and delivery of educational opportunities to new, targeted demographics and strategic geographic regions

2.5b. Implement a comprehensive enrollment management plan to maximize program capacity and achieve academic program goals.

4.2a. Understand and work to remove systemic institutional barriers for recruitment, retention, and degree completion of students from historically underrepresented groups in higher education.

5.2b. Utilize innovative and competitive financial aid strategies to maintain the fundamental principle of providing access to an affordable, quality education for all admitted students.

5.2c. Implement new strategies at the program level that enhance yield of admitted students.

*Enhancing Discovery*

*Risk: The ability to improve the level of discovery, especially funded research to compare more closely to the median of our peers.*

2.6a. Develop efficient mechanisms to gather and distribute faculty, staff, and student scholarship and discovery data

2.6c. Strategically align staff and faculty expertise and strengths with available resources at the unit level to promote learning and discovery.

3.1b. Support implementation and accountability of discovery communities to increase both the aggregate and per-capita level of research activity supportive of a Carnegie-classified Doctoral University: Higher Research Activity.

3.1e. Enhance information technology and data management infrastructure to support research.

3.2b. Actively support technology and knowledge transfer in partnership with WMU spin-off companies, industry, and community

3.2c. Develop curricular programs that will contribute to the incumbent and future workforce needs.

3.3f. Assist all students with developing meaningful connections in their local and global communities.
Becoming a Steward of Place

Risk: The ability to maintain a positive and constructive campus climate

1.6a. Revitalize University facilities to enhance informal space for student learning, personal development, and interaction with others.

1.6d. Support and develop a championship athletic culture that promotes institutional pride and community connectedness, and also enhances the University experience for all stakeholders.

3.3a. Develop and implement a renewed Campus Compact Action Plan, dedicating the University to work with other institutions to advance the public purposes of higher education.

4.3c. Promote human resource practices and programming that meet the needs of WMU employees to enhance workplace engagement.

4.3d. Implement changes in student service facilities that create a barrier-free, welcoming environment for a diverse population.

4.4c. Offer and encourage participation in professional skills training to increase employee retention, advancement, and workplace satisfaction.

4.4d. Implement a transformational wayfinding plan to improve navigation to and within WMU campuses.

5.3c. Increase the number and scope of green programs that maximize return on University investment.

5.4a. Develop and execute an external and internal communication plan that effectively engages all stakeholders and reflects the shared narrative of the University.

5.4d. Implement a transformational wayfinding plan to improve navigation to and within WMU campuses.

5.5a. Provide services that effectively connect and engage WMU’s global network of alumni and friends as advocates for the University.

Providing Campus Safety

Risk: The ability to maintain a healthy and safe living-learning environment that supports student success.

1.5c. Implement recommendations from the Title IX Sexual Misconduct and Safety Survey to ensure a safe and supportive environment for all stakeholders.

1.5d. Reinforce campus safety through informed modification in University policies and physical environment.

4.1e. Ensure viable, safe avenues to report instances of inequitable behavior.
Institutional Planning and Compliance

Risk: The ability to develop organizational practices and operations that allow flexibility, compliance, and sustainable infrastructure.

2.2a. Promote academic excellence and innovative discovery through strategic investment in personnel.

2.2d. Develop an operational succession plan for faculty, staff, and administrators.

2.3e. Advocate for proposed capital outlay projects, such as the College of Aviation expansion.

2.4b. Improve data systems to monitor, review, and assess graduate student success

5.1b. Leverage multiple revenue streams to support clearly defined University goals and responsible budget forecasts

5.1c. Expand and improve integrated data-driven information systems for decision-making.

5.5b. Raise external support for student scholarships, named professorships, innovation infrastructure, capital projects, and other University-identified priorities.
Appendix C

Risk Identification and Evaluation

The purpose of the risk assessment step is to develop an understanding of the risk or opportunity in order to inform your evaluation and decision of whether a response is required, and, if so then at what level of the organization and where. Here is where CRŌM Action Teams assess the potential impact and likelihood of the risks and opportunities.

Risk/Opportunity Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning to Guide Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning to Guide Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transformative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Opportunity Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning to Guide Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transformative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRŌM Action Team Results

CRŌM Action Team 1 – Learner Success
Chart 3 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 17 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 1 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=3.19) and likelihood (m=2.64). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 3. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRŌM Action Team 1 - Learner Success

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 1 – Learner Success Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013” document, provided by Northwestern University
Chart 4 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 17 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 1 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.

Chart 4. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact: CRŌM Action Team 1 - Learner Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</th>
<th>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>LIKELIHOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Monitoring (Accept)</td>
<td>Periodic Review (Share)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **Red** = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- **Orange** = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- **Yellow** = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- **Green** = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 1 – Learner Success Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRÕM Action Team 2 – Enrollment Management**

Chart 5 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 30 risks and opportunities identified by CRÕM Action Team 2 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=2.87) and likelihood (m=2.07). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 5. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRÕM Action Team 2 – Enrollment Management

Matrix Plot of Avg Impact Score vs Avg Likelihood Score

Sources:
Chart 6 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 30 risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Team 2 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</td>
<td>Periodic Review (Share)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</td>
<td>Periodic Monitoring (Accept)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Red = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- Orange = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- Yellow = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- Green = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRÔM Action Team 2 – Enrollment Management Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRÔM Action Team 3 – Learner Support**

Chart 7 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 56 risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Team 3 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=2.75) and likelihood (m=2.75). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 7. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRÔM Action Team 3 - Learner Support

**Matrix Plot of Avg Impact Score vs Avg Likelihood Score**

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRÔM Action Team 3 – Learner Support Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013” document, provided by Northwestern University
Chart 8 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 56 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 3 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.

Chart 8. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact: CRŌM Action Team 3 - Learner Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Monitoring (Accept)</td>
<td>Periodic Review (Share)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</td>
<td>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **Red** = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- **Orange** = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- **Yellow** = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- **Green** = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 3 – Learner Support Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRÔM Action Team 4 – Discovery**

Due to the small number of entries, Chart 9 illustrates the intersection of the actual impact and likelihood scores submitted for the seven risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Team 4 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=3.79) and likelihood (m=3.71). Data labels refer to “risk/opportunity name.”

Chart 9. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRÔM Action Team 4 - Discovery

![Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score](image)

**Sources:**
Data and terminology come from the “CRÔM Action Team 4 – Discovery Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017.
Chart 10 diagrams the actual impact and likelihood scores submitted for the seven risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 4 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.

Chart 10. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact: CRŌM Action Team 4 - Discovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</th>
<th>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Red** = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- **Orange** = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- **Yellow** = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- **Green** = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

**Sources:**
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 4 – Discovery Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRŌM Action Team 5 – Steward of Place**

Chart 11 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 54 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 5 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=3.46) and likelihood (m=3.25). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 11. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRŌM Action Team 5 – Steward of Place

![Matrix Plot of Avg Impact Score vs Avg Likelihood Score](chart)

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 5 – Steward of Place Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013” document, provided by Northwestern University
Chart 12 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 54 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 5 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.

Chart 12. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact: CRŌM Action Team 5 – Steward of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Review (Share)</td>
<td>Periodic Monitoring (Accept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</td>
<td>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Red = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- Orange = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- Yellow = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- Green = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

**Sources:**
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 5 – Steward of Place Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRÖM Action Team 6 – Campus Safety**

Chart 13 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 23 risks and opportunities identified by CRÖM Action Team 6 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=3.04) and likelihood (m=3.26). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 13. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRÖM Action Team 6 – Campus Safety

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRÖM Action Team 6 – Campus Safety Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017.
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013” document, provided by Northwestern University.
Chart 14 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 23 risks and opportunities identified by CRÔM Action Team 6 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.

Chart 14. Monitoring and Review Relative to Likelihood and Impact: CRÔM Action Team 6 – Campus Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Monitoring (Control)</th>
<th>Continuous Review (Mitigate and Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic Monitoring (Accept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELIHOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic Review (Share)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Red = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- Orange = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- Yellow = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- Green = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

**Sources:**
Data comes from the “CRÔM Action Team 6 – Campus Safety Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes
**CRÖM Action Team 7 – Institutional Planning**

Chart 15 illustrates the intersection of the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 32 risks and opportunities identified by CRÖM Action Team 7 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment Worksheet. Reference lines were added to identify the overall mean scores for impact (m=2.43) and likelihood (m=2.90). Data labels refer to “risk action.”

Chart 15. Matrix Plot of Impact Score vs Likelihood Score: CRÖM Action Team 7 – Institutional Planning

Matrix Plot of Avg Impact Score vs Avg Likelihood Score

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRÖM Action Team 7 – Institutional Planning Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Terminology is based on the “Office for Audit and Advisory Services Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – Overview, January 7, 2013” document, provided by Northwestern University
Chart 16 diagrams the average impact and likelihood scores submitted for the 32 risks and opportunities identified by CRŌM Action Team 7 in its Risk/Opportunity Assessment worksheet using a heat map to better illustrate their priority. Data was replotted to a 4.0 x 4.0 scale, and reference lines for overall mean scores were retained.


![Chart 16](chart_16.png)

Key:
- **Red** = Continuous Review; (Mitigate and Control) requires immediate response and oversight, should be constantly monitored and reviewed monthly
- **Orange** = Continuous Monitoring; (Control) Requires planned response and reviewed every 3 months
- **Yellow** = Periodic Review; (Share) Manage by specific response procedures and reviewed every 12 months
- **Green** = Periodic Monitoring (Accept) Management by routine procedures and operations; should not require much attention but should be reviewed on an annual basis

Sources:
Data comes from the “CRŌM Action Team 7 – Institutional Planning Risk and Opportunity Assessment Worksheet,” submitted April 21, 2017
Heat map is based on a model used by the University of Oregon, with categories slightly revised for WMU’s purposes