

Charles Sturt University Strategic Risk Assessment –May 2009

The below ratings for likelihood, impact and level have been derived through the Table: Combined Effect of Likelihood / Seriousness, which is sourced at the end of the document.

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
1. Quality of Educational Experience					
1.1 Course Profile and Architecture					
1.1.1 Not aligned to student expectations and demand.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued review, development and rationalisation of courses and course architecture with the view to ensuring relevance to students and professional associations. • Ongoing attention to TAFE articulation. • Revision of course architecture to align with University Calendar (2010). • Respond appropriately to systematic student feedback mechanisms. • Continue to implement and improve practice based learning. 	Possible	Major	High	1
1.1.2 Requirements of Professional Associations not satisfied	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner professional associations with the view to developing innovative course structures and subjects. • Close consultation in developing new courses, in professional areas for offer through distance education (DE), including some at Masters level (and CGS offerings). • Continued development of short fee paying courses to address professional development needs. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
1.1.3 University does not have resources and capacity to properly support offerings.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued review, development and rationalisation of courses and relevant analyses to ensure that offerings align with the resources of the University and its teaching partners. • Management of staffing according to the identified CSU Discipline Profile. • Identification of “teaching and professional” positions in selected disciplines. • Provide flexible part-time employment opportunities to practicing professionals. • Further rationalisation of disciplines, courses and subjects. 	Possible	Major	High	2
1.2 Quality of Teaching Materials					
1.2.1 Decline in quality.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to increase undergraduate courses meeting the Academic Senate’s criteria for national and international standing. • Use student feedback mechanisms to improve service; including their use in performance management and formalised reporting at school and faculty level. • Define and apply more consistent QA standards and responsibilities across the institution. • Internal and external (AUQA) review of standards. 	Possible	Major	High	1
1.2.2 Digital learning product development and delivery is inadequate in relation to competitor offerings.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued development within the Institute for Innovation and Flexible Learning. • Define then implement strategy to increase acceptance, use and 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	2

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
	development by academics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase emphasis on product development, including partnership arrangements. 				
1.2.3 Interact modification compromises CSU's longer term ability to plug in externally developed enhancements.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce development and change control protocols to ensure that underlying code is not functionally corrupted. • Where practical modify CSU practices to align with collaboratively available modules and extensions. 	Likely	Minor	Medium	4
1.2.4 Inadequate institutional focus on student learning experience	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued emphasis on practice based learning. • Establish protocols for the consistent and timely quality assurance of student articulation, teaching delivery, assessment and communication with students. • PBF to encourage development of teaching skills and professional currency. • Student Experience project currently ongoing. 	Possible	Major	High	2
1.3 Teaching Delivery					
1.3.1 Inability to recruit, develop and retain quality staff.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review progress on strategies to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide streamlined, flexible employment processes and conditions. ○ Provide competitive remuneration and conditions packages to staff. ○ Provide research and professional development opportunities for 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
	<p>academic staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation of an Indigenous Employment Strategy; and some progress in indigenous appointments, who are working on the strategy. ○ Improve academic staff to student ratios. ○ Implement recommendations of Academic Workforce Review. ● Consider scholarship and retraining opportunities for targeted general and academic staff to address academic recruitment priorities. 				
<p>1.3.2 Inadequate in-service training.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review effectiveness of current arrangements. ● Align training, recruitment and performance management processes. 	Possible	Minor	Low	4
<p>1.3.3 Teaching Status 1.3.3.1 Diminution of the status of teaching compared to the status of research.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learning and teaching quality emphasised in CSU promotions, policy and Performance Management frameworks. ● Ongoing appointment of strategic teaching fellows. ● The Teaching Scholars Scheme provides support for leaders in teaching. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3
<p>1.4 Quality Assurance</p>					
<p>1.4.1 Procedural subjectivity and inconsistency</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic Senate is revising the reports it requires on academic activity.. ● Implement standardised parameters for course articulation, student 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
	<p>communication and quality assurance of teaching and assessment processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt an institution wide framework for faculty and external teaching partner compliance. • Ensure that revised processes are sufficiently streamlined to support the implementation of the 2010 Academic Calendar. • Commitment to action Student Experience Survey results. • Promotion is possible on the basis of scholarship of teaching. Good teaching is a prerequisite for promotion. • Status of teaching has been raised by establishment of Teaching Institutes to parallel Research Centres. These promote the research and innovation in key areas of teaching. • Promotion of links with the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). 				
1.5 Third Party Providers					
1.5.1 Failure to identify and manage business and quality risks.	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due diligence requirements for joint ventures and commercial activities. • Improved structure and processes to manage activities with transnational partners. 	Possible	Major	High	2
2. CSU fails to grow research outputs in a sustainable manner					
2.1 Partner Risks					
2.1.1 Partner and funding body financial constraints inhibit research	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Centres to develop funding contingency plans. 	Possible	Minor	Low	4

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
2.2 Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA)					
2.2.1 Ongoing changes in the Government's Excellence in Research for Australia disadvantages CSU.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitored by the Centre for Research and Graduate Training (CRGT). • Consultation with DIISR. 	Likely	Moderate	High	1
2.3 Time Available					
2.3.1 Staff do not allocate adequate attention to research due to teaching and other commitments.	<u>Strategy</u> Release of staff time for research by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidation of the course profile; • Review of course architecture; • Reduction in the number of subjects and subject offerings; and • Review of the University Calendar. • Research Centre Fellow Scheme 	Possible	Major	High	3
2.4 Research Quality					
2.4.1 Research activities prove not to be of sufficient quality when benchmarked against outputs from other institutions.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to acquire the best staff in the key areas and to broker the best teams. • Application of project management disciplines to research and research administration. • CRGT provision of support and guidance to research projects. • Changed policy and procedures to favour quality over quantity. 	Possible	Major	High	1

Description		Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
2.5 Funding Model						
2.5.1 CSU's model to fund research is not effective.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closely monitor the effects of funding research. Ensure that appropriately skilled staff are available for research. Where necessary this may require supplementation of learning and teaching resources. Some staff resources may become available as a result of course rationalisations. 	Unlikely	Major	High	2	
2.6 Attracting Researchers						
2.6.1 Inability to attract and retain key researchers in a highly competitive environment.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of attractive research based positions. Identification and focus on areas of CSU research strength. Competitive remuneration and conditions packages. 	Unlikely	Major	High	1	
2.7 Realistic Expectations						
2.7.1 Research plans fail to clarify realistic expectations, outputs and risks.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CRGT funding of research centres does not proceed without the completion of a plan. CRGT quality assurance and input. 	Unlikely	Major	High	3	
2.8 Industry Based Projects						
2.8.1 Unavailability of long term industry based projects from which ongoing research outcomes can be realised.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on research areas of excellence to encourage ongoing industry participation. Development of working relationship with funding bodies through CRGT. 	Possible	Major	High	3	

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
2.9 Research Administration					
<p>2.9.1 Inadequate research administration skills, policy, systems and commitment.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRGT restructure and Work Process Improvement (WPI) strategy. Includes implementation of new computer based packages to support research administration. • Strengthening of management skills across Schools, Faculties and Research Centres. 	Unlikely	Moderate	Medium	4
3. Student Load Targets not Realised					
3.1 Commonwealth Assisted Student Demand					
<p>3.1.1 Demand falls significantly below expectations, not withstanding efforts to promote CSU and its courses.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on the development of a course profile that draws strong student demand and enhances the institutional profile and professional standing over the long term. • Identification and further development of strong disciplines within the University. • Identification of new student cohorts. • Continued attention to improvement of academic and administrative services to students, to ensure a level of service that is at least commensurate with competitors – major requirement of Heads of School (HOS). • Co-ordinated development of CSU's digital learning environment. • Promotion of CSU as a premier Australian University. • Realignment of course offerings to areas of high demand. • Ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of advertising and 	Likely	Major	Extreme	1

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
	<p>promotional activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the Indigenous Educational Strategy. • Develop a Western Regions Education Strategy. • Close monitoring of student satisfaction as a basis for accountability and continuous improvement. • Attempt to increase student retention through enhanced quality of provision and focus on student experience. • Attempt to enrol high calibre students in disciplines of national importance through scholarships. 				
3.2 DE Competitors					
<p>3.2.1 Increased competition for DE students sees declining demand for CSU courses in the longer term.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u> As per 3.1 above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an expectation that Interact functionality can be developed over time. • Positioning of the University to offer a flexible range of on-campus, distance based and mixed course offerings. • Implement new institutional calendar. • Collaborative opportunities with high quality institutions may be considered. 	Likely	Major	Extreme	1
3.3 Fee Paying Student Load					
<p>3.3.1 Decline in demand by fee paying students.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u> As per 3.1 and 3.2 above..</p>	Likely	Moderate	High	2
4. Financial and Administrative Constraints					

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
4.1 Global Financial Crisis					
4.1.1 Misalignment of investment structures with Capital Program and Institutional Development Program	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculate estimated cash flow requirement for planned projects over the life of the University Plans. Calculations of high, low and mean should be based on the profile of each project, the strength of the cost estimation process and the capacity of the University to action and finalise each project. Where necessary, reprioritise and then adjust the Capital Plan and the Institutional Development Plan to align with available liquidity. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	2
4.1.2 Loss of investment income.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly external review of CSU investments. Ongoing internal monitoring. 	Certain	Minor	Medium	3
4.1.3 Loss of investment principal.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodic external review of CSU investments. Ongoing internal monitoring. Revise planned expenditure to accommodate the current written down value of investments. 	Almost certain	Moderate	High	2
4.2 Information Technology Integration.					
4.2.1 IT Applications fail to support streamlined business processes.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eventual integration of HR, Finance, Student Administration and other applications has potential to enhance business process, reduce administrative overhead, improve academic productivity and student experience.. 	Unlikely	Major	High	3

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamline project management approaches to 1) force shorter decision making timeframes 2) assume the necessity of an institution <i>wide solution</i> for most activities and 2) adopt <i>best of breed</i> packaged solutions wherever available. • Adopt an integrated point of sale / inventory management system to support core student support activities. • Use stand alone industry applications to support practice management and specialised business requirements. Integrate, as appropriate, system usage into teaching requirement. • Cease internal delivery of business processes that cannot be supported and controlled in a cost-effective manner. • Ongoing liaison with application suppliers, where required to ensure timely solutions. 				
4.3 Cost Escalations					
<p>4.3.1 Facilities maintenance and equipment replacement costs increase significantly.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify forward maintenance and replacement cost projections and incorporate within a Faculty/Division budgets. • Financial ledgers to include appropriate accounting provisions of clinical equipment replacements. • DFM to advise longer term management strategy. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3
<p>4.3.2 Administrative wage and contractor costs above the sector average.</p>	<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyse and compare CSU costs to the reported costs of competing institutions. • Further streamlining of business processes. • Automation of processes, where appropriate, to drive efficiencies. 	Unlikely	Moderate	Medium	4

Description	Management Strategy	Likelihood	Impact	Level	Priority
4.4 Teaching Partners					
4.4.1 Inefficiencies in support provided to external teaching partners.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work process review in Student Administration. • Commitment to consolidate, streamline and where necessary strengthen. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	4
4.5 Ontario					
4.5.1 Inefficiency and lack of cost transparency in the support provided from Australia to the Ontario Campus.	<u>Strategy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review administrative support arrangements at Ontario with the view to identifying cost effective options that are best placed to maximise regulatory compliance. 	Possible	Moderate	Medium	3

Table: Combined Effect of Likelihood / Seriousness

This table has been adapted from AS/NZS 4360:2004, Risk Management. Under the Charles Sturt University risk management approach the colour of the risk grade will be contingent on likelihood, consequence and risk grade calibrations that are agreed with the activity sponsors. Please note that the table should be used as a guide only.

Grade: Combined effect of Likelihood/Seriousness					
Likelihood	Consequence Rating				
	1. Insignificant	2. Minor	3. Moderate	4. Major	5. Catastrophic
A.. Almost Certain	L	M	H	E	E
B. Likely	L	M	H	E	E
C. Possible	L	L	M	H	E
D. Unlikely	L	L	M	H	H
E. Rare	L	L	L	M	H

Strategic Risk Assessment

Emerging Issues

1. Uncapping of student load impacts domestic demand for student places.
2. Course profile and currency impact on international demand for places.
3. Financial capacity to high quality teaching materials, and delivery..
4. Emerging global depression adversely impacts course demand in some areas and significantly reduces realisable revenue from all sources (grant and non grant);
5. Likely increased Competition for Distance Education..
6. Misalignment of investment structures with Capital Program and Institutional Development Program draw down requirements;
7. Core IT applications not up to the task of supporting streamlined business processes in a well controlled manner.
8. Financial constraints may inhibit research growth.
9. Demographic shifts significantly reduce school leaver demand from 2010 onwards.
10. Aging of academic staff (the median at CSU is about 49).
11. Uncosted and deferred maintenance