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Overview: University of Massachusetts System
# About UMass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking</strong></td>
<td>#1 Public University in New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campuses</strong></td>
<td>Five undergraduate &amp; graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>74,000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Graduates</strong></td>
<td>19,000 annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni</strong></td>
<td>• 330,000 in MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 530,000 worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td>• 24,000 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3rd largest employer in MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>$752M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3rd largest in MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4th largest in New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>$3.8B annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impact</strong></td>
<td>$7.5B across Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- University of Massachusetts Amherst
- UMass Chan Medical School
- UMass Boston
- UMass Dartmouth
- UMass Law

- University of Massachusetts Lowell

- Economic Impact: $7.5B across Massachusetts
Systemwide Enterprise Risk Management Program
Systemwide ERM Governance Structure

- **Board**: Provides direction and guidance as needed
- **President’s Council**: Provides direction and guidance as needed
  - Validates systemwide risks
  - Prioritizes systemwide risks
  - Affirms mitigation strategies for systemwide risks
- **ERM Exec. Committee**: Identifies systemwide risks
  - Assesses systemwide risks
  - Develops/implements mitigation strategies for systemwide risks
- **ERM Working Group**: Identifies campus-level risks
  - Assesses campus-level risks
- **Campus ERM Committees**: Mitigates campus-level risks
Two-Year Systemwide ERM Program Cycle

Our ERM Program continues to evolve – each phase of the program cycle impacts other phases

FY24 Q4
Typically issued at the end of the FY in which report is due.

FY24 Q1
First assessment of mitigation strategies for Top 10 risks complete

Implement Risk Mitigation Strategies

Issue ERM Report

Identify and Assess Risks

Assess Risk Mitigation Strategies

Prioritize Risks

FY24 Q2–Q3
Preparing for FY24 Risk Assessment
• Start during October Working Group Meeting
• Will use information from Mitigation Assessment Program to inform Risk Assessment
How the Systemwide Enterprise Risk Management Program Functions at the University of Massachusetts

- Identify and assess risks with systemwide implications
- Support informed decision-making
  - Transparency of information/activity
  - Normalized review/prioritization of risk
- Facilitate systemwide coordination on risk identification and assessment
- Assist in identifying risk owners
- Facilitate coordination of mitigation activities for crisis response
- Facilitate the assessment of effectiveness of mitigation activities on risk

- Own risk
- Own risk mitigation strategies
- Implement risk mitigation strategies
- Own compliance review or monitoring
- Own campus ERM programs or plans
Risk Assessment Process &
Systemwide Risk Registry
Risk Assessment Process

- Focused on systemwide impacts
- Evaluates inherent exposure* of the University to the risk
  - Risk assessment does not account for mitigation strategies for likelihood and consequence
- Rates risks across three factors
  - **Likelihood***: Could the University system experience this risk?
  - **Consequence***: How much would the University system be impacted by this risk?
    - Service/Operations Disruptions
    - Financial
    - Legal/Compliance
  - **Urgency**: How soon does the University system need to prioritize this risk?
    - Values (1-4) are assigned to each rating
    - Generates and Inherent Risk Score for each risk
Inherent Risk Score Calculation

Likelihood Rating \times \text{Sum of Consequence Ratings} \times \text{Urgency Rating} = \text{Inherent Risk Score}

- Assessed by ERM Working Group
- Assessed by ERM Executive Committee
# FY2022 Systemwide Risk Registry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>All Hazards Planning &amp; Response Capabilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alcohol and Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Multi-State Payroll Tax</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Crisis Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Immigration Rules and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilities and Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fraud, Waste, and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Health &amp; Mental Health Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Uninsured Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vendor Risk Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Multi-State Business Tax</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Employment Laws and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attract, Recruit, Retain Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Policies &amp; Response Procedures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NCAA Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IT Disaster Recovery</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Policies and Procedures Regarding Minors on Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Continuity Planning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Academic Quality and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Environmental Health, Public Health, &amp; Safety Regulations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Oversight of Student Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Risk Assessment Data
# FY22 Risks Ranked Based on Highest Legal/Compliance Exposure

*Listed by highest legal/compliance exposure, and then by Inherent Risk Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Security</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Def. Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Hlth &amp; Mental Hlth Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Hazards Plans &amp; Response Cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-State Payroll Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-State Business Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex. Assault Policies &amp; Rspns Proced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Env. Hlth, Pub. Hlth, &amp; Safety Regs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol and Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration Rules and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraud, Waste, and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCAA Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, Recruit, Retain Faculty/Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Disaster Recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/Proced. Minors on Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of Student Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured Loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- **Highest Legal/Compliance Exposure**
- **Medium Legal/Compliance Exposure**
- **Lower Legal/Compliance Exposure**
Risk Mitigation Assessment
Goals of the Mitigation Assessment Program

• Document risk mitigation strategies for *transparency*

• *Correlate* assessment of risk mitigation strategies to a risk’s assessed inherent risk exposure

• Demonstrate *impact* of mitigation strategies on risk exposure
Transparency

• Create a common operating picture for the University system
• Increase awareness of risk and risk mitigation
• Ground-truth the degree of risk exposure
Correlation

• Traditional mitigation assessment considers important organizational factors, but these factors do not directly correlate to risk exposure

• Needed to identify the impacts mitigation measures have in reducing the exposures identified in the risk assessment process
Assessment of Risk Exposure

Risk Assessment

Likelihood
Consequence
Urgency

Inherent Risk Exposure
Traditional Mitigation Assessment

Inherent Risk Exposure

- Resiliency
- Cost Benefit Analysis
- Efficiency
- Alignment with Goals and Objectives
Correlation of UMass Risk Assessment and Mitigation Assessment

- Likelihood
- Consequence
- Urgency*

Residual Risk Exposure
Demonstrate Impact of Mitigation Strategies

**Individual Effectiveness**
Measure the effectiveness of an *individual* mitigation strategy on reducing risk exposure

**Comparative Effectiveness**
*Compare* the effectiveness of *multiple* mitigation strategies on reducing risk exposure

**Aggregate Effectiveness**
Measure the *aggregate* effectiveness of all risk mitigation strategies on reducing risk exposure
UMass Mitigation Assessment Tool for Reducing Risk Exposure
Initial Data Capture

- All data is provided by risk mitigation partner(s) conducting the mitigation assessment
- Members of the ERM Governance Structure help identify partners for each risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Point</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title of mitigation strategy being documented/assessed</td>
<td>Unique Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Brief description of mitigation strategy</td>
<td>Understand what the strategy is and does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>• Operational: Everyday or regularly occurring activity</td>
<td>Understand if strategy is ongoing or timebound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project-based: Initiative or project with finite timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>• Proposed: Strategy is not yet approved/funded</td>
<td>Determines whether strategy is included in the mitigation assessment calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planned: Strategy is approved/funded, but not yet implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing: Strategy is underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete: Strategy has concluded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Level</td>
<td>• Fully: Mitigation strategy is fully implemented</td>
<td>Determines whether weightings are applied to the mitigation assessment calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partially: Mitigation strategy is not yet implemented at full capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N/A: Not applicable or not yet implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequence

What effect does or would the mitigation strategy have on each of the following risk consequence categories*?

• Service Disruption, Process Impact on Operations
• Finance
• Legal/Compliance
• Workforce
• Reputation
• Life Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Effect</td>
<td>Greatly reduces the University's exposure in this risk category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Effect</td>
<td>Somewhat reduces the University’s exposure in this risk category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to No Effect</td>
<td>Neutral - barely or does not reduce the University’s exposure in the risk category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Creates additional/increases exposure in the risk category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Consequence categories align with the consequence categories used in the risk assessment process.
## Likelihood

Does or would this risk mitigation strategy impact the likelihood of the risk occurring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** Decreases Likelihood**</td>
<td>Improves: Mitigation strategy has decreased the likelihood that the risk will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** No Impact**</td>
<td>Neutral: Mitigation strategy has made no impact on the likelihood that the risk will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Increases Likelihood**</td>
<td>Worsens: Mitigation strategy has increased the likelihood that the risk will occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Effectiveness Score Calculation

- Consequence rating value is assigned based on level.
- Consequence ratings are then weighted based on Implementation Level.
- Consequence ratings are then added.

- Likelihood rating value is relative to the inherent likelihood rating.
- Likelihood ratings is weighted based on Implementation Level.

- Proposed strategies are not calculated or ranked.
- Individual effectiveness score is used to rank mitigation strategies.
Residual Risk Score Calculation

- Consequence rating values for each mitigation strategy are relative to the inherent consequence rating values for the risk.
- Consequence ratings for are then weighted based on Implementation Level.
- Ratings for all consequence categories for all mitigation strategies is then averaged.

Average of Consequence Category Ratings for all Mitigation Strategies

- Likelihood rating value for each mitigation strategy is relative to the inherent likelihood rating for the risk.
- Likelihood ratings for are then weighted based on Implementation Level.
- Likelihood ratings for all mitigation strategies are then averaged.

Average of all mitigation strategy Likelihood Ratings

Urgency Rating Value for the mitigation assessment is the same value as the Inherent Urgency Rating.

Inherent Urgency Rating for the Risk

Residual Risk Score

Planned and proposed strategies are not included in the calculation because benefits of strategies are not yet realized.
## Demo of MATRIX

### Risk Mitigation Strategy Assessment Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Area</th>
<th>Control Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Level</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategy Rating</th>
<th>Likelihood Rating</th>
<th>Effect on University’s Financial Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grant Financial Support</td>
<td>Maintain established budgeting practices and procedures to ensure accuracy and transparency of financial data.</td>
<td>Successfully Implemented</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grant Funding of Other Renewal</td>
<td>Monitor and manage grants to ensure compliance with all requirements.</td>
<td>Successfully Implemented</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reporting - Quarterly Budget Reporting and Annual Budget Planning</td>
<td>Ensure accurate and timely budget reporting.</td>
<td>Successfully Implemented</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Deposition - Quarterly Capital Planning and Financial Capital Plan</td>
<td>Implement planned capital projects to meet financial goals.</td>
<td>Successfully Implemented</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consequence Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What MATRX Does and Does Not Accomplish

☑️

- Provides transparency on risk mitigation strategies
- Demonstrates progress on mitigating risk or depicts areas that may require additional attention
- Enables more robust discussions on risk and risk mitigation
- Demonstrates movement in addressing risk

☒

- Does not track key performance indicators
- Does not define risk tolerance
- Does not define specific follow-on actions needed
- Does not conclude satisfaction or dissatisfaction with status of addressing risk
Stakeholder Engagement
Mitigation Assessment – Stakeholder Engagement Process

**Outreach**
ERM Program makes outreach to stakeholders (risk and/or mitigation partners)
- Leverage existing systemwide affinity groups where possible
- Coordinate with ERM governance members to identify stakeholder

**Meeting**
ERM Program convenes meeting with stakeholder(s)
- Include systemwide representation wherever possible
- Alternately, meet with stakeholders campus by campus

**Identification**
Stakeholder(s) identify mitigation strategies to be documented and assessed

**Assessment**
- ERM facilitates and navigates tool
- Stakeholder(s) assess mitigation strategies

**Compilation**
ERM Program compiles resulting information
- Identify trends across individual campus assessments
- Share results with ERM governance members and stakeholders prior to leadership
# Mitigation Assessment Program Triumphs & Turbulences

## Triumphs

- MATRX has been well received by both internal and external stakeholders
- Results to date have been shared with leadership and our Board of Trustees
- Results have driven additional discussion around priority risks
- Adaptability of the tool to capture additional detail on mitigation strategies

## Turbulences

- Lengthier process than originally anticipated
- Challenges in identifying stakeholders and mitigation strategies for risks that do not have existing affinity groups
Mitigation Assessment Data
Preliminary Individual and Comparative Mitigation Strategy Assessment

17 Strategies

SAMPLE RESULTS
Financial Sustainability

Preliminary Individual and Comparative Mitigation Strategy Assessment

19 Strategies

State Funding of CBA Increases
- Reporting: Quarterly Budget Projections & Annual Budget Reporting
- Reporting: Quarterly Capital Reporting & Biennial Capital Plan
- Reaching/Maintaining 2% Operating Margin
- Cash Flow Modeling and Projections
- Reporting - Annual Five-Year Forecast Refresh
- Reserve Policy
- SPARC Dashboard
- UMass Global Financial Reporting

Line of Credit
- Operating Cash Invested with Foundation
- Implementation of UMPlan for Annual Budgeting
- UMPlan - Financial Forecast Module
- UMPlan - Tuition Planning Module

Compliance with Federal Grants
- Monitoring Standard Metrics
- Adoption and Forecasting of Changes in GASB
- Appropriate Account Treatment for P3s

© 2021 University of Massachusetts.
Preliminary Individual and Comparative Mitigation Strategy Assessment

More Effective

Effective

9 Strategies

1. Reaching/Maintaining Keep Up Targets
2. Reaching/Maintaining Catch Up Targets
   - Reporting – Biannual Capital Plan
   - Reporting – Quarterly Capital
3. Reporting – Keep Up
   - Reporting – Catch Up
   - Capital Policy
4. Tracking Campus Deferred Maintenance
5. Manage MMARS Activities related to DCAMM
Each risk on the systemwide risk registry presents a different range of risk exposure for the University. In this diagram:
- The far-left point for each risk reflects the Inherent Risk Rating for that risk.
- The far-right point represents the lowest possible residual risk exposure associated with that risk.
  - Please note: the lowest possible residual risk exposure is not a prescribed goal, but merely a reflection of lowest possible rating.
- The orange diamond reflects the current residual risk having accounted for existing mitigation strategies.
Influence of Mitigation Assessment Data
Influence on Risk Assessment Process

• Influence Urgency Rating
  – Are we satisfied with where we are, or do we need to continue to prioritize?
    ▪ Does not mean mitigation stops

• Identify risks that need to be reviewed with more granularity
ERM Data Empowers UMass to Better Understand & Prioritize Risk

Data gathered through the assessment of both risk and risk mitigation strategies enables UMass to contemplate risk through multiple viewpoints.

Spotlight: Consequence Categories

Consequence categories assists UMass in understanding how risk affects the University and how effective mitigation strategies are in reducing exposure. These are evaluated for six categories of impact:

- **Operations/Service Disruption**
- Financial
- **Legal/Compliance**
- Workforce
- **Reputation**
- Life Safety
### Operations Consequence Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>FY22 Risk Assessment Assessed Rating</th>
<th>FY23 Mitigation Assessment Assessed Rating (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health &amp; Mental Health Support</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Risk Management</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, Recruit, Retain Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Financial Consequence Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>FY22 Assessed Financial Risk Exposure</th>
<th>Impact of Assessed Mitigation Strategies on Financial Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Deferred Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health &amp; Mental Health Support</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Risk Management</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, Recruit, Retain Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Reputation Consequence Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Assessed Reputation Risk Exposure</th>
<th>Impact of Assessed Mitigation Strategies on Reputation Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health &amp; Mental Health Support</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Risk Management</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract, Recruit, Retain Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Risk Exposure: Negligible, Low, Medium, High
- Mitigation Strategies: Better, Neutral, Worse
- Impact of Assessed Mitigation Strategies on Reputation Exposure: Better, Neutral, Worse
Considerations for FY24 Risk Assessment

- Enrollment – Distinguish between recruitment and retention
- International Activities – Distinguish among travel, business operations, employment and immigration

Considerations for Future ERM Program

- Increase emphasis and understanding around risk appetite and risk tolerance
Conclusion & Take Aways

- Aligning assessment of risk mitigation strategies to risk assessment methodology allows for contextual comparison of risk exposure and risk mitigation.
- Transparency on risk mitigation strategies and visibility on progress in reducing risk exposure is empowering.
- Volume of mitigation strategies have intuitively been implemented around highest areas of risk exposure.
- ERM can be a cornerstone for creating risk-informed priorities and strategies.
Thank you for attending!
Please contact us with follow-up:

Christine Packard
Assistant Vice President
Enterprise Risk Management
cpackard@umassp.edu

Olivia Watson
Analyst
Enterprise Risk Management
owatson@umassp.edu

University of Massachusetts President’s Office