

ME Department Risk Management Plans for high priority items - 2006-2007

The Highest Rated Risks based on the Faculty/Staff/Student Risk Identification and Rating Process are shown below, along with some additional discussion and plans for mitigating and monitoring the risk items. See the risk rating sheets for examples of each risk category.

Safety	Risk Priority³	Max Rating	% rated 6-9
	Avg of ratings		
Safety Hazards and Accidents			
Risk of Physical Injury to Students (Grad students doing research)	5.30	9.00	60
Risk of Safety Regulatory Violations	4.42	9.00	37
Risk of Senior Design - Safety	4.12	9.00	35

Discussion: Senior Design has developed a safety plan, but it needs to be continually reviewed and improved. Of more immediate concern is ensuring safety and training for all graduate students involved in experimental research.

Plans for mitigation and monitoring: An ME Dept Safety Committee has been established (1/3/07 faculty meeting). The chair will be the ME lab coordinator (Randy), and membership will include lab coordinators from any Centers that operate within the department (Shyler from OCRC) plus representatives from the SAB (Jared Leininger), GSAB (Dhruv Kohli), ME Department Lab Committee (Izzi for now, to be replaced by new faculty hire with lab expertise), and ME Department Graduate Program committee (Khairul).

- This standing committee's first charge is to consider the list of safety concerns surfaced in the risk assessment, examine current practices in the department, and establish policies and procedures and enforcement methods to ensure safety and monitor the potential risks.
- The committee will report to the faculty in the Fall and in the Spring.

Perceived & Real Dishonesty	Risk Priority³	Max Rating	% rated 6-9
	Avg of ratings		
Perceived & Real Dishonesty			
P & R Dishonesty in Coursework by Students - Exam level	5	9	63
P & R Dishonesty in Coursework by Students - Homework level	4.78	9	56
P & R Dishonesty in Publications by Students	4.50	9	46
P & R Dishonesty in Research by Students	4.57	6	43

Discussion: The Chas numerous initiatives underway, especially related to the academic honor councils and the establishment of an honor code.

Plans for mitigation and monitoring: Individual faculty should be aware of the student perception of significant cases of dishonesty in homework and exams, and should take steps to limit the temptation for student dishonesty. Izzi will act as a liaison with the college Academic Honor Council, and we will coordinate our future departmental actions with the College actions, once they have been announced.

Department and Personnel

	Risk Priority		
	Avg of ratings	Max Rating	% rated 6-9
Inadequate Resources and support for New Faculty will lead to problems with performance and retention	5.94	9.00	76
Excessive Work Load Expectations will reduce job satisfaction and performance	5.92	9.00	67
Inadequate incentives will cause the program to not meet its objectives	5.20	9.00	60
Inadequate Staffing levels will lead to inability to complete essential tasks	6.00	9.00	60
Inadequate Infrastructure & Facilities will limit our ability to do good work	3.82	9.00	41
Poor faculty/staff morale will lead to problems with performance and retention	4.35	9.00	35

Graduate Program

	Risk Priority ³		
	Avg of ratings	Max Rating	% rated 6-9
<u>Limitations for Future Growth - Graduate Program</u>	6.00	9.00	69
<u>Inadequate Recruiting & Retention</u>			
Inadequate R & R of Faculty	6.46	9.00	85
Inadequate R & R of New Students	4.69	9.00	54
Inadequate R & R of Current Students	5.77	9.00	54
<u>Academic Quality</u>			
Lack of Quality - Student's Research Work	5.00	9.00	46
Inadequate Advising - Faculty constraints	5.31	9.00	46
Lack of Quality Support for Research Work	4.15	6.00	38
<u>Internal Communications & Relations</u>			
Lack of guidelines leading to deficient reports, thesis/dissertation	5.60	9.00	60
Poor student advising will cause problems for students	5.18	9.00	53
Poor student monitoring will lead to student misconduct	4.40	9.00	40

Discussion: These categories are being considered together because the highest rated graduate program items seem to be the same as in the department and personnel category (faculty recruiting and retention and overall support), and the internal communications items are also related to graduate program quality. The ratings show a serious concern with respect to faculty recruiting and retention, overall support and resources, and the "control" of the quality of graduate student work. Current initiatives that address some of these areas include the university-level faculty salary initiative, the college-level new building project, the departmental changes to grad program policies and procedures, and increased focus on faculty development that should improve the situation.

Plans for mitigation and monitoring: The graduate committee will review the list of graduate program concerns surfaced in the risk assessment, especially related to Faculty Recruiting and retention and limitations for future growth, as well as the applicable concerns from internal communications and relations. The P&T committee will review the list of department and personnel program concerns surfaced in the risk assessment. Together the two committees will make recommendations for departmental policies and procedures and priorities to address the risk items. Initial report due date TBD.

Undergraduate Program	Risk Priority		% rated 6-9
	Avg of ratings	Max Rating	
<u>Academic Quality Issues with the UG Program</u>			
Inadequate quality of service courses will cause problems for students	5.47	9.00	47
Curriculum issues will cause problems for students	4.47	9.00	41
Inadequate attention to assessment will cause accreditation problems	4.10	9.00	40
Scheduling issues will cause problems for students	3.82	9.00	35
Workload Constraints will limit faculty effectiveness in UG program	3.82	9.00	35
Issues with courses will lead to some students not meeting outcomes	4.13	9.00	33

Discussion: These items can be treated as "areas for improvement" and integrated into our departmental continuous improvement process.

Plans for mitigation and monitoring: Assessment committee will review the list of academic quality concerns identified in the risk assessment, and will include them in the faculty program review report as "areas for improvement".

Communication & Relations	Risk Priority		% rated 6-9
	Avg of ratings	Max Rating	
<u>External Communications & Relations</u>			
Negative press (including Plagiarism) will impact our Reputation	5.94	9.00	76
Lack of Publicity or Exposure in Public and Media will cause recruiting problems	5.71	9.00	59
Poor University Relations will cause problems for the department	4.65	9.00	53
Lack of Alumni Relations will decrease alumni support	4.10	9.00	40

Discussion: The department does not have much control over these items, but we can support ongoing college initiatives to improve public relations, and continue to deal with the students impacted by the plagiarism issue in a prompt and fair manner.

Plans for mitigation and monitoring: Develop regular open communications with Jack Jeffries, John Burns, Colleen Girton, and others responsible for external relations. Make an effort to support positive press - share our good news. The SAB will work on improving relations with alumni, especially getting contact info from graduating seniors.