**ACCESSING LOGIC MANAGER**

1. The hyperlink below will take you to the Office of Risk Assurance & Compliance (ORAC) resources page, where you will find the access to Logic Manager:

<https://www.otago.ac.nz/risk/resources>



You may have to provide your UoO email address and password.

If logging on from an external location (off campus) you may need to have your MS Authenticator on your mobile device for two step authentication.

Save the internet page as a favourite, so that you can return to Logic Manager without having to visit the ORAC web page.

**REVIEWING A LOGIC MANAGER RISK FILE**

Please ensure that your division has a ‘formally’ documented risk management review process, risks should be reviewed at least monthly and after any material change or event. One method for achieving this, is to add ‘risk management’ to the agenda for internal meetings, from grass roots (individual teams) up to SLT/SMT meetings, see below.



Very High and High divisional risks should be known by the appropriate SLT member and their Directors / HoD’s etc. Some risks take time to reduce and some never do, some even go up before they come down…that’s all OK providing there is documented justification.

1. Every risk with a residual score of VERY HIGH >15 or HIGH >10 should be reviewed monthly as part of a standing agenda.
2. Unscheduled reviews should be undertaken if there has been a change or an event that may affect the risk.
3. What to review…
	1. **What Can Go Wrong** this is best written as **IF** and **THEN** statements, existing risks will need to be converted into this format, example below. **Ensure that the THEN statement includes a description of the worst realistic outcome, in the case below it is that UoO could lose revenue due to lower new applicants or retained students.**

***IF*** *– UoO fails to keep pace with its competitors in the areas of digital learning platforms required by students…*

***THEN*** *– Students may select other places to study, reducing funding for UoO and potential failure to meet TEC KPI’s.*

*E.g. Students involved in technology research have requested UoO invest in a wider range of VR or augmented interfaces. The divisions that have shown a desire to facilitate this are ????? the expected costs is $$$$$.*

*UoO currently has an insufficient number trained staff to facilitate an expansion of VR and augmented learning platforms.*

*Other NZ universities e.g. XXX and YYYY are known to be expanding student access to this technology.*

* 1. The **‘Impact’ score**, if this risk were to eventuate, what is the ‘**worst** **realistic**’ harm it could do to the University? The impact can change if there have been wider changes in other areas of the University’s needs or external influences, but these changes are infrequent. Use the on screen guidance to review the options.



* 1. **Likelihood**…this is usually the area of greatest change…internal and external factors make this score reasonably dynamic…e.g. have we introduced changes that will help to address the risk or have external changes increased our exposure to this risk? **REMEMBER**…we are assessing the likelihood of the worst realistic outcome not anything lesser…be consistent across impact and likelihood!

**Add text for the ‘Impact’ and ‘Likelihood’ sections to justify the score you have chosen.**

* 1. **Assurance**, this is where we tell the story of any controls we have in place, use the free text to advise if we are moving in the right direction. **REMEMBER** only controls that have been implemented can be used to reduce the overall risk score…whilst it is important to record any planned future changes e.g. project groups …budget requests etc etc, they can’t reduce the residual risk score unless they have made a practical impact already.

Every risk **MUST** have at least one control described in the assurance section…sometimes a control sounds negative e.g. reducing the number of papers available for student selection but it’s a control and should be listed…it demonstrates what we are having to do currently to manage the risk and the impact it is having today.

* + Review the controls that are listed…are they:
* Actively being used? **How do we know?**
* What effect are they having? **How do we know?**
* Are they sustainable…can we rely on them for the long term?

If the answers above are positive, then the control is ‘adequate’ and may be used to reduce the assurance score, which will effectively reduce the overall residual risk score. If the answers are negative then the control is ‘inadequate’ i.e. they are the all we can do for now, but we want to do more.

LM calculates ‘residual risk’ = Impact x likelihood = inherent risk x Assurance (which is a decimal fraction). Assurance scores values are as follows

**1** = 0.2…**2**= 0.4…**3** = 0.6…**4** = 0.8…**5** = 1.0

Example:

5 x 5 = 25 x assurance score of 3 (0.6) = Residual risk score of 15.

* 1. **‘What is your response to the risk?’**

If you believe that more can be done to lower the risk, select Mitigate.

* 1. **‘Reasoning’**

Following on from (g) if you believe that more can be done, list your recommendations and action plans here in detail. Explain what you need, explain how this will help explain what road blocks you are facing etc etc.

**Reviewed with no change**

If there are no changes or updates you **MUST** make a record of the fact that you have reviewed the file, otherwise your time and effort will not be demonstrated. Simply update the ‘Assurance section’ with your name, the date and ‘no change’.