

Procedure for Risk Assessment							
Issue No : 01	Revision No: 00	Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01					
Issue Date: 01/06/2023	Revision Date: 20/05/2025	Page 1 of 7					

#### 1. PURPOSE:

To implement a risk assessment framework for each process under the Educational Organizational Management System to proactively manage potential threats to academic and administrative excellence.

### This framework integrates:

- Process-Based Risk Identification: Aligns with ISO's High-Level Structure by evaluating risks at individual process levels.
- Contextual Analysis: Considers internal/external factors (e.g., regulatory changes, stakeholder expectations) to ensure holistic risk evaluation.
- Stakeholder-Centricity: Prioritizes risks affecting learners, staff, and partners, reflecting ISO 21001's focus on educational stakeholder needs

#### RESPONSIBILITY:

i) Defining the risk assessment procedure : EOMS Coordinatorii) Risk assessment of individual Processes : Respective HODs

2. REFERENCE: ISO 21001:2018, Clause 6.1

#### 3. DESCRIPTION:

### 4.1 RISK ASSESSMENT:

- \* Risk evaluation is conducted at the level of individual processes. During this evaluation, the organization's context including both internal/external factors and stakeholder needs and expectations is taken into account.
- ❖ Each department, led by its HOD, identifies potential opportunities and challenges for their respective processes. This is done collaboratively with Department Faculty and is based on historical insights and experience. The findings are documented as annexures to departmental procedures. Additionally, the root causes or enabling conditions for these opportunities are also captured in the annexure.
- ❖ For each identified opportunity or challenge (encompassing both beneficial and adverse impacts), the likelihood of occurrence is estimated. A numerical scale ranging from 1 to 5 is used to assign scores based on the perceived frequency.

Controlled Copy

ISO EOMS: 21001:2018



 Issue No : 01
 Revision No: 00
 Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01

 Issue Date: 01/06/2023
 Revision Date: 20/05/2025
 Page 2 of 7

Evaluation of Impact is done as follows:

	Impact							
Probability	How severe would the outcomes be if the risk occurred?							
		Impact: 1 (Insignificant)	Impact: 2 (Minor)	Impact: 3 (Moderate)	Impact: 4 (Major)	Impact: 5 (Critical)		
	Likelihood: 5 (Almost Certain)	Moderate 5	High 10	Very High 15	Extreme 20	Extreme 25		
What is the probability the risk will happen?	Likelihood: 4 (Likely)	Moderate 4	Moderate 8	High 12	Very High 16	Extreme 20		
	Likelihood: 3 (Possible)	Low 3	Moderate 6	Moderate 9	High 12	Very High 15		
	Likelihood: 2 (Unlikely)	Very Low 2	Low 4	Moderate 6	Moderate 8	High 10		
	Likelihood: 1 (Rare)	Very Low 1	Very Low 2	Low 3	Moderate 4	Moderate 5		

5x5 Likelihood-Impact Matrix (see table above) is a globally recognized tool for:

- Quantifying Subjective Risks: Translates qualitative judgments (e.g., "Likely" or "Critical") into actionable numerical scores.
- Prioritization: Color-coding (Red/Orange/Yellow/Green) enables quick visual prioritization, ensuring resources target high-impact risks first.
- ❖ Dynamic Adaptation: Scores can be recalibrated annually based on emerging trends or organizational maturity



## **Procedure for Risk Assessment**

Issue No : 01 Revision No: 00 Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01

Issue Date: 01/06/2023 Revision Date: 20/05/2025 Page 3 of 7

## **RISK Register**

Work Center / Process	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigating Action	Likelihood (Value)	Impact (Value)	Risk Level (L x I)	Qualitative Level	Color Code	Risk Owner
Admission	Nontransparent admission leading to bribery	Transparent, merit- based admission process; digital records; grievance redressal	4 (Likely)	4 (Major)	16	Very High	Red	PRO
Advairiatustias	Teacher absenteeism reducing learning outcomes	Monitor attendance; enforce accountability	3 (Possible)	4 (Major)	12	High	Orange	Vice Principal Administration
Administration	Failure to meet statutory requirements	Monitor compliance obligations; regular legal review	2 (Unlikely)	5 (Critical)	10	High	Orange	Vice Principal Administration
Teaching /Learning	Work-related stress among teaching staff	Professional development, counseling, workload balance	4 (Likely)	3 (Moderate)	12	High	Orange	Vice Principal Academics
j	Wasted educational time due to ineffective teaching	Monitor teaching quality; student feedback	3 (Possible)	3 (Moderate)	9	Moderate	Yellow	Vice Principal Academics



## **Procedure for Risk Assessment**

Issue No : 01 Revision No: 00 Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01

Issue Date: 01/06/2023 Revision Date: 20/05/2025 Page 4 of 7

Work Center / Process	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigating Action	Likelihood (Value)	Impact (Value)	Risk Level (L x I)	Qualitative Level	Color Code	Risk Owner
	Selling of exam questions, grades, certificates	Secure exam protocols; audits; strict penalties	2 (Unlikely)	5 (Critical)	10	High	Orange	Controller of Examination
Examination	Manipulation of exam results due to nontransparent evaluation	Digital/biometric verification; independent audits	3 (Possible)	4 (Major)	12	High	Orange	Controller of Examination
Result	Manipulation of results data affecting funding/job allocations	Encrypted result management; random audits	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8	Moderate	Yellow	Controller of Examination
Placements	Manipulation of Placement data affecting resource allocation	Transparent placement criteria; regular audits	2 (Unlikely)	3 (Moderate)	6	Moderate	Yellow	Placement Officer
	Lab equipment failure	Preventive maintenance; inventory of spares	3 (Possible)	3 (Moderate)	9	Moderate	Yellow	Lab Coordinator
Facility Maintenance	Accidents/incidents in workshops	Safety training; PPE; safety awareness	2 (Unlikely)	5 (Critical)	10	High	Orange	Safety Officer



## **Procedure for Risk Assessment**

Issue No : 01 Revision No: 00 Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01

Issue Date: 01/06/2023 Revision Date: 20/05/2025 Page 5 of 7

	133de Dat	e: 01/06/2023 Rev	ision Date: 20/05	72023	ge 5 01 7			
Work Center / Process	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigating Action	Likelihood (Value)	Impact (Value)	Risk Level (L x I)	Qualitative Level	Color Code	Risk Owner
Facility	Off-budget activities/nontransp arent budget processes	Transparent budgeting; regular audits	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8	Moderate	Yellow	Finance Manager
Maintenance	Threats to security of people and property	CCTV, security staff, vulnerability assessment	3 (Possible)	4 (Major)	12	High	Orange	Security Officer
Human Resource Management	Non-availability of quality human resources	Career growth planning; need-based training; proactive recruitment	3 (Possible)	4 (Major)	12	High	Orange	HR Manager
	Attrition of skilled employees	Perks, facilities, grievance redressal	3 (Possible)	3 (Moderate)	9	Moderate	Yellow	HR Manager
Lah Matorial	Delay in procurement of lab materials/services	Rate contracts, advance procurement	3 (Possible)	3 (Moderate)	9	Moderate	Yellow	Purchase Officer
Lab Material Management	Stock out of critical lab material/spares	Local suppliers; streamlined requisition	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8	Moderate	Yellow	Lab Coordinator
System Department (IT)	Unauthorized access/breach/ modification of information system	Password/access controls, regular security audits	3 (Possible)	5 (Critical)	15	Very High	Red	Head of IT services



## **Procedure for Risk Assessment**

Issue No : 01 Revision No: 00 Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01

Issue Date: 01/06/2023 Revision Date: 20/05/2025 Page 6 of 7

Work Center / Process	Risk Description	Proposed Mitigating Action	Likelihood (Value)	Impact (Value)	Risk Level (L x I)	Qualitative Level	Color Code	Risk Owner
Administration	Loss/leakage of confidential information	Confidentiality clauses; data protection policies	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8	Moderate	Yellow	Vice Principal Administration
Administration	Failure of strategic initiatives	Monitor/report performance; adjust as needed	2 (Unlikely)	4 (Major)	8	Moderate	Yellow	Vice Principal Administration

Red = Extreme Risk (15–25) — Immediate action required
Orange = High Risk (10–14) — Action required soon
Yellow = Moderate Risk (5–9) — Monitor and manage
Green = Low Risk (1–4) — Acceptable, routine controls

### **Risk Appetite Alignment**

- Extreme Risks (Red): Unacceptable; require immediate intervention (e.g., IT security breaches).
- High Risks (Orange): Tolerable only with short-term mitigation (e.g., teacher absenteeism).



Procedure for Risk Assessment							
Issue No : 01	Revision No: 00	Doc. No: EOMS-MITS/PRO/RA/01					
Issue Date: 01/06/2023	Revision Date: 20/05/2025	Page 7 of 7					

### **Key Theoretical Concepts Embedded in the Framework**

### a) Preventive Action

ISO 21001 mandates addressing root causes before risks escalate. Example:

Mitigation for "Nontransparent Admission": Digital records and grievance redressal systems prevent bribery by design.

### b) PDCA Cycle Integration

Plan: Define procedures (EOMS Coordinator's role).

Do: HOD-led risk assessments with faculty input.

Check: Regular audits

Act: Adjust strategies based on monitoring

### c) Educational Sector-Specific Risk Considerations

- ❖ Academic Integrity: Risks like exam fraud or grade manipulation threaten Institutional credibility.
- \* Resource Availability: Lab equipment failures or staff attrition directly impact learning quality.
- Compliance: Statutory non-compliance risks legal penalties and loss of accreditation.

#### d) Continuous Improvement Mechanism

- Annexures: Historical data in departmental procedures enable trend analysis for future risk forecasting.
- Ownership Clarity: Assigning risk owners ensures accountability.

Controlled Copy

ISO EOMS: 21001:2018