

RISK REGISTER

A risk register, or risk management plan, analyzes reasonably practicable risks, proposes plans to move forward in the face of them, and sets a schedule for regularly re-assessing new risks. Risks span the spectrum from technical and training issues to changes in market trends. However, the analysis helps to determine the potential impact based on four criteria: schedule, scope, quality, and probability (cost was not factored because the designer is working gratis, the client is a non-profit, and participants are volunteers).

Impact Classification Rubric			
Domain	"C" Rating	"B" Rating	"A" Rating
Schedule	Project delay of 0-2 days	Project delay of 3-5 days	Project delay of > 5 days
Scope	Scope decrease barely noticeable	Minor areas of scope are affected	Major areas of scope are affected; scope reduction unacceptable to the client
Quality	Quality reduction barely noticeable	Quality reduction does not affect vital functionality	Quality reduction requires client approval
Value	C - 10	B - 50	A - 100

Overall scoring is based on qualitative risk analysis and expert judgment since software (such as that which could calculate risk analysis simulations) and data is not available for a quantitative analysis. For simplicity, the register uses a streamlined impact classification rubric. Additionally, instead of prompting a single response for each identified risk, this risk register breaks out the highest ranked possibilities to make all contingencies known (acceptance, avoidance, mitigation, and transference). Then, should those risks materialize, it's possible to choose that option which all parties approve.

Major Risks & Rationale

The following are some of the plausible risks that are most likely to occur:

- Developing 6+ hours of content and activities with a "staff of one" is too much work to submit in full by the hard deadline.

- Polly Cooper Chapter stakeholders request repeated revisions during design and development, impacting both the scope and schedule of the project.
- Usability studies during the prototyping phase highlight issues with navigating and using the chosen learning platform.
- UMGC oversight requests additional documentation or deliverables beyond what's been originally scoped for the project.
- Real-world challenges cut into available design and development time as needed to meet the 200 hour labor requirement.

Probability-Impact (PI) Matrix Scoring				
Impact Value (See Above)	Probability 0-30%	Probability 30-60%	Probability 60-80%	Probability 80-100%
(A) 100 (Max)	30 - Moderate	60 - High	80 - Very High	100 - Very High
(B) 50 (100/2)	15 - Low (30/2)	30 - Moderate (60/2)	40 - Moderate (80/2)	50 - High (100/2)
(C) 10 (50/5)	3 - Very Low (15/5)	6 - Very Low (30/5)	8 - Very Low (40/5)	10 - Low (50/5)

Risk Classification					
#	Phase	Risk Event	Probability (P)	Impact Rating (R)	Risk Score (P*R)
1	3,4	Developing 6+ hours of content and activities with a "staff of one" is too much work to submit in full by the hard deadline.	90%	A - 100	90 - Very High
5	All	Real-world challenges cut into available design and development time as needed to meet the 200 hour labor requirement.	50%	A - 100	50 - High

2	All	Polly Cooper Chapter stakeholders request repeated revisions during design and development, impacting both the scope and schedule of the project.	30%	B - 50	15 - Low
3	3	Usability studies during the prototyping phase highlight issues with navigating and using the chosen learning platform.	25%	C - 10	2.5 - Very Low
4	All	UMGC oversight requests additional documentation or deliverables beyond what's been originally scoped for the project.	10%	C - 10	1 - Very Low

What are the primary forms of risk response? Typically, they include **acceptance** (utilizing a contingency plan), **avoidance** (bypassing the risk), **mitigation** (reducing the probability or impact), and **transference** (shifting the risk to another party). Within risk management, each of the four responses is customized to the specific risk. For this register, only the most probable and disruptive risks were analyzed based on their combined risk score.

Risk Responses

Risk #1: Developing 6+ hours of content and activities with a “staff of one” is too much work to submit in full by the hard deadline.

- **Accept** - Build only half of the designed units and include a plan to add the rest later.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - UMGc requires designing the full curriculum, but they don't require developing all 7 units and their respective lessons.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - Unable to meet all the text/script, media, and activity development requirements scoped for the prototyping phase.
- **Mitigate** - Get ahead of the timeline by working ahead, as quickly as possible.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - Polly Cooper Chapter stakeholders don't require frequent pauses for feedback and are willing to let the designer/developer push through.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - Design is accepted without major changes or revisions.
- **Transfer** - Utilize Google's teaching materials, how-to guides, and other content.

- ◆ **Assumption** - Google's nonprofit management resources and "grow with Google" curriculum provide a sufficient boost.
- ◆ **Trigger** - Media creation starts to slow down the development process to the point that shortcuts are warranted.
- **Avoid** - The requirement was to design 6+ hours, but maybe not to develop them all.
- ◆ **Assumption** - Polly Cooper Chapter needs at least three units of content, but they don't need them all by the delivery deadline.
- ◆ **Trigger** - The "module" deliverable is clarified as only one unit, meanwhile development is behind schedule.

Risk #2: Real-world challenges cut into available design and development time as needed to meet the 200 hour labor requirement.

- **Accept** - Schedule "marathon" sessions to catch up during weekends.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - Daytime commitments of the "staff of one" preclude making significant progress during the week.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - Unable to commit at least two hours every weeknight toward the completion of the learning experience.
- **Mitigate** - "Work smarter, not harder" and make the time available count more. Use screencasts instead of animations, let YouTube auto-dictate subtitles, etc.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - Working "smarter" saves enough time to recover the schedule.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - Unable to commit 20 hours per week to the project, in any combination of hours per day.
- **Transfer** - Instead of transferring the project work to a subcontractor or freelancer (which isn't an option for a capstone course), transfer as much real-world as possible such as taking vacation/sick days to work on this project.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - There is nothing happening in the real-world which can't be transferred ie., personal illness.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - Significantly short of the overall labor total by Phase 3, necessitating a "reboot" and refocus.
- **Avoid** - The 200 hour guideline was only a suggestion to illustrate commitment.
 - ◆ **Assumption** - With sufficient focus and ingenuity, it's possible to complete this project in under 200 hours of work.
 - ◆ **Trigger** - The "module" deliverable is clarified as only one unit and/or work progresses on schedule irrespective of the time log.