

---

**BOARD MEETING**

---

Date of Meeting	29 March 2017
Paper Title	College Strategic Risk Register
Agenda Item	17.15
Paper Number	17.15A
Responsible Officer	Janet Thomson, Vice Principal Resources And College Development
Status	Disclosable
Action	For Noting

---

**1. Report Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide members with an update of the current College Strategic Risk Register.

**2. Recommendations**

Members are requested to discuss the attached revised College Strategic Risk Register as at mid-March 2017.

**3. Background**

**3.1** The College has in place a risk management policy, approved by the Board of Management, and has an ongoing process of risk management where the College Strategic Risk Register is the key tool in monitoring Glasgow Clyde College's exposure to risk and the countermeasures being taken to mitigate the key College risks to a satisfactory level. The College Strategic Risk Register is reported to the Board on a quarterly basis and risk management is part of the Audit Committee remit with the College Strategic Risk Register being reported to each of their Committee meetings.

**3.2** At the Audit Committee at the end of September there was a full discussion on the College Strategic Risk Register and members of the Audit Committee felt that there were too many risks on the Register with some overlaps which could be mapped together to have fewer risks. The risk register has now been revised on this basis to streamline the risks and to show them grouped by risk category. This review was undertaken by the Vice Principal Resources and College Development and the Depute Principal and has been discussed with the Chair

of the Audit Committee and Audit Committee member Keith Rosser. The proposed revised College Strategic Risk Register is attached.

- 3.3** There are twelve risks in the new College Strategic Risk Register which compares to twenty five risks in the previous College Strategic Risk Register format. There is a column in the attached risk register which indicates how the previous risks have been grouped into the new risks or where the previous risks are now embedded into main risks on the register.
- 3.4** There are twelve risks in the new College Strategic Risk Register which compares to twenty five risks in the previous College Strategic Risk Register format. There is a column in the attached risk register which indicates how the previous risks have been grouped into the new risks or where the previous risks are now embedded into main risks on the register.
- 3.5** The updated risk register now includes a link to the College Development Plan indicating which goal the risk links to and the mitigating actions have been reviewed to ensure they are the most appropriate against each of the streamlined risks. The risk register had previously been updated to reflect the recommendation in last year's internal audit report including the format of the mitigation actions, reduced number of risk categories, amended wording in respect of some risks, and a new risk added relating to teaching delivery quality at the previous update. This further revision takes this review a stage further.
- 3.6** There are now three categories of risk which are Financial Risks of which there are three, Organisational Risks of which there are six, and Governance Risks of which there are three.
- 3.7** There are five risks which are scoring as high after mitigating actions which are as follows :-

F1 – Adverse Funding Changes (SFC/SDS/ESF). This is scoring as probability of 5 and impact of 4 after mitigating actions. There are challenges for each of these funding strands particularly in the medium term. The SFC funding allocation does not fund the Region to the full value of the simplified model and recent indications from SFC are that this is now going to be reviewed over a longer transition period than originally stated with transition now through to 2020/21. For SDS there are changes in the funding strands they provide and changes to SDS itself. For ESF it increases in 2017/18 however will then significantly reduce as the current programme ends.

F2 – Failure to achieve contracted overall teaching delivery targets for any key partner (SFC/SDS/ESF). This is scoring as probability of 3 and impact of 5 after mitigating actions. This is high because there are a range of delivery

requirements particularly associated with SDS and ESF funding. Also the portfolio planning is now closer to the target requirement than in previous years with less extra capacity built in.

F3 – Failure to achieve surplus targets for non-SFC commercial activity. This is scoring as probability of 3 and impact of 5 after mitigating actions. The College plans to at least maintain its commercial income and this is challenging in difficult economic circumstances and with some increased economic uncertainties e.g. Brexit.

O1 – Negative impact on employee relations (e.g. national bargaining, industrial action, local consultation). This is scoring as probability of 4 and impact of 5 after mitigating actions. This is certainly high and has been indicated as increasing given recent position regarding industrial action. It is also the case that some of the key issues in this risk are associated with decisions that are not within the College's direct control.

O2 – Failure of College operational processes/systems/ICT infrastructure (including risk of fraud). This is scoring as probability of 3 and impact of 5 after mitigating actions. This is just scoring within the high range and is due to the volume of activity across the College processes and in areas such as cyber security.

**4. Risk Analysis**

The College Strategic Risk Register is a key part of the College's risk management framework.

**5. Legal Implications**

There are no specific legal implications from this paper.

**6. Financial Implications**

There are financial implications in relation to many of the risks in the College Strategic Risk Register as indicated in the risk category for each.

**7. Regional Outcome Agreement Implications**

The College is required to have a risk register as part of the Financial Memorandum here are no specific Regional Outcome Agreement implications from this paper.

**8. Has an Equality Impact Assessment been carried out**

Not applicable.