

Board Meeting

Date of Meeting	Monday 25 January 2016
Paper Title	Risk register
Agenda Item	10
Paper Number	BM4-F
Responsible Officer	Martin Fairbairn, Interim Chief Officer
Status	Disclosable
Action	For Discussion

1. Report Purpose

- 1.1. This paper presents the current version of GCRB's risk register.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. The Board is invited to suggest additions and amendments to the current risk register, specifically:

- Have all the key risks to effective operation of GCRB and delivery of the Regional Outcome Agreement been identified?
- Which of the individual risk assessments do Board members think are in most need of revision?
- What are the most significant improvements Board members would suggest in relation to the individual risk 'treatments'?

3. Background

- 3.1. At its October 2015 meeting, the Board approved GCRB's risk management policy and guidance, as recommended by the Audit Committee.
- 3.2. In workshop-style, the board also revised the first risk register in detail. Notes from that workshop are attached at Annex A. All of these points have been reflected in the current version of the risk register, with one exception – consideration of risk management at the committee level. This will now be developed with the committee chairs.

4. Risk Register

- 4.1. The full risk register comprises:
- A 'Risk Matrix', which plots identified risks visually (Annex B).
 - The 'Risk Register', which summarises all the identified risks (Annex C).

- The individual risk ‘management action plans’, which provide the detailed assessment of each risk (Annexe D).
- 4.2.** Compared to the previous version of the risk register (and taking into account the workshop discussion):
- the net risk score for three risks has increased as a result of an increase in the ‘likelihood’ assessments (0001, 0002 and 0009);
 - the net risk score for one risk has decreased for the same reason (0006);
 - a new risk has been added on reputation management (0012).
- 4.3.** Adequacy of student support funds (0011) remains the highest risk (although there have been some positive developments, as described in the detailed update).
- 4.4.** At the next level are the following risks, with a net score of 6:
- 0008: If the assigned colleges lack confidence in the quality of GCRB’s governance, effective collaboration across the region will be impaired and GCRB’s ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained.
 - 0009: If staff across the region lack confidence in regional co-ordination of key change activities, collaboration will be ineffective.
 - 0012: If GCRB is unable to improve its reputation, its ability to ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained
- 4.5.** The board will therefore want to give particular consideration to these risks with regard to their current ‘treatments’.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1.** Paragraph 17 of the Financial Memorandum between the Scottish Funding Council and GCRB requires GCRB to have an effective policy of risk management and risk management arrangements.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1.** Relevant financial risks are referred to in the risk register.

7. Regional Outcome Agreement Implications

- 7.1.** Through the conditions of grant associated with the Regional Outcome Agreement, GCRB is required to conduct its affairs in accordance with the expected standards of good governance, which include operating appropriate risk management arrangements.

Risk management – key points from risk workshop on 27 October 2015

001: Media coverage of governance issues in Glasgow region discourages suitable candidates from applying for vacancies

- 1 Currently written at a moment in time. Since this will be an ongoing issue it should be written in a way that reflects its long-term nature
- 2 GCRB has responsibility for recruitment of assigned college board members as well as its own board, should be written in a way to reflect this more clearly
- 3 Reaching out to stakeholders/partner organisations as part of treatment
- 4 Wording should be more strategic/high level
- 5 Should be about ensuring high quality members to ensure good governance
- 6 Include more about oversight role re assigned colleges;
- 7 This risk should not be confused with media/PR issues, which should be created as a separate risk, and the two should be linked when dependencies are identified
- 8 Media/PR is then part of the mitigation for this risk
- 9 Equality and diversity should be borne in mind – currently focus on gender – should be wider than this
- 10 Risk score should be higher given need to find a large number of new board members across the region.

002: If SFC is unable to allocate adequate resources to Glasgow, delivery of the Regional Outcome Agreement will be put in jeopardy

- 11 Should also reflect risk of inadequate Scottish Government funding for the college sector as a whole.
- 12 If funding level is inadequate, then it might not be possible to sign the Regional Outcome Agreement.
- 13 If funding is insufficient, it will be extremely difficult to manage expenditure given the fixed nature of most costs.
- 14 Consider role in attracting new funding sources.

003: If SFC is not satisfied with how GCRB has responded to its requirements for fully operational fundable body status, achievement of that status will be delayed

- 15 Need to include something about purpose of FBS, not just badge, why needed – funding to meet the needs of students
- 16 This risk is about a specific achievement – when status gained should be replaced by something about GCRB being a highly performing body

004: If there is a lack of consensus across the region on most key issues, creation and delivery of an effective ROA will be difficult

17 Make clear reference is to assigned college boards

18 Should be more about structure of the region

19 Set risk at more strategic level – about setting a shared strategy for the region - how we will add value, how we will make what we have work better, how we will agree key priorities

20 More about articulating a clear strategy for Glasgow and achieving a strategic vision for FE in Glasgow – getting consensus/managing conflict should be the treatment not the risk;

005: If there is breakdown in academic quality management arrangements in the assigned colleges, student success will fall below the target levels in the ROA.

21 Widen out to cover other performance aspects., while retaining academic quality aspect.

22 Recognise that it is important that GCRB positions itself correctly in this important area.

006: If the quality of governors or senior personnel at one of the assigned colleges falls below the required level, the strategic and operational effectiveness of the college will be impaired.

23 There is a difficulty if people aren't allowed to learn as a consequence of a 'blame culture'.

24 Add something about region-wide governance learning.

007: If key stakeholders lose confidence in GCRB, leverage of necessary partnership resources for delivery of the ROA will be impaired.

25 Risk talks about losing partnerships, should also include how to establish in the first place

26 Should also include nurturing partnerships

27 Wider than just Chair and Chief Officer, should be a joined up offer from the region as a whole – think about how we co-ordinate this better with assigned colleges

28 Most important partnership is with the assigned colleges

008: If the assigned colleges lack confidence in the quality of GCRB's governance, effective collaboration across the region will be impaired..

29 Risk should be threat to ability to deliver for the students of Glasgow

30 Linked to achievement of fundable body status/being a high performing body

31 Also link to stakeholder relations

32 Role of internal and external audit for GCRB should be part of treatment

33 Self evaluation of effectiveness part of treatment

34 Code of good governance and other governance documents part of treatment;

009: If staff across the region lack confidence in regional co-ordination of key change activities, collaboration will be ineffective.

35 Net risk score should be increased.

010: If there is a significant delay to the availability of the new facilities for City of Glasgow College, course provision for students will be reduced

36 Risk should be adapted to focus on fit-for-purpose facilities across the region

37 Broaden out – not just COGC.

011: If there is insufficient non-advanced student support funds, students will be unable to take up places offered and activity targets will not be met.

38 With regard to the 'treatment', there should be a focus on increasing consistency of the policies across the three colleges.

Overall points:

39 Don't find the 'risk names' useful in the top-level risk register - better to replace with the full risk description.

40 Risks need to be more high level, currently too narrow, be more strategic

41 Current net risk scores are probably too optimistic.

42 In time develop more operational risks that you would be used to seeing on a risk register such as business continuity, systems, integrity of data, business resilience

43 Should be written in a way that assumes fundable body status

44 Dependencies should be developed between risks

45 Reporting/monitoring for risks at committee level should be developed

Strategic Risk Assessment Matrix: 25 January 2016

(Shows net risk scores, i.e. after 'treatment')

	Low Impact 1	Medium Impact 2	High Impact 3
Low Likelihood 1	1	2	3
Medium Likelihood 2	2	4	6
High Likelihood 3	3	6	9

Risk Register: 25 January 2016

Outcome		RISK DETAIL					CURRENT EVALUATION OF RISK (after treatment)				AIM and PROGRESS	
		Risk Description	Tolerance types	Risk ID	Level	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Net Risk Score	Risk tolerance	Target Risk Score	Risk Movement
All		If potential applicants do not perceive there to be a value in applying to be board members, the quality of GCRB and college governance could be reduced	Reputation, Compliance	0001	1	IC	2	2	4	1	1	+2
All		If Scottish Government and SFC are unable to allocate adequate resources for the college sector and Glasgow respectively, it might not be possible to sign the Regional Outcome Agreement and its delivery will be put in jeopardy	Financial	0002	1	ICO	2	2	4	3	3	+2
All		If SFC is not satisfied with how GCRB has responded to its requirements for fully-operational fundable body status, GCRB's ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained	Reputation, Compliance	0003	1	ICO	1	3	3	1	1	0
All		If there is a lack of consensus between GCRB and the assigned college boards on a shared strategy for the Glasgow region, GCRB's ability to make a positive impact on learning opportunities for students will be reduced	Reputation, financial	0004	1	ICO	1	2	2	1	1	0
High quality and efficient learning		If there is breakdown in performance in the assigned colleges (including academic quality management arrangements), the Regional Outcome Agreement targets may not be achieved.	Education & student experience	0005	1	ICO	1	3	3	4	3	0
All		If the quality of governors or senior personnel at one of the assigned colleges falls below the required level, the strategic and operational effectiveness of the college will be impaired.	Reputation, Compliance	0006	1	ICO	1	3	3	1	1	-3
All		If key stakeholders lose confidence in GCRB, leverage of current and future partnership resources for delivery of the ROA will be impaired.	Reputation	0007	1	ICO	1	2	2	1	1	0
All		If the assigned colleges lack confidence in the quality of GCRB's governance, effective collaboration across the region will be impaired and GCRB's ability to make a	Reputation	0008	1	IC	2	3	6	1	1	0

RISK DETAIL							CURRENT EVALUATION OF RISK (after treatment)				AIM and PROGRESS	
Outcome	Risk Description	Tolerance types	Risk ID	Level	Risk Owner		Likelihood	Impact	Net Risk Score	Risk tolerance	Target Risk Score	Risk Movement
AI	If staff across the region lack confidence in regional coordination of key change activities, collaboration will be ineffective.	People and culture	0009	1	ICO		2	3	6	2	2	+2
AI	If there is a material shortfall in the quality of facilities, student success will be reduced	Major change activities	0010	1	ICO		1	2	2	2	2	0
AI	If there are insufficient non-advanced student support funds, students will be unable to take up places offered and activity targets will not be met.	Reputation, Education & student experience	0011	1	ICO		3	3	9	1	1	0
AI	If GCRB is unable to improve its reputation, its ability to ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained	Reputation	0012	1	ICO		2	3	6	1	1	N/A
									0			0

Key:

IC = Interim Chair

ED = Executive Director

Proposed movement or change

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If potential applicants do not perceive there to be a value in applying to be board members, the quality of GCRB and college governance could be reduced

Risk ID: 0001.

Cross references to related risks: 0003, 0006, 0007, 0008, 0012

Owned by: Interim Chair

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Wide promotion of vacancies
- Close liaison with Scottish Government over timing of promotion
- Targeted direct promotion of relevant organisations and individuals

Commentary (Update):

- GCRB and the colleges have worked closely together to develop a co-ordinated approach with shared resources
- A recruitment campaign has been launched by all four organisations at the beginning of January
- The opportunities are being targeted at three levels: general promotion; through stakeholder organisations (including those with an equality and diversity focus); direct to individual contacts
- For the longer-term, and as indicated under Risk 0012, work needs to begin on a wider approach to reputation management

Gross risk score:
(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation /
Compliance - 1

Target risk score: 1

**Previous net Risk Score (as previously
reported to Board):**

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score – 2

**Current net Risk Score
(after treatment):**

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 2

Net score - 4

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If Scottish Government and SFC are unable to allocate adequate resources for the college sector and Glasgow respectively, it might not be possible to sign the Regional Outcome Agreement and its delivery will be put in jeopardy

Risk ID: 0002.

Cross references to related risks: 0005, 0008, 0010, 0011

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Reporting to Performance & Resources Committee of financial position of assigned colleges
- Reporting to SFC any aspects of 2015-16 ROA which may be at risk due to financial constraints
- Preparation of 2016-17 ROA integrated with financial planning
- Exploration of opportunities for cross-region approaches to attracting new funding sources

Commentary (Update):

- Full progress and financial reporting to the Performance & Resources Committee has been implemented
- Preparation of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement is on track
- However, the announcement by SFC of indicative funding could be delayed
- It is planned to start work in this quarter on exploration of opportunities for cross-region approaches to attracting new funding sources

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Financial - 3

Target risk score: 3

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score – 2

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 2

Net score – 4

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If SFC is not satisfied with how GCRB has responded to its requirements for fully-operational fundable body status, GCRB's ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained

Risk ID: 0003

Cross references to related risks: 0001, 0004, 0008

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Reporting to Performance & Resources Committee of progress against plan
- Minimum of monthly meetings with SFC to review progress
- Maximise the extent to which GCRB operates as if it does have full-operational fundable body status

Commentary (Update):

- A report has been provided to the 25 January 2016 meeting of the board on progress towards achieving fully-operational fundable body status
- In practical terms (including committee and board business), GCRB is now seeking to operate on the assumption it does have full status
- An announcement is due from the Scottish Government with regard to GCRB's permanent Chair
- The timetable for recruitment of GCRB's Executive Director is on track

Gross risk score:
(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2
Impact – 3
Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation /
Compliance - 1

Target risk score: 1

**Previous net Risk Score (as previously
reported to Board):**

Likelihood – 1
Impact – 3
Net score – 3

**Current net Risk Score
(after treatment):**

Likelihood – 1
Impact – 3
Net score - 3

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If there is a lack of consensus between GCRB and the assigned college boards on a shared strategy for the Glasgow region, GCRB's ability to make a positive impact on learning opportunities for students will be reduced

Risk ID: 0004

Cross references to related risks: 0003, 0008, 0009

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Regular engagement by the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer with senior officers in the assigned colleges
- Plan for development of ROA maximises involvement of assigned colleges
- Plan for development of ROA ensures integration with financial planning
- Ongoing work to strengthen collaborative structures

Commentary (Update):

- Preparation of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement is on track
- The cross-college structures at management level are operating well and are providing the necessary support for development of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement
- The induction of new board members across the region provides an opportunity to develop relationships at board level
- Work now needs to start on reviewing the region's longer-term strategy

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation / Financial
- 1

Target risk score: 1

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score – 2

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score - 2

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If there is breakdown in performance in the assigned colleges (including academic quality management arrangements), the Regional Outcome Agreement targets may not be achieved.

Risk ID: 0005

Cross references to related risks: 0002, 0006, 0010, 0011

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Reporting to each meeting of the Performance & Resources Committee of progress against the ROA
- Reporting to the Board of progress in implementation of actions agreed between a college and SFC
- Provision of annual assurance by each assigned college board of adequacy of academic quality arrangements

Commentary (Update):

- Full progress and financial reporting to the Performance & Resources Committee has been implemented
- The reports to date indicate good progress with implementation of the 2015-16 Regional Outcome Agreement

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Education & student experience - 4

Target risk score: 3

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 3

Net score – 3

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 3

Net score - 3

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If the quality of governors or senior personnel at one of the assigned colleges falls below the required level, the strategic and operational effectiveness of the college will be impaired.

Risk ID: 0006

Cross references to related risks: 0001, 0005, 0007, 0009, 0012

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Working with the assigned colleges to enhance board member recruitment arrangements
- Oversight by the Nominations & Remuneration Committee of board member recruitment
- Institution of arrangements with SFC to share monitoring information
- Regular engagement by the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer with senior officers in the assigned colleges
- Use opportunity of induction arrangements for new members across the whole region to share learning from recent experience

Commentary (Update):

- GCRB and the colleges have worked closely together to develop a co-ordinated approach to the current board member recruitment campaign
- Planning is now commencing for induction of the new members, with a shared cross-region element.

Gross risk score:
(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation / compliance - 1

Target risk score: 1

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Net score – 6

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 3

Net score - 3

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If key stakeholders lose confidence in GCRB, leverage of current and future partnership resources for delivery of the ROA will be impaired.

Risk ID: 0007

Cross references to related risks: 0001, 0006, 0008, 0012

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Regular engagement with key stakeholder organisations on a cross-region basis
- Regular engagement by the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer with senior officers in the assigned colleges

Commentary (Update):

- A programme of co-ordinated engagement with key stakeholders has taken place (including Glasgow City Council, Skills Development Scotland, Education Scotland and Scottish Enterprise)
- The cross-college structures at management level are operating well and are providing the necessary support for development of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation - 1

Target risk score: 1

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score – 2

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score - 2

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If the assigned colleges lack confidence in the quality of GCRB's governance, effective collaboration across the region will be impaired and GCRB's ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained

Risk ID: 0008

Cross references to related risks: 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0007, 0009, 0012

Owned by: Interim Chair

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Involvement of senior officers in board and committee meetings of GCRB.
- Institution of continuous development programme for board members of GCRB.
- Programme of engagement between key stakeholders, the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer
- Regular engagement by the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer with senior officers in the assigned colleges
- Work of GCRB internal audit
- Conduct of annual board effectiveness reviews (including compliance with relevant governance standards and requirements)

Commentary (Update):

- The Interim Chair has attended board meetings of all the assigned colleges
- The cross-college structures at management level are operating well and are providing the necessary support for development of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement
- GCRB has appointed its internal auditors
- The first board effectiveness review is underway
- The external audit report on GCRB's first set of accounts will include commentary on GCRB's governance

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation - 1

Target risk score: 1

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Net score – 6

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Net score - 6

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If staff across the region lack confidence in regional co-ordination of key change activities, collaboration will be ineffective.

Risk ID: 0009

Cross references to related risks: 0004, 0006, 0008

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Development of forum with staff trade unions
- Plan for development of ROA maximises involvement of assigned colleges
- Plan for development of ROA ensures integration with financial planning
- Programme of engagement between key stakeholders, the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer
- Regular engagement by the Interim Chair and Interim Chief Officer with senior officers in the assigned colleges

Commentary (Update):

- Full progress and financial reporting to the Performance & Resources Committee has been implemented
- Preparation of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement is on track
- Discussions have taken place at official level on options for membership and terms of reference of a partnership forum. In addition, update meetings have been offered to all the relevant trade unions.
- The cross-college structures at management level are operating well and are providing the necessary support for development of the 2016-17 Regional Outcome Agreement

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: People and culture - 2

Target risk score: 2

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 2

Net score - 4

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Net score - 6

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If there is a material shortfall in the quality of facilities, student success will be reduced

Risk ID: 0010

Cross references to related risks: 0002, 0005

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Regular liaison with senior college staff on estates issues
- Regular liaison with senior staff City of Glasgow College officers to receive updates on progress and contingency planning

Commentary (Update):

- Progress with City of Glasgow College's new City Campus building is on track
- Glasgow Kelvin College has identified specific issues with its Springburn campus, and is seeking to manage these
- The Cardonald campus of Glasgow Clyde College needs development

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Major change activities - 2

Target risk score: 2

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score – 2

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 1

Impact – 2

Net score - 2

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If there are insufficient non-advanced student support funds, students will be unable to take up places offered and activity targets will not be met.

Risk ID: 0011

Cross references to related risks: 0002, 0005

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Regular reporting to SFC and Scottish Government of projected regional spend compared to available funding
- Sharing of projected spend information across the region and consideration of re-allocation of available budget
- Seek to maximise consistency of how student support funding policies are applied across the region

Commentary (Update):

- SFC has been advised of the projected insufficiency of student support funds
- The net position has improved as a result of previous and current year underspend at Glasgow Kelvin College
- There is also a possibility of further amelioration through redistribution of student support and ESF funds from other regions
- Work is being undertaken to share and improve information on projected requirements
- Work has started to look at opportunities to maximise consistency of how student support funding policies are applied across the region

Gross risk score:
(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 3
Impact – 3
Gross score - 9

Risk tolerance score: Reputation /
Education & student experience - 1

Target risk score: 1

**Previous net Risk Score (as previously
reported to Board):**

Likelihood – 3
Impact – 3
Net score - 9

**Current net Risk Score
(after treatment):**

Likelihood – 3
Impact – 3
Net score - 9

Glasgow Colleges' Regional Board

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk that: If GCRB is unable to improve its reputation, its ability to make a positive difference on the student experience in Glasgow might be constrained

Risk ID: 0012

Cross references to related risks: 0001, 0006, 0007, 0008

Owned by: Interim Chief Officer

Date of this review: 25 January 2016

Date of next review: 25 April 2016

Update

Treatment:

- Regular engagement with key stakeholder organisations on a cross-region basis
- Exploration of a collaborative approach to region-wide reputation management

Commentary (Update):

- A programme of co-ordinated engagement with key stakeholders has taken place (including Glasgow City Council, Skills Development Scotland, Education Scotland and Scottish Enterprise)
- Work now needs to begin on a wider approach to reputation management

Gross risk score:

(assuming no treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Gross score - 6

Risk tolerance score: Reputation - 1

Target risk score: 1

Previous net Risk Score (as previously reported to Board):

N/A

Current net Risk Score (after treatment):

Likelihood – 2

Impact – 3

Net score - 6