

Board of Management Development Committee

Date of Meeting	Monday 3 October 2016
Paper No.	DC1-D
Agenda Item	6
Subject of Paper	Strategic Risk Review
FOISA Status	Disclosable
Primary Contact	Paul Clark, College Secretary/Planning
Date of production	22 September 2016
Action	For Approval

1. Recommendations

1. To note the review of strategic risks as relevant to the Committee's remit
2. To review and approve the Risk Scores and Risk Management Action Plans associated with these risks

2. Purpose of report

2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with an update on the Senior Management review of strategic organisational risks relating to Growth and Development, and one related Finance risk, via the Risk Management Actions Plans (MAPs) for these risks. Also included is the Risk Matrix, and the Risk Register.

3. Context

3.1 Risk Management is a key component of the College's internal control and governance arrangements, and as such is an important responsibility of the Senior Management Team, and the Board of Management. The current strategic risks have been identified by SMT and the Audit Committee, as the primary strategic risks currently faced by the College. The risks are aligned within the same framework of strategic themes as the College Strategic Plan. The risks included in the Risk Register have potential impacts on one or more of the College's strategic priorities.

3.2 In line with recommended good practice as identified by the Internal Audit of Risk Management in 2013/14, each Board Committee has since undertaken a regular review of the strategic risks within its remit.

3.3 The strategic risks which most closely relate to the committee's remit (with current risk scores and RAG rating) are:

- Risk 4 - Failure to realise planned benefits of Regionalisation (6/Amber)
- Risk 5 - Failure to achieve New Campus objectives (3/Green)
- Risk 6 - Negative impact upon College reputation (3/Green)
- Risk 7 - Failure to achieve improved business development performance with stakeholders (6/Amber)
- Risk 8 - Failure to achieve improved performance (3/Green)
- Risk 9 - Failure to recruit, retain, and develop suitable staff (4/Green)
- Risk 16 - Failure to maximise income via diversification (6/Amber)

3.4 The Risk Management Action Plans for the above risks are attached at Appendix 1, and provide more detailed descriptions of the risks, treatments, and commentaries.

3.5 A full review of strategic risks is currently being undertaken (at September 2016) involving senior Risk "owners", and all updated Risk MAPs will be reported to the Audit Committee and full Board of Management in the current meeting cycle.

4. Impact and implications

4.1 The effective management and control of risks is essential to the on-going stability and future growth of the College, with clear implications in terms of potential impact upon College students and staff, as well as the College's wider reputation and legal compliance status.

4.2 Several strategic risks are financial in nature, and potentially constitute a threat to the College's stated strategic priority to "Maintain our long-term financial stability".

4.3 Regional and sectoral considerations are included in the process of risk management, and are reflected in the risk documentation.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Risk Management Action Plans

Appendix 2: Risk Register

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to realise planned benefits of Regionalisation

Risk ID: 4

Owned by: Pr/DP

Review Date: September 2016

Update

Description:

1. Failure to secure a positive position for COGC in the context of the Regionalisation Agenda
2. Failure to manage changes to governance arrangements arising from Regionalisation in the best interests of the College and its stakeholders

Treatment:

Maintain effective dialogue with Regional Board, Glasgow Colleges, SFC, and Scottish Government. College senior staff involvement in regional strategic groups.

Commentary (Update):

Dialogue is being maintained with GCRB and with the Glasgow Colleges. The Depute Principal has chaired the Strategy and Planning Group, and the Quality and Progression Group. The Executive Director Infrastructure has chaired the ICT sub-group of the Sustainability group, and the College has also been well-represented on the Learning and Teaching Group. Note that the fora have changed and now comprise the Principal's Group, the Learning and Teaching Group, and the Sustainability Group.

The Glasgow Colleges' Strategic Partnership (GCSP) produced a curriculum and estates strategy – A Vision for College Learning in Glasgow 2015-2020. An estates strategy has now been implemented. This assures the College's growth plan towards 210k wSUMS. (now referred to as 180,000+ Credits).

The move to Regional Boards for further education colleges is the subject of Scottish Parliament legislation. However, there remains a wide range of issues still to be addressed in terms of the respective roles of Regional Boards and college Boards, including the fundable status of GCRB.

The College is currently hosting the GCRB team at the NHS Campus, and at May 2016 provided staff cover on an interim basis. GCRB will decant to new office accommodation in the new City Campus from August 2016.

TUPE discussions are ongoing with regard to curriculum transfer arrangements. Discussions ongoing with Glasgow Kelvin College regarding elements of the curriculum, to meet the targets within the Curriculum and Estates Plan for Glasgow. This will conclude by 28th May 2016.

At September 2016, GCRB is requesting that a new Strategic Plan for Glasgow be

developed. This raises the possibility of a further review of curriculum & estates planning for Glasgow. The transfer of credits agreed in the current Regional Plan will have been reached by end 16-17. It should be noted therefore that there is a dependency on an agreement of redistribution of credits.

This risk may be mitigated by robust curriculum planning at CoGC, feeding into regional discussions. Note also the dependency on SG funding of the sector and the region generally.

Current Risk Score: Likelihood 3/5 Impact 3/5 Risk Score 9/25 Target Score: 3	Gross Risk Score (assuming no intervention) Likelihood 5/5 Impact 4/5 Risk Score 20/25	Risk Appetite (Willing to accept): Low Medium High
---	---	---

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to achieve New Campus Objectives

Risk ID: 5

Owned by: VPNC

Reviewed: September 2016

Update

Description and Treatment:

New Campus Risks are closely managed via the New Campus Register. The next revision of the Register will be presented to the Board Finance and Physical Resources Committee in November 2016. The undernoted issues (associated Level 2 Risks), with mitigations and commentaries, are representative of those which have had potential for significant impact and it is noted that a number of these are likely to further reduce in score or be closed out following the delivery of City Campus. The risk associated with level of learning and teaching delivery (Credits) is addressed separately under Risk 18.

5.1. Failure to secure access to the College's agreed financial contribution to the project via application to the sector and College Foundations and as a consequence failure to meet NPD, other contractual and transitional funding obligations. **(RAG Rated: Amber 2/3)** – as a further successful application to the College Foundation has been made, this risk is anticipated to reduce in significance,

5.2 Failure to manage required change and transition for all areas of the College operation in advance of transfer to the new college including: **(Amber 2/3)**

- IT functions
- Estates and FM operating model (n.b. increased score on New Campus Risk Register at January 2016)
- New learning & teaching strategy
- Required integrated approaches to business processes

This risk will be closed out and re-shaped as a 'business as usual' risk shaped around the implementation of change and transition strategies and structures

5.3 Failure to communicate and adequately prepare for migration to the new campus **(Green 1/3)** Closed

5.4 Failure to manage potential impacts on the New Campus Project (Propose **Green 1/3**) Risk will focus again on implementation and new business as usual impacts

5.5 Failure of capacity and availability of CGC project resource - the risk that the College is not able to provide the resources required to meet the project programme during construction and operation due to competing demands on staff time or staff transferring to other organisations. **(Amber 2/3)** n.b. Risk Owner suggests consideration of reduction in likelihood – additional budget assigned. For consideration by Finance and Physical Resources Committee.

Risk to refocus on contract management and operational structures post [practical

completion.

5.6 Failure to agree with SFC a transition plan to deliver 180,000+ Credits. (Ref. Risk 18); currently **Red** N.B. now reduced from Red to Amber on NC Project Risk Register).

Risk Treatments included in commentary below.

Commentary (Update):

5.1. Failure to secure access to the College's agreed financial contribution to the project via application to the sector and College Foundations and as a consequence failure to meet NPD, other contractual and transitional funding obligations.

The BoM, SFC and funders have confirmed the College's financial contributions to the New Campus Project. Following Scottish Government's legislation to reclassify colleges in the context of ONS in March 2014, the College has invested the agreed budget for New Campus Project and contingency in the Sector & College Foundations. A successful application to the Sector Foundation confirmed the release of £11.7m for NPD contractual payments in May 2014.

The initial tranche of applications to the College Foundation was approved in December 2014, with some adjustments relating to access to contingencies.

Further applications will be required for the duration of the project and it will be necessary to ensure that these meet the eligibility criteria of the Foundation. A mechanism has been identified to ensure access to contingency funding if required to mitigate against creation of programme delay or potential for a compensation event. This, however, will require a form of application to the trustees. Description and mitigation in relation to this area is covered under Risk ID19 'Impact of ONS Reclassification on the Status of Colleges'.

An update to the College's Foundation was provided by the ED Finance w/c 26 October 2015 highlighting our likely future funding applications. The January 2016 Finance and PR Committee (FPRC) agreed a range of proposals to be developed for submission to the College Foundation. Further details of applications to the College Foundation were presented to FPRC in March 2016. These relate to investment in new equipment and ICT to mitigate risks associated with migration to City Campus.

A further application was made to the College Foundation in summer 2016 and the significant costs highlighted above have been met.

5.2. Failure to manage required change and transition for all areas of the College operation in advance of transfer to the new college including:

- IT functions
- Estates and FM operating model
- New learning & teaching strategy
- Required integrated approaches to business processes

Transition Management

- IT functions: the services of Aecom IT Consultancy have been engaged to support the scoping and tendering process related to three main infrastructure transition areas. Outline Project Initiation documents have been drafted and presented to Project Board and BoM Finance & Physical Resources Committee. A detailed programme will be developed and monitored for delivery of these essential areas of cross college activity.
- Estates & FM Operating Model: the detailed migration plan includes key dates for training of Estates & FM staff familiarisation and orientation of new systems, equipment and operating practices. It is essential that this area which is also key to College business as usual functions is monitored to ensure that adequate resource is available to deliver key College interfaces. Additional support has been commissioned from GTFM (Gardiner & Theobald) to support the handover and operational phase.
- New Learning & Teaching Strategy: the development of new approaches to learning and teaching are recognised as critical to realising the benefits of the New Campus Project. Development risk identification and mitigation in this area is covered by risk MAPs 1, 2 and 3.
- Required integrated approaches to business processes: a range of areas including the IT infrastructure projects have been identified for further development, these include the requirement for new policies & procedures; new approaches to timetabling and room booking; new ways of working; protocols and procedures for central stores; the further development of a single intranet portal. Additional consultancy now obtained from HAA Design to support new ways of working and the development of policies and guidance.
- Project Sponsor has presented proposals to ELT/SMT which highlight all aspects of change and transition and related policy decisions. Further transition plans will be created to support activities in the run up to Phase 1 migration. This will become a standing item at ELT/SMT to ensure that progress on implementation is monitored and controlled, and SMT members have also been instructed to include this item on their team agendas.
- City of Glasgow College will be subject to a Scottish Government “Gateway 0 Review: Readiness for Operations” by end March/beginning April 2015. Slight delay due to funding arrangements with SFC). This review will focus upon preparations for migration, including transition plans and appropriate structures for the College’s new operating environment. (n.b. this commentary also applies to Risk 5.3 below). Note: pre-migration review complete – by August 2015 – and recommendations actioned (March 2016).
- A comprehensive lessons learned evaluation has been undertaken following Riverside Migration to ensure that valuable insights may be applied to City transition

We are now operational within City Campus. Going forward our attentions will move to managing new operations, developing and improving contract management and operational structures, optimising performance and realising the benefits associated with our new campus business plan.

5.3. Failure to communicate and adequately prepare for migration to the new campus

A detailed migration plan outlining migration activities and interfaces showing timelines and dates for implementation has been developed. The migration core team has been identified with core members from both GLQ and CoGC and a schedule of meetings is in place. A significant allocation of resource within the GLQ consortia has been identified. The City Migration Plan is at the point of being finalised.

A “readiness for migration” evaluation will be undertaken by all critical workstreams in June 2016 to confirm readiness to migrate. Migration complete.

5.4. Failure to manage potential impacts on the New Campus Project

Risks that may have impact on the new campus project. All risks likely to impact on the new campus project are fully detailed in the New Campus Project Risk Register. This Register and Risk Report was updated in January 2016, and will be approved by the project Board and the Finance and PR Committee in due course. The revised Risk Register will be presented to the FPRC in June 2016. Many risks will be mainstreamed and others reshaped post completion to focus on the remaining phases of the project

5.5. Failure of capacity and availability of CGC project resource

Reference NC Risk Register Risk ID 7. The Project Board and ELT have approved additional staffing resources and investment to support delivery and migration strategy.

5.6. Failure to agree with SFC a transition plan to deliver 180,000+ Credits

Reference CoGC Risk Register Risk ID 18. Note: ROA approved with growth and SUMs movement included. There is a dependency on demand in new growth areas.

Current Risk Score:	Gross Risk Score (assuming no intervention)	Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):
Likelihood 1/5	Likelihood 5/5	
Impact 5/5	Impact 5/5	
Risk Score 5/25	Risk Score 25/25	Low Medium High
GREEN		
GREEN		
Target Score:5		

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Negative impact upon College reputation

Risk ID: 6

Owned by: DCD

Review Date: September 2016

Update

Full Risk Description and Treatment:

1. Failure to protect and maintain the brand.
2. Complaint to Scottish Public Services Ombudsman upheld

Treatment:

1. Now that the City Campus is operational the Communications team is reviewing the mechanisms and best practice for internal and external communication. The CDD is also reviewing the structure of the team to ensure that is more relevant and fit for purpose to maintain the brand.
2. College Complaints Procedure to be available and communicated to all employees; train staff, including managers in operation of college policies & procedures, including legal requirements

Commentary (Update):

1. The College has featured in a number of press articles recently where titles have taken a negative approach. The college has embraced dialogue with journalists and is using this recent experience to strengthen areas across the team.
2. New Complaints procedure agreed and implemented in line with developments in SPSO framework for FE.
3. The College Complaints Report is now published via the College Website, in line with SPSO requirements.
4. Further staff training now in place to support implementation of SPSO model complaints handling procedure.
5. Through the Meltwater News platform the College continues to monitor its coverage, reputation and positioning within the marketplace on a weekly basis
6. Ongoing press enquiries relating to a wide range of areas are commonplace, including some relating to College operations at the City Campus. The College is also experiencing a high volume of FOISA requests just now covering a range of areas from staff salaries to overseas expenditure.

Current Risk Score:

Likelihood 2/5

Impact 5/5

Risk Score 10/25 Amber

Target Score 5

Gross Risk Score
(assuming no intervention)

Likelihood 5/5

Impact 5/5

Risk Score 25

Risk Appetite
(Willing to accept):

Low Medium High

x	Likelihood				
Impact	5	10	15	20	25
	4	8	12	16	20
	3	6	9	12	15
	2	4	6	8	10
	1	2	3	4	5

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to achieve improved business development performance with stakeholders

Risk ID: 7

Owned by: DCD

Review Date: September 2016

Update

Description:

Loss of/Failure to build effective partnerships/Reputational Risks/Staff Health and Well Being (see Level 2 Risks below).

Treatment:

Relationships are managed as detailed in the Corporate Development Strategy and in line with the agreed Business Development Process Map to ensure good communications, and that any issues are dealt with timeously. The strategy has been reviewed with reference to Blue Ocean and the 8 strategic priorities. In line with Strategic Priority 8 the additional strategic planning documents are now required for:

- International/Global reach
- Commercial & Business Development
- Sponsorship
- Employer Engagement
- Corporate Communications

These documents will come to the Board as part of the new “Blue Ocean” Strategy development. However the Corporate Development team will continue to work with the Faculties in procuring new business as well as source sustainable and reputable opportunities for additional non-government income.

N.B. Associated Level 1 Risks:

- Growth and Development/College Reputation (Risk 6)
- Statutory Compliance Failure (Risk 10)
- Finance/Income Targets (Risk 15)
- Income diversification (Risk 16)

Current Risk Score: Likelihood 2/5 Impact 5/5 Risk Score 10/25 Amber Target Score 5	Gross Risk Score (assuming no intervention) Likelihood 5/5 Impact 5/5 Risk Score 25	Risk Appetite (Willing to accept): <u>Low</u> Medium High
---	--	--

x	Likelihood				
Impact	5	10	15	20	25
	4	8	12	16	20
	3	6	9	12	15
	2	4	6	8	10
	1	2	3	4	5

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to achieve improved performance

Risk ID: 8

Owned by: DP

Review Date: September 2016

Update

Full Description and Treatment:

1. Ensure identification, dissemination, monitoring and review of quality improvement KPIs for all areas of service delivery.
2. Work with VPs, Directors and Heads to target areas of under performance.

Commentary (Update):

Heads of Performance working with Faculty Directors to set SMART targets following Performance Review meetings, with a view to significantly improving performance.

Support Area reviews will commence in May 2016. Faculties with identified areas of under-performance are targeted for Accelerated Quality Improvement and detailed action plans have been put in place with intervention and support from Performance Team.

The Performance Review process has been further developed into a single stage process to heighten accountability and deliver targeted support. This process is delivering improvement action plans to areas that require them.

Impact score raised from from 2 to 3 – in consideration of the implication of Regional Outcome Agreement potentially aligning funding to KPIs. Gross risk score increased from 6 to 9 (May 2015).

September 2016: Risk Score moved to 5x5 matrix. Student success performance indicators for 2015-16 to be confirmed.

Change to Risk Score:

Risk Score remains 3
(Green)

Gross Risk Score
(assuming no intervention)

9

Risk Appetite
(Willing to accept):

Low Medium High

Current Risk Score:

Likelihood 1/5

Impact 5/5

Risk Score 5/25

Target Score: 5

Gross Risk Score
(assuming no intervention)

Likelihood 4/5

Impact 5/5

Risk Score 20/25

Risk Appetite
(Willing to accept):

Low Medium High

x	Likelihood				
Impact	5	10	15	20	25
	4	8	12	16	20
	3	6	9	12	15
	2	4	6	8	10
	1	2	3	4	5

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to recruit, retain, and develop suitable staff

Risk ID: 9

Owned by: HeadHR, HeadOD

Review Date: September 2016

Update

Full Description and Treatment:

1. Failure to recruit and retain staff
2. Failure to develop and motivate staff; failure to identify training and development needs and appropriate tailored development strategies.

1. Develop and implement relevant policies i.e. Employee Benefits strategy, Recruitment and Selection policy, Organisational Development policy etc

2.

- Develop and implement relevant policies i.e. Employee Engagement & Reward strategy and procedures
- Develop and agree an organisation development strategy and operational plan.
- Develop a framework of mandatory and optional CPD (1 hours CPD time for Academic Staff on Weds).
- Review, re-launch and provide training for all reviewers and reviewees for the new employee Personal Development Review (PDR) process
- Implement IIP Action Plan.

Commentary (Update):

Recruitment & Selection Policy & Procedure signed off and in use, as is Employee Engagement policy. A People Plan (HR Strategy) is in use and operational plans are in place for Organisational Development delivery and to support the strategic plan.

CPD opportunities are highlighted during annual personal development reviews, requested by staff or by managers, to increase the effectiveness of the College. There is an annual One City all staff development day, on-going team events and development, enhancement of qualifications, PDA & TQFE, mandatory on-line training modules, visiting industry experts, master class sessions etc to support City Learning and personal development, delivered via a blended learning approach.

There is also a dedicated 1 hour per week for CPD which has been temporarily suspended due to the move to the new campus as room availability and timetables are reviewed, this will be re-established in 2016. The Staff Student and Equalities Committee (Nov 2015) noted that there is now more CDP provision than previously, and that the CPD hour, while welcome, accounts for a relatively small proportion of CPD provision. Risk Score therefore remains at Green.

The College has invested in Coaching and Mentoring Development in 2015/16. Two initial tranches – one consisting of managers and one consisting of teaching staff supporting World skills participants, engaged in an initial coach/mentor development training. This has led to a large number of coaching relationships and conversations

within the College, as each of the cohorts are required to coach or mentor at least three others as part of the qualification.

The College aims to create an established internal coaching agenda which will help develop talent and contribute to continuity planning and retention.

<p>Current Risk Score:</p> <p>Likelihood 2/5 Impact 3/5 Risk Score 6/25</p> <p>Changed to AMBER under 5x5</p> <p>Target Score: 3</p>	<p>Gross Risk Score (assuming no intervention)</p> <p>Likelihood 4/5 Impact 5/5 Risk Score 20/25</p>	<p>Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):</p> <p>Low Medium High</p>
--	--	---

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to maximise income via diversification

Risk ID: 16

Owned by: DP/DCP

Review Date: Sept 2016

Update

Full Description and Treatment::

Failure to optimise income opportunities via existing and potential markets and partners.

Commentary (Update):

Commercial and International Teams, as well as Academic Faculties, have reviewed all aspects of income diversification. This is now reflected within the new Corporate Development Strategy (under review by the Development Committee, 2015-16) as well as Financial and Operational Plans. Income generation from Industry Academies included in Faculty planning.

A corporate development strategy, with business cases, was presented to the Board of Management Development Committee in April 2016, and is currently under ongoing review in the context of developing strategic priorities.

Regular reportage on growth and development in relation to targets is now a standing item on the Development Committee agenda.

The Corporate Development Team and Faculties are currently undertaking a review of Commercial and International targets, with a view to setting new targets subject to performance review in 2016-17.

Current Risk Score:

Likelihood 3/5

Impact 4/5

Risk Score 12/25

RAG Rating: AMBER

Target Score: 4

Gross Risk Score
(assuming no intervention)

Likelihood 5/5

Impact 4/5

Risk Score 20/25

Risk Appetite
(Willing to accept):

Low Medium High

x	Likelihood				
Impact	5	10	15	20	25
	4	8	12	16	20
	3	6	9	12	15
	2	4	6	8	10
	1	2	3	4	5

Risk Register: 22 September 2016

RISK DETAIL					CURRENT EVALUATION OF RISK*			AIM and PROGRESS			RISK TREATMENT ACTIONS AND UPDATE	
Strategic Theme	Risk Name	Risk ID	Level	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Score	Gross Risk	Target Risk Score	Risk Movement	Hyperlink to Risk Management Action Plan (MAP)	Date of last review
Students	Failure to support student success	1	1	VPSE	1	5	5	25	3	Amber to Green	Risk 1 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Students	Failure to establish optimal pedagogical model	2	1	VPSE	2	5	10	20	3	5x5	Risk 2 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Students	Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression levels	3	1	VPSE	1	5	5	tbc	3	Amber to Green	Risk 3 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Students	Failure of the College's Duty of Care to Students	21	1	VPSE	1	3	3	tbc	3	0	Risk 21 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Failure to realise planned benefits of Regionalisation	4	1	Pr/DPr	3	3	9	20	3	5x5	Risk 4 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Failure to achieve New Campus objectives	5	1	VP-NC	1	5	5	25	5	5x5	Risk 5 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Negative impact upon College reputation	6	1	DCD	2	5	10	25	3	5x5	Risk 6 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Failure to achieve improved business development performance with stakeholders	7	1	DCD	2	5	10	25	3	5x5	Risk 7 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Failure to achieve improved performance	8	1	DPr	1	5	5	20	5	5x5	Risk 8 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Growth and Development	Failure to recruit, retain, and develop suitable staff	9	1	DHR	2	3	6	20	3	5x5 now Amber	Risk 9 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Processes and Performance	Negative impact of statutory compliance failure	10	1	SMT/CSP	1	5	5	tbc	2	5x5	Risk 10 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Processes and Performance	Failure of Corporate Governance	11	1	CSP	2	5	10	tbc	3	5x5	Risk 11 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Processes and Performance	Failure of Business Continuity	12	1	Pr/CSP	3	4	12	25	3	5x5	Risk 12 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Processes and Performance	Failure to manage performance	13	1	DPr	2	4	8	20	2	5x5 now Amber	Risk 13 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Processes and Performance	Negative impact of Industrial Action	14	1	DPr/EDPC	4	4	16	tbc	3	5x5	Risk 14 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Failure to achieve operating surplus via control of costs and achievement of income targets.	15	1	EDF	3	2	6	tbc	6	5x5	Risk 15 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Failure to maximise income via diversification	16	1	DPr	3	4	12	tbc	3	5x5	Risk 16 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Negative impact of funding methodology within Glasgow Region	17	1	EDF	2	3	6	tbc	2	5x5	Risk 17 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Failure to agree a sustainable level of grant-funded activity within the Region	18	1	Pr/VPSE	3	5	15	25	3	5x5	Risk 18 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Impact of ONS reclassification of the status of colleges	19	1	EDF	2	3	6	tbc	3	5x5	Risk 19 MAP.docx	Sept '16
Finance	Failure to obtain funds from College Foundation	20	1	EDF	1	4	4	tbc	3	5x5	Risk 20 MAP.docx	Sept '16

Recent movement or change

- Key:**
- Pr - Principal
 - DPr - Depute Principal
 - VP-NCSD - Vice Principal New Campus
 - VPSE - Vice Principal Student Experience
 - EDPC - Executive Director People and Culture
 - EDF - Executive Director Finance
 - FD - Faculty Director
 - DCP - Director Corporate Development
 - CSP - College Secretary/Planning
 - DHR - Director of Human Resources

x		Likelihood				
Impact	5	10	15	20	25	
	4	8	12	16	20	
	3	6	9	12	15	
	2	4	6	8	10	
	1	2	3	4	5	