# Board of Management

# Learning and Teaching Committee

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date of Meeting** | **Tuesday 24 April 2018** |
| **Paper No.** | **LTC4-B** |
| **Agenda Item** | **4** |
| **Subject of Paper** | **Strategic Risk Review** |
| **FOISA Status** | **Disclosable** |
| **Primary Contact** | **Paul Clark, College Secretary/Planning** |
| **Date of production** | **16 April 2018** |
| **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 the Committee's remit, via the Risk Management Actions Plans (MAPs) for these risks. Also included is the current 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 Risk MAPs for the following risks are appended for consideration:

- Risk 1 - Failure to support successful student outcomes (Score 10, Amber).
- Risk 2 - Failure to establish optimal pedagogical model (Score 5, Green).
- Risk 3 - Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression levels (Score 10, Amber).

3.4 The strategic context for these Risks is the delivery of the College's strategic aims associated with "Students" Strategic Theme, and in particular the undernoted Strategic Priorities and associated aims within the College Strategic Plan 2017-2025:
- To be an inspirational place of learning
- To enable individuals to excel and realise their full potential

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

## 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 support student success**

**Risk ID: 1**

**Owned by:  VPSE**                                    **Review Date: April 2018**

## Update

Full Description:

Risk that -
Students leave the College without completing course. Students fail to achieve qualification. Students have a poor experience at the College.  College suffers negative financial impact, reputational damage, and potential negative impact upon student recruitment.

Treatment:
Performance Reviews; Self-evaluation/Quality cycle; Curriculum Planning (incl. focus upon PIs); Student Experience Strategy.

Commentary (Update):

Education Scotland Review completed January 2016. Overall a highly positive response reflects the upward trend in student attainment.

Student Experience Strategy has been developed and a number of initiatives have been taken forward as part of it implementation. City Learning 4.0 is one of these initiatives and will be embedded in all Operational Plans at Curriculum Head and Faculty level.

Curriculum planning processes have been further refined to include criteria for course discontinuation to ensure courses meet student/industry demand, reflect College and regional curriculum strategic priorities, and financial viability.

Student success will be confirmed by SFC on the 13th February 2018 for City of Glasgow College and the Scottish college sector.  Student success from 2016/17 indicates a slight decline in FT PIs.  However, it should be noted that CoGC has the highest combined FT PIs in the sector.  It is anticipated that this decline in some of our PIs will be mirrored by the Scottish college sector and is a consequence of the industrial unrest at the end of last academic year. In part time FE and HE the College continued to grow.  The table below identifies the College's 5 year trend: -

| Level | Mode | Completed Successfully | | | | | Change 15-16 to 16-17 | Change 12-13 to 16-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17* | | |
| FT | FE | 60% | 70% | 72% | 72% | 69% | -3% | +9% |
| FT | HE | 70% | 74% | 76% | 76% | 74% | - 2% | +4% |
| PT | FE | 68% | 75% | 77% | 87% | 88% | +1% | +20% |
| PT | HE | 76% | 84% | 83% | 81% | 83% | +2% | +7% |

*Ref: SFC PI 2016/17 published Feb 2018*

Each College Faculty has developed an action plan in 2017/18 to address low PI courses and the plans are being monitored against performance targets through the Performance Action Group (PAG). Faculty action plans are under review at the Student Experience Leadership Group to monitor Faculty improvement plans.

Action has been identified as part of the PAG Group to target partial success (live students that currently have failed units which prevent them gaining their qualification). Faculties have identified resources required to mitigate partial success. A number of actions have been identified by the PAG group through scrutiny of low PI courses which will lead to performance improvement.

| Current Risk Score: | Gross Risk Score (assuming no treatment) |
|---|---|
| Likelihood 2/5<br>Impact 5/5<br><br>Risk Score 10/25<br><br>RAG Rating: AMBER<br><br><br>Target Score: 5 | Likelihood 5/5<br>Impact 5/5<br><br>Risk Score 25/25 |
| Risk Appetite (Willing to accept): | Risk Tolerance (Able to accept): |
| **Low**    Medium    High | Category: Student Experience<br><br>Low    **Medium**    High<br>1   2      **3**   4      5   6 |

| 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 | |
| x | Likelihood | | | | |

## Risk Management Action Plan

**Risk Description:**    Failure to establish sector leading pedagogical model

**Risk ID: 2**

**Owned by:  VPSE**                                    **Review Date: April 2018**

## Update

Full Description:

Risk that learning and teaching approaches fail to meet the needs of learners and other stakeholders (inc. employers) in the context of the new campus.  There should be an evidence base for "sector-leading" (Agreed by L&TC, Nov 2017).

Treatment:
Curriculum Review and Development processes. Student Experience Strategy (incl. City Learning/ Industry Academies). Faculty Operational Planning.

Commentary (Update):

The Regional Curriculum and Estates Review process has been completed and now operational, supporting key government priorities. Annual Curriculum Plans being developed in partnership with Glasgow colleges in alignment with the Regional Outcome Agreement. Regional Curriculum Hubs ensure that the curriculum portfolio is annually refreshed to reflect this position. The review for 18/19 has just concluded and been reported at the last GCRB board meeting.

City Learning 4.0, the refreshed City Learning model,  has been embedded within Faculty Operational Plans and was implemented in November 2017.  Work has commenced in supporting faculties to adopt City Learning 4.0. This will be a key theme for One City event in June 18. A suite of KPIs for City Learning 4.0 have been developed.

The Industry Academy model has been shared at regional level, and joint IA initiatives are currently in operation, in particular with regard to STEM delivery via an IA model.  24 Industry Academies were operational in 2015/16, exceeding the target of 18, now under review within the Performance Review process and reporting on their output is now available via college dashboard.  A new faculty structure will support the mainstreaming of Industry Academies into all 73 curriculum teams.

The Centre of Technical and Professional Education has now been established and the team have developed a three year work plan with the initial area of focus being City Learning 4.0.

The Student Experience Strategy and its three key initiatives; Widening Access, Student Partnership Agreement and City Learning 4.0 are well underway. Excellent progress has been made to date with measurable outputs for all three.

| Current Risk Score: | Gross Risk Score (assuming no treatment) |
|---|---|
| Likelihood   1/5<br><br>Impact        5/5<br><br>Risk Score    5/25<br><br><br>RAG Rating: `GREEN`<br><br><br><br>Target Score: 5 | Likelihood    4/5<br>Impact         5/5<br><br>Risk Score  20/25 |
| **Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):** | **Risk Tolerance (Able to accept):** |
| **Low**    Medium    High | Category: Student Experience<br><br>Low    **Medium**    High<br>1    2      **3**    4      5    6 |

| 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 good student outcome/progression**

**Risk ID: 3**

**Owned by:  VPSE**                                        **Review Date: April 2018**

## Update

Full Description:

Failure of curriculum to be industry relevant. Ineffective links with industry. Ineffective HEI articulation arrangements.

Treatment:
Course Improvement and Action Meetings (CIAMs) well established. All Schools are developing links with industry to ensure industry relevant curriculum.  Ongoing collaboration with HEIs to maintain and develop articulation links.

Student Experience Strategy emphasises need for employability, industry relevant curriculum, and industry links (Industry Academies)

Commentary (Update):

The College has participated in the pilot to develop an ongoing College Learner Destination Survey led by SFC.

Data is collected from students to determine satisfaction with suitability of course with regard to preparation for work (First Impressions Questionnaire), and Exit student questionnaire.

A revised Curriculum Review and Planning process is now in place to monitor student outcomes and progression with adjustments made to portfolio as an output of this review.

A student partnership agreement has been established for August 2017 supported by a feedback initiative called "My Voice" and monitored through a Student Partnership Forum.

The New Quality Arrangements 'How Good is our College' were rolled out across the sector in December 2016.   The College Associate Assessors and Performance and Improvement Director have been working with our assigned Education Scotland during 2016/17 to incorporate best practice.   As part of this work an implementation plan for the quality arrangements was devised and put in place.

During the 2016/17 session staff development for teaching and support has taken place on the model, performance indicators and on evaluative writing.  A model for Shared Teaching Practice has been developed which will be implemented in pilot form in the College in 2017/18.  A regional quality group was formed which has sought to share practice and develop a common approach to the implementation of arrangements.  An

evaluative report of 2016/17 and an enhancement plan for 2017/18 has been produced and will form the focus of targeted action for 2017/18.

Excellent links with Universities have been established through the additional funded places scheme and COGC have one of the highest percentages of students articulating to university with advanced standing in comparison with the sector. The college is represented on the Commission on Widening Access (COWA) group and is a key partner in setting up the National Articulation Forum ( a recommendation from COWA).

The Audit Committee (May 24 2017) agreed an increase to Likelihood score from 1 to 2, resulting in a total risk score of 10 (AMBER)

The College implemented its enhancement plan in 2017/18 as part of the HGIOC arrangements. A focus of the plan is to ensure good student outcomes and progression to further study or employment.

n.b. it is noted (April 2018) that the College only generates employer information for 766 Part-time students, and gathers destinations on Full-time students in line with SFC requirements.

| Current Risk Score: | Gross Risk Score (assuming no treatment) |
|---|---|
| Likelihood    1/5<br>Impact         5/5<br><br>Risk Score   10/25<br><br>RAG Rating:   GREEN<br><br><br>**Target Score: 10** | Likelihood    4/5<br>Impact         5/5<br><br>Risk Score  20/25 |
| **Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):** | **Risk Tolerance (Able to accept):** |
| **Low**   Medium   High | Category: Student Experience<br><br>Low   **Medium**   High<br>1   2      **3**   4      5  6 |

| 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 |
| X | Likelihood | | | | |

# Risk Register: 16 April 2018

| Strategic Theme | Risk Name | Risk ID | Level | Risk Owner | Likelihood | Impact | Net Risk Score | Gross Risk Score | Target Risk Score | Risk Movement | Link to Risk Mgt Action Plan (MAP) | Date of last review |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RISK DETAIL** | | | | | **CURRENT EVALUATION** | | | **AIM and PROGRESS** | | | **RISK TREATMENT** | |
| **Students** | Failure to support successful student outcomes | 1 | 1 | VPSE | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 1 MAP.docx | Apr '18 |
| **Students** | Failure to establish optimal pedagogical model | 2 | 1 | VPSE | 1 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | | Risk 2 MAP.docx | Apr '18 |
| **Students** | Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression levels | 3 | 1 | VPSE | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | | Risk 3 MAP.docx | Apr '18 |
| **Students** | Failure of the College's Duty of Care to Students | 21 | 1 | VPSE | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 4 | Propose change to 1x5=5 | Risk 21 MAP.docx | Apr '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Failure to realise planned benefits of Regionalisation | 4 | 1 | Pr/DPr | 3 | 3 | 9 | 20 | 3 | | Risk 4 MAP.docx | Apr '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Failure to complete project programme to schedule | 5 | 1 | VPI | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 5 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Negative impact upon College reputation | 6 | 1 | EDCD | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 6 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Failure to achieve improved business development performance with stakeholders | 7 | 1 | EDCD | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 7 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Failure to achieve improved performance | 8 | 1 | VPSE/DirP | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | | Risk 8 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Growth and Development** | Failure to attract, engage, and retain suitable staff | 9 | 1 | VPFHR | 2 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 3 | | Risk 9 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Negative impact of statutory compliance failure | 10 | 1 | CSP/DCP | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | | Risk 10 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Failure of Compliance with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) | 24 | 1 | DCS/CSP | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 24 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Failure of Corporate Governance | 11 | 1 | Pr/CSP | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | Propose change to 1x5=5 | Risk 11 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Failure of Business Continuity | 12 | 1 | VPI/CSP | 4 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 4 | Propose change to 3x5=15 | Risk 12 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Failure of IT system security | 25 | 1 | VPI | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 25 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Failure to manage performance | 13 | 1 | VPSE/DirP | 1 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 4 | | Risk 13 MAP.docx | Jan '18 |
| **Processes and Performance** | Negative impact of Industrial Action | 14 | 1 | VPFHR | 3 | 4 | 12 | 25 | 4 | | Risk 14 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Finance** | Failure to achieve operating surplus via control of costs and achievement of income targets. | 15 | 1 | VPFHR | 4 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 2 | Propose change to 3x3=15 | Risk 15 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Finance** | Failure to maximise income via diversification | 16 | 1 | VPFHR/ EDCD | 2 | 3 | 6 | 20 | 4 | From 9 to 6 Devt Cttee | Risk 16 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Finance** | Failure to obtain funds from College Foundation | 20 | 1 | VPFHR | 1 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 3 | | Risk 20 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Finance** | Negative impact of Brexit | 22 | 1 | VPFHR | 5 | 2 | 10 | tbc | 5 | | Risk 22 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |
| **Finance** | Failure to agree a sustainable model and level of grant funding within Glasgow Region | 23 | 1 | VPFHR | 3 | 5 | 15 | 25 | 5 | | Risk 23 MAP.docx | Feb '18 |

**Key:**
Pr - Principal
DPr - Depute Principal
VPSE - Vice Principal Student Experience
VPFHR -Vice Principal Finance & HR
VPI -Vice Principal Infrastructure
EDCD - Executive Director Corporate Development
FD - Faculty Director
CSP - College Secretary/Planning
DHR - Director of Human Resources
DirP- Director of Performance
DCS - Director of Corporate Support
DirP- Director of Performance
DCS - Director of Corporate Support

Recent/Proposed change

| 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 |

| Trend | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Date | Jun-17 | Aug 17 | Oct-17 | Dec-17 | Feb-18 | Apr-18 | Jun 18 (prop) |
| Average Risk Score | 10 | 10 | 9.76 | 9.56 | 9.50 | 9 | 8.59 |

| Tolerance vs Risk Score | Acceptable Risk Score | | Acceptable Risk Score | | Acceptable Risk Score | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-3 | 4-5 | 6-9 | 10-12 | 15-16 | 20-25 |
| Risk Management Level of Tolerance (Able to Accept) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | Low | | Medium | | High | |