

RISK REGISTER

NOVEMBER 2017

Introduction

The Risk Register has been aligned with the Strategic Plan as far as possible. Risks are matched to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to enable integrated reporting to the Board.

The Risk Register shows the most significant areas of risk exposure. For each risk item there are control measures in place to mitigate the exposure.

Each risk item has an assessment for both Likelihood and Impact (L/I) at both the gross level and also at a residual level after the operation of the control mechanisms, with a time horizon of the next two years, and is assessed as Low, Medium or High.

Likelihood: High – probable that will occur Medium – possible but not probable that will occur Low – unlikely to occur

Impact: High - significant negative outcomes which would take major effort to resolve in the medium term and which may threaten sustainability if not resolved
Medium – significant negative outcomes which may have a major impact but which do not threaten sustainability
Low – negative outcomes which are unlikely to be significant

The assessments are combined to produce a traffic light indicator of risk (using the same Red, Amber, Amber-Green or Green scheme as the KPIs) as per the matrix:

Likelihood	H	Amber	Red	Red
	M	Amber-Green	Amber	Red
	L	Green	Amber-Green	Amber
		L	M	H
		Impact		

SUMMARY

Risk Exposure	Risk Owner	Gross L/I	Residual L/I	Direction
People				
Student experience	DVC			↔
Student progression	DVC			↗
Staff engagement and performance	COO			↔
Staff quality and succession planning	COO/DVC			↔
Student employability	DVC			↔
Governance and leadership	VC/US			↔
External				
Academic quality	DVC/US			↔
Legislation and regulatory	US			↔
Teacher Education	DVC			↔
Policy environment inc TEF	VC/Exec			↔
Pensions	DF			↗

Business				
Student recruitment	COO			↗
Financial sustainability	DF			↗
Estates infrastructure	COO			↔
IT infrastructure	COO			↔
Cyber security	COO			↗
International	DVC			↔
Research	DVC			↔
Partnerships and collaborations	VC/Exec			↔

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
Student experience – poor student experience leads to student dissatisfaction; reduced NSS scores leads to potential reputational issues; TEF score is impacted and recruitment is potentially affected	H/H	<p>Regular meetings with student union</p> <p>Student Liaison Officer (recent graduate) in each academic school</p> <p>Regular student feedback with resultant actions communicated effectively to students (e.g. student forums, MEQ and SES outcomes and actions)</p> <p>Increased student representation within schools and on University committees</p> <p>Learning Teaching and Assessment strategy in place</p> <p>Control process to minimise timetable changes</p>	M/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Student progression – poor student experience and support leads to dissatisfaction and falling pass rates; in year withdrawal increases; progression to next level falls</p>	<p>H/H</p>	<p>Provision of integrated support for students</p> <p>Early identification of students with known risk factors</p> <p>Student Liaison Officer (recent graduate) in each academic school</p> <p>Learning Teaching and Assessment strategy in place</p> <p>Monitoring of student engagement in directed activities</p> <p>Monitoring of retention rates and investigation of variances</p> <p>New software system for recording and analysing of student interactions</p> <p>Early in year re-assessments</p>	<p>M/M</p>
<p>Staff Engagement and performance – non engagement with strategic plan hinders meeting objectives; funding & pay issues cause industrial relations problems; student experience suffers</p>	<p>M/H</p>	<p>Effective annual staff review process and staff development programme</p> <p>Appropriate reward structures</p> <p>Academic workload planning model</p> <p>Effective performance management processes and procedures</p> <p>Staff friendly policies and approach including Investors in People</p> <p>Union recognition and commitment to full consultation process</p> <p>Action plan to implement lessons from staff perception survey</p>	<p>L/M</p>

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Staff quality and succession planning – lack of appropriately skilled and a knowledgeable academic and support staff leads to poor student experience and attainment; lack of appropriately qualified staff (in higher degrees and teaching qualification) and research active staff threatens reputation of institution and student attainment; lack of succession planning causes disruption</p>	M/M	<p>Robust staff recruitment procedures</p> <p>Appropriate and fit for purpose role profiles and effective performance management processes and procedures</p> <p>Regular teaching observation</p> <p>Learning and Teaching, Research and Knowledge Exchange strategies in place</p> <p>Effective staff development programme in place, effective probation procedures and focussed academic development function</p> <p>Expectation for academic staff to hold recognised teaching qualification or demonstrable equivalent experience</p> <p>Succession planning linked to strategic staff development</p>	L/M
<p>Student employability - academic provision, including placements, fails to provide sufficient employability skills and experience so that graduates do not secure employment</p>	M/M	<p>Engagement with employers on curriculum design and delivery</p> <p>All courses include placements</p> <p>Maintain effective Partnership and Placements office</p> <p>Effective careers and job service for graduate level employability</p> <p>Jobs brokerage service delivered by REED</p> <p>Student mentoring</p>	L/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Governance and leadership – governance structures are not effective; information provision not adequate to provide assurance; policies and processes are not clear and robust; responsibilities and accountabilities are not transparent</p>	M/M	<p>Governance structures based on CUC guidance and regular effectiveness reviews</p> <p>Information regularly supplied to Board and committees</p> <p>Corporate policies subject to regular review</p> <p>Internal audit includes governance themes</p>	L/M
<p>Academic quality – failure to meet academic quality of a high standard threatens reputation; failure to meet QAA, OFSTED and other professional body outcomes threatens future independence</p>	L/H	<p>Strong system of internal academic quality assurance</p> <p>Implement as appropriate recommendations of external examiner reports and other external scrutiny reports</p> <p>Periodic review of programmes, structures and processes and results implemented</p> <p>Focussed preparation for QAA, OFSTED and other professional body visits</p>	L/M
<p>Legislation and regulatory – failure to adhere to H&S, environmental, equality, immigration, data and other legislation including GDPR; failure to ensure appropriate data quality and other regulatory requirements; failure to sufficiently address PREVENT requirements; prosecution, reputational issues and financial penalties</p>	M/M	<p>Policies in place and reviewed regularly to ensure compliance</p> <p>Briefings and training to ensure policies understood</p> <p>Appointment of designated persons for aspects of legislation</p> <p>Effective H&S committee and robust H&S risk assessment process</p> <p>Rolling programme of internal audit reviews</p> <p>Various compliance reports to Governors including data quality</p> <p>Project in place to ensure GDPR compliance for May 2018</p>	L/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Teacher Education – continuing changes in government policy across both teacher training and requirements for involvement with schools; failure to develop new school-partnered models means that sustainability of ITT is threatened; increasing difficulties in sourcing placements means that quality of Primary UG ITT is endangered; failure to secure appropriate OFSTED outcome threatens ITT allocations</p>	H/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of School Direct partnerships Development of Masters and CPD provision Maintain effective Partnerships and Placements office Focussed preparation for OFSTED visits Strong links with Diocese re involvement with schools Investigation of new ways of closer working with schools Utilisation of mission groups to influence government policy and shape future policy development 	M/M
<p>Policy environment inc TEF – government policy environment producing challenges and opportunities; continued increased competition has recruitment implications; failure to achieve desired TEF level threatens reputation, recruitment and ability to increase fees; failure to grasp opportunity of apprenticeship agenda hinders drive to diversify income</p>	M/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of policy environment, consideration at Executive and discussion at Board TEF further development monitored and modelled to understand implications Participation in subject TEF pilot Dedicated apprenticeship resources and involvement in national developments Partnership approach to bidding for apprenticeships to access larger organisations 	M/M
<p>Pensions – failure to monitor pension position leads to unexpected and unmanageable increases in required funding</p>	M/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued awareness of possible issues around pensions and consideration of available actions 	M/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Student recruitment – enquiry, application and acceptance levels threaten ability to recruit to potential numbers of appropriate quality; poor portfolio planning and lack of market development threatens opportunity to recruit; relaxation of sector controls leads to greater competition</p>	H/H	<p>Targeted marketing and recruitment strategies and approaches focusing on key touchpoints in the student journey</p> <p>Further development of institution approach to offer making, including measured use of unconditional offers</p> <p>Enhancement of enquirer/applicant experience at key recruitment events</p> <p>Piloting of additional Open Days at critical points in the student journey</p> <p>Introduction of personalised Applicant Visit approach to utilise the University’s strengths and provide distinctiveness in the market</p> <p>New approach to Student Ambassador selection and training to ensure effective</p> <p>More targeted, data driven digital media campaigns</p> <p>Development of strategy focusing on key influencers including parents and teachers/advisers</p> <p>New approach to targeting of schools and colleges based on indicators including previous applications/enrolments, geographical proximity, size of 6th form cohort, WP indicators</p> <p>Regular portfolio review and expansion to new subject areas and new market sectors</p> <p>Monitoring of recruitment indicators, prompt investigation of concerns and appropriate actions taken</p>	M/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
<p>Financial Sustainability – failure to adequately address changeable recruitment outlook threatens ability to meet financial targets; failure to maintain flexible cost base means that ability to respond to changes is restricted</p>	H/H	<p>Preparation of detailed budgets and five year financial forecasts</p> <p>Scenario modelling; monitoring and challenging by F&R</p> <p>Use of appropriate KPIs as guidepost to financial sustainability</p> <p>Regular review of financial strategy to ensure that KPIs and targets are still appropriate</p>	M/M
<p>Estates infrastructure – investment in estates infrastructure and provision of facilities (e.g. sports facilities) does not provide a high quality student experience; business interruption plans do not ensure sufficient business continuity</p>	M/M	<p>Estates strategy in place</p> <p>Staff and student involvement in the development of and feedback on facilities and services</p> <p>Appropriate levels of investment included within approved financial plans to ensure continued improvement to facilities to meet student expectations</p> <p>Regular assessments of staff and student satisfaction with provision</p> <p>Business impact analysis with plans in place for disaster recovery and continuity</p>	L/M
<p>IT infrastructure – investment in IT infrastructure and systems development does not provide a high quality student experience; business interruption plans do not ensure sufficient business continuity</p>	M/M	<p>Information Services strategy in place</p> <p>Staff and student involvement in the development of and feedback on facilities and services</p> <p>Appropriate levels of investment included within approved financial plans to ensure continued improvement to facilities to meet student expectations</p> <p>Regular assessments of staff and student satisfaction with provision</p> <p>Business impact analysis with plans in place for disaster recovery and continuity</p>	L/M

Risk Exposure	Gross L/I	Control Mitigation	Residual L/I
Cyber security – failure to maintain sufficient cyber and information security leads to major data breach; reputational and financial implications; continuity of services is compromised	H/H	IT security plans in place including for cyber security Internal audit on cyber security IT security project to implement actions arising from internal audit Business impact analysis with plans in place for disaster recovery and continuity	M/M
International - inappropriate infrastructure to support international students; loss of Tier 4 status; reputational damage due to poor recruitment or student support practices; over reliance on international income; poor collaboration leads to potential reputational and QAA issues	M/M	All offers and UKVI issues dealt with via trained resource within Admissions supported by external advice Support for international students embedded within student support functions International office to focus on study abroad and partnerships All programmes to embed international experience Financial planning to place cautious assumptions on international income Robust collaborative procedures and assurance framework	L/M
Research – poor progression and completion rates for PhD students; failure to deliver on external grant funded projects; failure to develop research sufficiently leads to reputational risk	M/M	Rigorous appointment process for PhD studentships Experienced and trained supervisor teams Robust internal approval processes for grant submissions	L/M
Partnerships and Collaboration - poor collaboration leads to potential reputational and QAA issues; rationale not identifies so partnership does not contribute to strategic goals; too many partnerships spread resources too thin	M/M	Robust collaborative and assurances framework Coordinated approach to partnerships and collaborations through Executive Rationale and resource implications considered by Planning Committee scrutiny	L/M

