Board of Management

Learning & Teaching Committee

Date of Meeting	**11 May 2023**
Paper No.	**LTC4-F**
Agenda Item	**4.5**
Subject of Paper	**Strategic Risk Review**
FOISA Status	**Disclosable**
Primary Contact	**Drew McGowan** **College Secretary**
Date of production	**4 May 2023**
Action	**For Discussion and Decision**

1. Recommendations

1.1 To consider the Strategic Risk Register as at 25 April 2023 for risks reported to the Committee, and approve the score change to risk 3.

1.2 To note MAPs for the high-scoring risks (26) reported to the Committee.

2. Purpose

2.1 To provide the Learning and Teaching Committee with an update on the most recent review of the College's strategic risks for those reported to the Committee. The Strategic Risk Register and the Management Action Plans (MAPs) for high-scoring or revised risks are enclosed.

3. Consultations

3.1 All strategic risk owners were consulted during this latest review.

4. Key Insights

4.1 Risk management is a key component of the College's internal control and governance arrangements, and as such is an important responsibility of the Board of Management and the Senior Management Team. This responsibility is highlighted in the College's strategic plan at priority 6, 'to be efficient, effective, innovating, and vigilant'.

4.2 The SMT and the Board of Management have identified the primary strategic risks the College faces, and these are recorded in the Strategic Risk Register. The risks are aligned with the same framework of themes as the College's strategic plan.

4.3 The College's strategic risks are reviewed in detail by the Board's committees, with each committee focusing on those risks most closely aligned with their Terms of Reference. This involves senior risk 'owners' updating the MAP for each risk when required.

4.4 The Strategic Risk Register is enclosed and the Committee is asked to consider the current edition. Five strategic risks are reported to the Committee. Members are asked to note the high-scoring risks, and their associated MAPs, that are reported to the Committee:

• **Risk 26 (16/25 🔴):** Failure to achieve taught degree awarding powers.

4.5 One risk score change is proposed in this quarterly review by the Vice Principal Student Experience. Members are asked to reduce the score of risk 3 from amber to green. This change, as outlined in the updated MAP enclosed, is requested as industry links have been reinvigorated post-Covid and the latest College Leaver Destinations data shows we have an industry-relevant curriculum.

• **Risk 3 from 10/25 🟡 to 5/25 🟢):** Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression levels.

5. Impact and implications

5.1 The effective management, control and mitigation of risks is essential to the ongoing stability and future growth of the College. The identified risks have clear implications in terms of potential impact upon College students and staff, as well as the College's wider reputation and financial sustainability.

5.2 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'. The College risk register includes matters relating to legal compliance and specific duties.

5.4 Performance management and improvement are identified as areas of strategic risk, due to the potential impact on reputation, the student experience, and funding.

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

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Risk Register: 25 April 2023

Appendix 2: Risk MAPs: 3 and 26.

Risk Register: 25 April 2023

Strategic Theme	Risk Name	Board Committee	Risk ID	Level	Risk Owner	Likelihood	Impact	Net Risk Score	Gross Risk Score	Target Risk Score	Risk Movement/ Comments	Link to Risk Mgt Action Plan (MAP)	Date of last change
RISK DETAIL						**CURRENT EVALUATION**			**AIM and PROGRESS**			**RISK TREATMENT**	
Students	Failure to support successful student outcomes	AAC, LTC, PNC, SSEC	1	1	VPSE	1	5	5	25	5	Score decr. 10 to 5: PNC 8/22	Risk 1 MAP	Aug'22
Students	Failure to establish optimal pedagogical model	LTC	2	1	VPSE	1	5	5	20	5		Risk 2 MAP	Jan'22
Students	Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression levels	LTC	3	1	VPSE	2	5	10	15	5		Risk 3 MAP	Feb'22
Students	Failure of the College's Duty of Care to Students	LTC, SSEC	21	1	VPSE	2	5	10	20	4		Risk 21 MAP	Jan'22
Growth and Development	Failure to realise planned benefits of Regionalisation	PNC	4	1	Pr/DPr	3	3	9	20	3		Risk 4 MAP	Feb'22
Growth and Development	Negative impact upon College reputation	DC, PNC	6	1	VPCDI	3	4	12	25	5		Risk 6 MAP	May'22
Growth and Development	Failure to achieve improved business development performance with stakeholders	AAC, DC, PNC	7	1	VPCDI	4	5	20	25	5		Risk 7 MAP	May'22
Growth and Development	Failure to manage strategic risks associated with City of Glasgow International Ltd	DC	28	1	VPCDI	2	5	10	25	5	Score set to 10: DC 10/22	Risk 28 MAP	Oct'22
Growth and Development	Failure to manage performance and achieve improved performance	PNC	8	1	DirE	2	5	10	20	5	Merged risk approved by PNC 04/23	Risk 8 MAP	Apr'23
Growth and Development	Failure to attract, engage, and retain suitable staff	SSEC	9	1	EDHR	2	2	4	20	3		Risk 9 MAP	Aug'22
Growth and Development	Failure to achieve taught degree awarding powers	LTC	26	1	DPr	4	4	16	20	3	Score incr. 12 to 16 Board 12/22	Risk 26 MAP	Dec'22
Processes and Performance	Negative impact of statutory compliance failure	AAC, PNC	10	1	CS	2	5	10	20	5		Risk 10 MAP	Feb'22
Processes and Performance	Failure of Compliance with Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) Duties	AAC, PNC	29	1	DPr/CS	1	5	5	5	5	Score set to 5 PNC 01/23	Risk 29 Map	Jan'23
Processes and Performance	Failure of Compliance with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)	AAC	24	1	DPr	2	4	8	25	5		Risk 24 MAP	Jan'23
Processes and Performance	Failure of Corporate Governance	AAC, PNC	11	1	Pr/CS	2	5	10	20	5	Score incr. 5 to 10 by PNC 04/23	Risk 11 MAP	Apr'23
Processes and Performance	Failure of Business Continuity	AAC, FPRC, PNC	12	1	VPCS/ CS	3	4	12	25	4		Risk 12 MAP	May'22
Processes and Performance	Negative impact of Industrial Action	SSEC	14	1	EDHR	3	4	12	25	4		Risk 14 MAP	Aug'22
Processes and Performance	Failure of IT system security	FPRC, PNC	25	1	VPCS	2	5	10	25	5		Risk 25 MAP	Aug'22
Finance	Failure to achieve operating surplus via control of costs and achievement of income targets.	AAC, FPRC, PNC	15	1	VPCS	5	5	25	25	4	Score incr. 20 to 25 AAC 09/22	Risk 15 MAP	Nov'22
Finance	Failure to maximise income via diversification	AAC, DC, FPRC, PNC	16	1	VPCS/ VPCDI	4	5	20	25	5		Risk 16 MAP	Nov'22
Finance	Failure to obtain funds from College Foundation	FPRC	20	1	VPCS	1	4	4	20	4		Risk 20 MAP	Aug'22
Finance	Negative impact of Brexit	FPRC	22	1	VPCS/ DCS	3	3	9	15	5		Risk 22 MAP	Aug'22
Finance	Failure to agree a sustainable model and level of grant funding within Glasgow Region	FPRC	23	1	VPCS	3	4	12	25	5		Risk 23 MAP	Aug'22
Finance	Failure to secure sufficient capital investment	FPRC	30	1	VPCS	4	3	12	20	3		Risk 30 MAP	Aug'22
ALL	Failure to manage acute threats relating to coronavirus outbreak	AAC, FPRC, PNC	27	1	Pr/DPr	2	4	8	25	4	Score decr. 12 to 8: PNC 8/22	Risk 27 MAP	Aug'22

Key:
- Pr - Principal
- DPr - Depute Principal
- VPSE - Vice Principal Student Experience
- VPCS - Vice Principal Corporate Services
- VPCDI - Vice Principal Corporate Development/Innovation
- CS - College Secretary
- EDHR - Executive Director of Human Resources
- DirE - Director of Excellence
- DCS - Director of Corporate Support
- AAC - Audit & Assurance Committee
- FPRC - Finance & Physical Resources Committee
- LTC - Learning & Teaching Committee
- SSEC - Students, Staff & Equalities Committee
- PNC - Performance & Nomincations Committee
- DC - Development Committee

Recent (12mnth) change

Risk Score Matrix

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

Trend

Date	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Aug-22	Nov-22
Average Risk Score	9.43	8.95	11.2	11.3	10.7	10.4	10.4	10.6
Number of RED Risks	3	1	4	5	4	2	3	3

N.B. Closure of low-scoring risks will have an upward impact upon average risk score.

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
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Risk Management Level of Tolerance (Able to Accept)	Low		Medium		High	

Risk Management Action Plan

Risk Description: Failure to achieve good student outcome/progression

Risk ID: 3

Owned by: VPSE   **Review Date: April 2023**

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):

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 since August 2017 supported by a feedback initiative called "My Voice" and monitored through a Student Partnership Forum.

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).

Final student success information for 2017-18 is recorded in Risk MAP 1. Student progression information will be available from the College Leaver Destinations in November 2018. This risk plan will be updated to reflect actions in response to these datasets.

November 2020
Recent data for student progression against SFC Performance Indicators for CoGC 2019/20 shows a positive trend for both FE and HE compared to previous year:
FULL TIME FURTHER EDUCATION (FT FE)
- Student Enrolments: 2,530, DOWN 309
- Achieving Complete Success: 1,751 (69.2%), UP 3.3%
- Achieving Partial Success: 259 (10.2%), DOWN 1.0%
- Further Withdrawals: 347 (13.8%), DOWN 2.3%
- Early Withdrawal 173 (6.8%), DOWN 0.1%

FULL TIME HIGHER EDUCATION (FT HE)

Student Enrolments: 6,912, DOWN 104
Achieving Complete Success: 5,317 (76.9%), UP 5.4%
Achieving Partial Success: 714 (10.3%), DOWN 1.6%
Further Withdrawals: 611 (8.9%), DOWN 3.5%
Early Withdrawal: 270 (3.9%), DOWN 0.3%
Please note, this is the highest complete success rate city of Glasgow college has achieved at HE FT.

The College has recently launched a new Careers Information and Guidance webpages https://sites.google.com/view/cogccareers/home. The site also hosts a 'jobshop' and other areas including; how to find work experience; writing a great CV and cover letter; Identifying your own skills and how to communicate them effectively in a CV or job interview.

The Student Experience Questionnaire is currently out for completion by students, closing date 4 November. This will be the first full comprehensive data set of the Blended Learning Experience.

18 January 2020
The College was placed under Tier 4 Covid restrictions Friday 20 November 2020 resulting In most classes will be delivered online. For many of our teaching staff, this was a continuation of recent weeks and months. However, for some, this had significant implications for delivery of on-campus classes. Only those classes that were considered 'time critical' were allowed access to campus. The College's physical campus was subsequently closed after Christmas holiday as the country moved into full lockdown. Classes continued online but concerns are rising for the completion of practical units and ultimately completion of awards. In turn, employment placement activity is severely limited for students.

The SFC published FT College Leaver Destinations for academic year 2017 in October 2020. Confirmed leaver destinations were obtained for 89% of learners sampled, matching the performance of the sector as a whole. Of these leavers, just over 96% were in a positive destination, which was above the college sector average. Of those progressing into employment, 73% work in an area related to their study, some 7pp above the college sector average.

There remains a challenge in reducing the number of FE learners experiencing unemployment upon leaving, and we can expect this to become even more challenging over subsequent years. Of those college completers continuing within the college, over 92% do so at a higher level of study, some 5pp above the college average. Endorsement of our employer engagement, comes from an Education Scotland's progress visit in February 2020, whereby the panel highlighted employer engagement in work-based learning as an area of Excellent Practise worthy of sharing with the rest of the sector.

April 2021
Students are currently being asked to national SFC Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. The survey is open to Full Time students and Part Time students completing 160 hours or greater within the session and will remain open until Friday 30th April 2021. Whilst it is recognised the need for sectoral agencies to conduct such an exercise there is concern about the comparability with previous survey, the different experiences colleges have had with Covid ie some being in L4 restricted for longer periods of time and, the impact of the strike on responses.

In response to the impact of restrictions on student completion rates, the College is developing a series of options to support students. One of these is articulation onto higher study and we are also in discussion with our university partners to extend offer of conditional places to allow for

potential late results due to the impact of strike action. We anticipate general agreement. In addition, for those, studying for professional qualifications the college has worked to ensure that these are either covered or, we have made adjustments to programmes. We have also been in communication with employers or sponsoring company as applicable. In addition, we have worked with regulators and/or professional training bodies to ensure these adjustments are compliant with their requirements.

September 2021
The Learning and Teaching Committee reviewed this risk on 7 September 2021, and confirmed the Risk Score of 2x5=10, remaining Amber.

February 2022
The Learning and Teaching Committee reviewed this risk on 16 February 2022, and confirmed the Risk Score of 2x5=10, remaining Amber.

April 2023
The College has an industry-relevant curriculum (evident in the next destinations data). Industry links have been reinvigorated post-Covid and the College has increased and enhanced HEI articulation arrangements, therefore suggest this moves to a risk score of 1x5=5, Green.

Current Risk Score:	**Gross Risk Score (assuming no treatment)**
Likelihood 1/5 Impact 5/5 Risk Score 5/25 RAG Rating: GREEN **Target Score: 5**	Likelihood 4/5 Impact 5/5 Risk Score 20/25
Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):	**Risk Tolerance (Able to accept):**
<u>**Low**</u> Medium High	Category: Student Experience Low **Medium** High 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 achieve taught degree awarding powers (tDAP).

Risk ID: 26

Owned by: Depute Principal   **Review Date: April 2023**

Update

Full Description:

The College fails to achieve taught degree awarding powers (tDAP).

Treatment:

A project Board has been established, led by Principal Little, with ELT, HR, Students' Association and Board member representation. The Project Sponsor is the Depute Principal, Dr Sheila Lodge.

Commentary (Update):

A risk register was developed for the tDAP project comprising the risk areas outlined below. These areas include the tDAP criteria set out by the Quality Assurance Agency:

26.1 Communication: RED

26.2 Academic Staffing: RED

26.3 Administrative Systems: AMBER

26.4 Governance/Management: AMBER/GREEN

26.5 Quality Assurance: RED/AMBER

26.6 Financial: AMBER/GREEN

Note:
The College will submit its application for tDAP only when it is confident that it will be successful. There is no external deadline, and although ELT is keen to achieve tDAP as soon as possible, it is a question of 'when' rather than 'if'. This has a bearing in the current risk score below.

Update as at September 2020
The Audit and Assurance Committee agreed a change from 4x4 (16 - RED) to 3x4 (12 – AMBER).

Update as at May 2021
Although the coronavirus pandemic has delayed progress with some aspects of preparing to apply for tDAP, this still remains a key priority for the College, and progress is being made in specific areas, especially in relation to quality.

Update as at September 2021
The Learning and Teaching Committee reviewed this risk on 7 September 2021, and confirmed the Risk Score of 3x4=12, remaining Amber.

Update as at May 2022
A paper is being prepared for ELT and the Board on the likely revised schedule for achieving tDAP and measures to be taken in the interim to improve the College's chances of success.

Update as at December 2022
In the course of 2022, the nature and extent of the funding and financial challenges to the College have become clearer. As a result, a paper was presented to ELT on 28 September 2022. Although progress is being made against each of the criteria, it is clear that the criteria relating to staff profile and staff development would be particularly challenging:

The institution should be able to demonstrate that a significant proportion of its academic staff have:
10.1 higher degrees and relevant professional qualifications
10.2 teaching experience in other higher education institutions
10.3 experience of curriculum development and assessment design
10.4 relevant experience outside higher education, for example in professional practice.

In addition, Criterion 11 stipulates:

The institution should be able to demonstrate that:
11.1 a proportion of its academic staff are active in subject associations and relevant professional bodies
11.2 a significant proportion of its academic staff participate in professional development schemes
11.3 there are institutional and local level strategies of staff development designed to establish, develop and enhance staff competences
11.4 an extensive portfolio of teaching development activities has been established
11.5 staff contribute to academic publications.

Despite several attempts to encourage staff to participate, only 187 employees had completed the Staff Survey by July 2022. This means that there is still no definite data on the number of staff who hold a higher degree.
The first cut of the responses that have been obtained so far
suggest that City of Glasgow College is a very long way indeed from being able to meet the expectations of an institution applying for tDAP, where 'a significant

proportion' is held to mean that at least 40% of teaching staff should have a higher degree and be engaged with curriculum development and scholarly activity. For instance, key indicators include:

- Involvement in curriculum development   49 (26%)
- Membership of a subject association   14 (7%)
- Involvement in a validation event   19 (10%)
- Given a paper at a conference   9 (5%)
- Published a scholarly article   9 (5%)
- Published a book or book chapter   3 (1.6%)

The College could appoint a new cadre of staff with the requisite qualifications to meet the criteria. This would not only demand a massive financial investment, but would also create a highly divisive two-tier staffing strategy, which would undermine the united Team City culture that has been built so carefully over the last decade. Not only is such an approach clearly unaffordable at the current time; it is alsoentirely undesirable.

Alternatively, the College could push ahead with its 'grow its own' staff strategy, developing colleagues by encouraging many more to take a higher degree. The Director of Finance estimates costs for c.25-35 additional staff per annum beginning a higher degree part-time as c. **£0.9m - £1.15m per annum** (after year 1, 2022-23) over a four-year period, so approaching some **£4m** in total. It must be noted that even this investment would deliver a maximum of 115 staff with a higher degree at the end of year 3.

In addition, there would be further costs involved if many more staff were to be encouraged to participate in conferences and undertake other kinds of scholarly activity, such as writing pedagogical articles and developing research projects. This could easily amount to some **£50K** a year.

In addition, giving more existing staff the opportunity to participate quickly in curriculum development and validation would also incur costs. For illustration, the development costs for each Faculty bringing forward 2 degrees over two years (i.e. 8degrees a year), with 4 members of staff being involved in each development team,would demand c. **£190K** of additional resource for backfill and development days. Fees would also be charged by the university validating the degree.

Moreover, the fee for an institution applying for tDAP in Scotland was raised in July 2022 to **£2,600** at the time of submitting the Critical Self-Assessment plus **£93,000** to be paid if the application proceeds to a visit by a Scrutiny Panel.

Given the financial obstacles and the long time line likely to be involved in developing the College's staffing profile, ELT agreed to revise significantly teplanned timeline to application. It was suggested that, given the current financial uncertainties, no firm deadline be chosen at the present time, but that a working time frame of 10 years be established and revisited and revised as part of the annual operational planning cycle.

This would allow for timelines to be shortened if funding should become available sooner than presently seems likely.

In the meantime, it will be essential that the College continue to make progress towards meeting all the criteria for tDAP other than the staff profile during the period of financial stringency, since improvement, for instance, in our systems, student support, IT, quality and planning, and the work of the Learning & Teaching Academy, are all very much part of the College's continuing core business over the next five years.

Against this background, it was agreed in December 2022 that the risk score be raised to 4 x 4 = 16 (RED).

Current Risk Score:	Gross Risk Score (assuming no treatment)
Likelihood 3/5 Impact 4/5 Risk Score 16/25 RAG Rating: RED **Target Score: 5**	Likelihood 5/5 Impact 4/5 Risk Score 20/25
Risk Appetite (Willing to accept):	**Risk Tolerance (Able to accept):**
Low Medium High	Category: Business Continuity Low Medium High 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				