

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
Reaching Wider: delivering wider participation and access in support of social inclusion and economic upskilling										
R1 Reaching Wider' aspects of <i>Reaching Higher</i> are not successful (in particular, failure to meet the RH target on recruitment from Communities First areas to UK HEIs and FEIs)	Sector will be seen to fail to widen access to higher education with consequent impact on external perceptions and funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with and monitoring of "Reaching Wider" partnerships; Funding of widening access strategies; Widening access premia Funding steers to protect HE/FE provision Work to take forward Assembly's response to further develop Widening Access/ Reaching Higher in light of evaluation 		M	M	M/M	N	Revisit in the context of joint work with WAG and HEW on revising the Reaching Higher targets Utilise core funding strategically to support Widening Access provision	-	Head of BRC
Deal for Students: delivering the highest quality learning teaching support										
R2 Failure to meet <i>Reaching Higher</i> targets for Welsh medium provision.	Sector seen as failing to contribute to Assembly's laith Pawb agenda and continuing risk of external complaints about sector performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welsh medium development and premium funding Working with the sector to support the new strategic framework including the Welsh Medium Teaching Development Centre Incorporation of WM target into Reaching Wider and Widening Access strategies 		M	M	M/M	N	Revisit in the context of joint work with WAG and HEW on revising the Reaching Higher targets Further engagement with HEIs to explore potential for increasing provision; Utilise core funding strategically to support Welsh Medium provision	-	Head of SLF

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
Research Excellence: delivering improved research performance to underpin the knowledge economy and cultural and social renewal										
<p>R3 Sector fails to meet <i>Reaching Higher</i> targets of increasing proportion of Research Council income to 4.5% by 2010/11, and research income from other external sources by 60% by 2007/08, and by 100% by 2010/11.</p>	<p>Loss of potential additional research income, with an adverse effect on the research base in Wales in terms of:</p> <p>a) the level of activity which the sector is able to undertake;</p> <p>b) the negative impact on the sector's reputation and standing (e.g. staff recruitment difficulties); and c) loss of international competitiveness.</p> <p>Adverse effect on sector's standing with Assembly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close monitoring of progress via regular data returns and forecasts from HEIs (<i>RH</i> targets template) Establishment of sector-wide seminars on securing research council funding Exploration of possible increases in research funding. Provision of support for research based collaboration and reconfiguration. More strategic use of <i>RH</i> Fund via targeted funding for RAE support. Review of research policy Chief Executive on First Minister's Senior Science Advisory Group. 		M	M	M/M	N	Revisit with WAG and HEW when WAG refresh Reaching Higher during 2008	-	Head of RBC

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
Benefiting Economy and Society: delivering more productive relationships between HE institutions and the public and private sectors, other agencies and local communities										
R4 Forthcoming WAG Skills strategy fails to include the contribution which HE can make to addressing challenges posed by Leitch and Webb reviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WAG policy lacks a proper role for the HE dimension. HEI contributions to improving High Level Skills in Wales underplayed and/or under funded Development and rollout of foundation degrees stalled. HE/business links damaged if HE level skills are not improved or properly funded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consulting 3MC/L&T/WAC, which led to full WAG consultation response Attended WAG consultation seminars to promote HE's case Meetings with senior staff in Sponsor Department to ensure HE's potential contribution is properly played in and utilised Liaise with HEW (and with other partners) to co-ordinate positive presentation of HE's case. 		M	M	M/M	N	Revisit with WAG and HEW when WAG refresh Reaching Higher during 2008		Head of BRC

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
Initial Teacher Training : delivering newly qualified teachers of high quality										
R5 Unable to reach agreement on reconfiguration of ITT sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destabilisation of ITT provision. Sector unable to deliver newly qualified teachers of the highest quality. Reputational damage to Council. Institutions unable to recruit effectively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dialogue with the sector and HEW to encourage appropriate ITT reconfiguration plans. Dialogue with Assembly about consequences of delays in decision on ITT reconfiguration. Encourage developments in non-ITT provision as part of reconfiguration plans and investigate means to increase education research capacity in the sector. 	Maintain status quo	M	M	M/M	N	On-going discussions with Assembly and sector.	-	Head of SLF

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
Making it Work - the HE Sector in Wales: a strong emphasis on reconfiguration, collaboration, and other measures to sustain improved performance of individual institutions and the HE system as a whole										
R6: Funding from the Assembly is insufficient to be able to sustain levels of funded activity (e.g. as factors beyond our control bite, such as equal pay, pensions, NI etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant political impact of funding in Wales falling behind that in England and elsewhere in the UK Possible reduction in activity, or inability to maintain adequate volume of activity, which would threaten achievement of <i>Reaching Higher</i> targets. Institutions unable to maintain and/or develop estates, including meeting statutory responsibilities. Lack of flexibility in profile of above base-line funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dialogue with Assembly about need for funding at a level appropriate to the Assembly's vision, and to the reality of a UK and wider international market for students and staff in higher education. Continue to conduct funding gap analysis on an annual basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the sector to pursue value for money options and efficiencies 	M	H	M/H	N	Move towards more explicit focus on financial sustainability in respect of allocation of funding and strategic dialogue with institutions. Prepare contributions to Comprehensive Spending Reviews (CSR) as required by WAG	Over next 3 years (by 2011)	Head of SLF

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept <i>(Y/N) [see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
R7: A lack of impact through failure to achieve major HE Sectoral partnerships and the restricted nature of minor partnerships.	Failure to meet key <i>Reaching Higher</i> objective leads to loss of Assembly funding for HE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of proposals by the Reconfiguration & Collaboration Panel (plus the Research Councils and independent academic referees as appropriate) to ensure the viability and sustainability of partnerships • A requirement for WAG agreement to the release of funds for partnerships that are either over £200k in value, or are novel and contentious • A requirement for Vice-Chancellor sign-off of proposals, and confirmation of institutional priority attached to each bid, to ensure institutional buy-in to partnerships at a strategic level • Monitoring of partnerships to ensure successful delivery against targets and outcomes • Dialogue with partners to build on foundations of limited proposals • Maintaining our capacity to extend current invitations and encourage new ones • Dialogue with WAG about pressures on <i>RH</i> budget. 		M	M	M / M	N	<p>Establishment of ranking process to prioritise bids, thereby ensuring that funding is allocated to the most substantial and viable projects.</p> <p>Consider 'refreshing' R&C policy in light of these pressures.</p>	<p>Ranking included in R&C reports to Council from September 2008.</p> <p>April 2009</p>	Head of SLF

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		<i>A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk</i>	<i>B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence</i>							
R8 Too many institutions in a marginal or unsatisfactory financial position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential closure of institutions Weak basis for any major reconfiguration/merger proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argue case for increased levels of funding for the sector Intervene at an early stage when institutions are getting into difficulty Require institutions to address sustainability in their strategic plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require recovery plans and monitor implementation 	L	H	L/H	N	Develop a more holistic approach to HEFCW's institutional risk assessment process	May 2009	Head of GLI
Making It Work – HEFCW: being an effective public sector body by: having the capability and infrastructure that enables us to work effectively internally and with all our stakeholders and partners (especially the Welsh Assembly Government and the HE sector in Wales; being an employer of choice.										
R9 DCELLS reorganisation takes time to embed	Liaison and effective working with relevant DCELLS colleagues impeded, with consequential failure by HEFCW to address one or more key Assembly priorities.	Close officer dialogue with relevant new colleagues; individual induction support as appropriate.	Escalate any clear concerns at officer level	M	M	M/M	N	Invite Council to make representations.	July 2008	Chief Executive (in close consultation w/ Chairman)
R10 Current telephone system failing due to age.	Loss of availability of telephones for more than three days	Maintenance contract with BT	Use of mobile phones and/or email for communication.	H	L	H/L	N	Investigate replacement telephone system.	Mar 09	Head of GLI SIAM
R11 Inability to implement 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 pay remit due to ongoing delays from WAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputation Low morale Turnover Employment relations issues Impact on HR and Payroll workload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing discussions with WAG Pay negotiations underway via Works Council Management Board discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Escalate to Chairman for further communication with WAG 	H	M	H/M	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further communication with WAG for final decision Involvement of Chairman in influencing WAG 	May 08 May/ June 08	Director of FCS
R12 Risk of exceeding cash 2% threshold at end of financial year	Potential underspend on budget leading to return of funds to WAG at financial year end.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget and Cash Management document sets out procedures for all aspects of budgetary activities. 	Advance notice given to WAG of potential budget underspend and request for possible carry forward of committed funds.	L	H	L/H	N	Alternative budget spend plans to be managed by HEFCW Budget Group and proposals put to Council for approval prior to financial year end to ensure cash does not exceed 2% threshold.	Jan – March each year	Director FCS

Risk Description <i>A clear statement of the identified risk</i>	Consequence <i>A clear statement of the effect if the risk is realised</i>	Existing controls <i>Details of controls <u>already in place</u> designed to mitigate the risk and/or address the consequence (contingency plans)¹</i>		Prob. <i>Likelihood of risk being realised H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Impact <i>Severity of consequence H(igh), M(edium), or L(ow)</i>	Risk Rating <i>Combined Probability / Impact score</i>	Tolerate / Accept (Y/N) <i>[see risk matrix.]</i>	Further Actions to improve controls and/or mitigate impact <i>If risk <u>not</u> tolerable / acceptable</i>	Action by date	Resp. Officer
		A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk	B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence							
R13 Failure to deliver funding round	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of robust funding allocations Unable to pay institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Project timetable Oversight of process by Funding Group Checking procedures 		L	H	L/H	N	Provide funding on the basis of previous year's data/funding allocations.		Head of SLF
R14 Loss of or poor service when moving to Welsh PSBA	Disruption to/loss of communication service	Testing and implementation undertaken externally – beyond our control	Consider alternative ISPs	L	H	L/H	N	Put communication route in place to be informed of progress	Jul 08	AH