

| 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 WAG Skills strategy (STWFW) fails to deliver 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 continue to be underplayed and/or under funded Development and rollout of foundation degrees stalled. HE/business links damaged if improvements to HE level skills are not set within a proper context or properly funded. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3MC held single issue meeting on STWFW on 12 September which offered advice to WAG colleagues on ways forward on HE elements Continuing engagement with DCELLS on FDs proposals Meetings with senior staff in Sponsor Department to ensure HE's potential contribution continues to be properly played in and utilised Case made in ELLC evidence and hearings (coordinated with HEW) | Awaiting refresh of Reaching Higher | M | M | M/M | N | Engage actively with Jones review group | | Head of BRC |
| Deal for Students: delivering the highest quality learning teaching support | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| R2 Failure to meet Reaching Higher 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 Support the work of the Robin Williams Coleg Ffederal Planning Board due to report by June 2009 | - | Head of SLF |
| Research Excellence: delivering improved research performance to underpin the knowledge economy and cultural and social renewal | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| <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; 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. | | H | M | H/M | N | <p>Revisit with WAG and HEW when WAG refresh <i>Reaching Higher</i> during 2009</p> | - | 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 |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | | <i>A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk</i> | <i>B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence</i> | | | | | | | |
| R4 Welsh research performance looks poor when assessed via the emerging Research Excellence Framework (REF)(a metrics based assessment method for HE post RAE) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputational damage to Welsh research base • Sector finds it more difficult to attract external research partners and funders • Adverse funding consequences flow, with consequential damage to WHE's ability to impact positively on Welsh economy developments • Loss of leading Welsh Research staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing to UK-wide discussions on development of REF methodology • Await outcome of pilot REF project, with Bangor representing Wales (emerging issues for Wales possibly then played into Jones Group deliberations) • On UK-wide adoption of REF methodology, open discussions with sector and DCELLS on how best to manage consequences for Wales | | H | H | H/H | N | Engage in further modelling Strengthen capacity to engage in and influence REF development processes | | 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 |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | | <i>A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk</i> | <i>B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence</i> | | | | | | | |
| Benefiting Economy and Society: delivering more productive relationships between HE institutions and the public and private sectors, other agencies and local communities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Initial Teacher Training : delivering newly qualified teachers of high quality | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 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 Engagement with Jones Review Group Early analysis of implications of Assembly Draft Budget for HE Engagement with WAG processes for Strategic Capital Investment Fund | 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 (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 | | | | | | | |
| 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 and prioritisation 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 • A requirement for Vice-Chancellor to prioritise and sign-off proposals 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>Consider 'refreshing' R&C policy in light of these pressures.</p> <p>Investigate use of 'One Wales' funding</p> <p>Actively engage with WAG transforming education and training agenda, including HE/FE partnerships</p> | <p>April 2009</p> <p>April 2009</p> <p>Ongoing</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 |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | A) Existing controls which mitigate the risk | B) Existing contingency plans to address consequence | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| R9 Fail to secure stable and sustainable outcome regarding Lampeter | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational damage to Council Prolonged and damaging uncertainty in Lampeter Opportunity for strengthening of sector missed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWCF report done Changes in UWL SMT Close HEFCW dialogue with UWL and potential partner HEIs Close HEFCW dialogue with WAG and other key stakeholders | | M | H | M/H | N | Officers monitoring closely, and prepared to raise level of engagement Scope to apply financial considerations | Aim for full resolution wef start of 09/10 academic year | CEO in close consultation with Directors |

| 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 – 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| R10 DCELLS reorganisation takes time to embed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liaison and effective working with relevant DCELLS colleagues impeded, with consequential failure by HEFCW to address one or more key Assembly priorities. Failure in WAG to register HE dimension of other policy domains, with impacts on consultation and coordination between HE and other post-16/skills agendas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close officer dialogue with relevant new colleagues, via routine and special meetings, as needed Individual induction as appropriate Active role by officers in alerting WAG colleagues to key agendas/issues | Escalate any clear concerns at officer level | H | M | H/M | N | Escalate any clear concerns even higher If need be, invite Council to make representations. | Ongoing but review Jan 2009 | Chief Executive in close consultation with Directors |
| R11 Inability to reach agreement on and implement pay and grading arrangements 2009 onwards | <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 process Works Council consultation Staff consultation HR Committee consultation Pay quotation underway Management Board discussions | • | M | M | M/M | N | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consultation with staff Communication with WAG | Jan 2009 | Director FCS/ Head of Resources |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| R13 Loss of or poor service when moving to Welsh PSBA | Disruption to/loss of communication service | Testing and implementation undertaken externally – beyond our control | Backup provider in place | L | H | L/H | N | Put communication route in place to be informed of progress | Jul 08 | Senior IS Manager |
| R14 Late submission of Reviews and Forward Job Plans under new timetable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pay implications Unable to complete training needs analysis No forward plan objectives Core training plan not created Ineffective management Impact on HR and budget Failure to retain IIP Failure to evaluate quality of returns Failure to analyse results Potential action taken against HEFCW or individual Litigation Ineffective recruitment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timescale plan in place. MOPD Guidelines Management Performance training for all line managers Review/plan return report to Management Board | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Core Training plan in place. | M | M | M/M | N | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerated Time scale plan, active reminder process operating via Mgt Team | Feb/ March 2009 | Head of Resources/HR & Training Manager |

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| R15 No Approved Pension Admin Centre (PAC) provider following withdrawal of current provider (Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR)) in June 2009 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to administrate pensions Unable to provide pension scheme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet office looking in to options of pension administration across whole of civil service pensions arrangement Communication with BERR Six month notice period Commence tender process regardless in November 2008 | | L | H | L/H | N | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commence processes to source new provider | Oct 2008 | Head of Resources/HR & Training Manager |
| R16 Failure of server room aircon units | Equipment failure, risk of fire. Significant disruption | 2 aircon units in server room, rent mobile aircon units | Maintenance contract | M | M | M / M | N | System to be replaced, possibly relocated. Contingency to procure mobile air con units depending on cost | Oct 08 | Senior IS Manager |

| 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> | | | | | | | |
| R17 Loss of continuity in Council members' knowledge and experience of the Council's business due to appointment of six new members of Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short term disruption to the effectiveness of Council business Delays in the Council's ability to make decisions and to engage with strategic priorities (e.g. RAE, T&F group) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard induction programme developed for all new Council members | Delegated authority scheme in place to enable Chief Executive and Chairman to make necessary decisions where strategic urgency arises | M | M | M / M | N | Tailored induction programme to be developed for each new Council member taking into account their existing level of funding business knowledge and also the Council committees that they will be members of. Retiring members to be invited to meet new members, where practicable, to share their experience of Council business and accumulated knowledge Prioritise the work of the Clerk to the Council in consultation with the chief executive and chairman to manage this induction process and ongoing Council business Manage the agenda of Council business to focus on key strategic priorities that require Council decision and consider delaying less urgent business in the short term if necessary | | Head of GLI/Clerk (in consultation with chairman, CEO and Directors) |

