

Committee	Board		
Agenda Item Number	10		
Date paper prepared	26/09/2023	Date of committee meeting	04/10/2023
Subject	Risk Register Synopsis		
Author	Principal, Professor Jane Lewis Emma McCarthy		
Action requested	For information - to note.		
Purpose of the paper	<p>This paper has been prepared to summarise local activity to address the corporately identified risks outlined in the summary below.</p> <p>Risk is discussed at fortnightly SMG meetings with a risk selected from the list below selected for review at each meeting and the local register updated with progress against historic actions and the identification of new actions.</p>		
Summary of the paper	<p>The University has adopted the following risk policy and appetite statements:</p> <p>Risk Policy: <i>The University's general approach is to minimise its exposure to risk. It will seek to recognise risk and mitigate the adverse consequences. However, the University recognises that in pursuit of its mission and academic objectives it may choose to accept an increased level of risk. It will do so, subject always to ensuring that the potential benefits and risks are fully understood before developments are authorised, and that sensible measures to mitigate risk are established.</i></p> <p>Risk Appetite: <i>The University will take a portfolio approach to risk management i.e., whilst at any one time it may be carrying a high level of risks in one or more parts of its business, it will ensure that the number of areas exposed to high risk at any time are minimised and balanced with a low-risk approach in other areas.</i></p> <p><i>The portfolio of risk will be regularly reviewed by the risk review group, finance and general purposes committee and university court. High risk areas will be very closely aligned to strategic priorities and aligned to high returns i.e., the university should not be exposed to high levels of risk if returns are likely to be minimal or if the activity is not business critical.</i></p> <p><i>The elapsed time over which the university is exposed to a high level of risk in any area should be minimised as much as possible.</i></p> <p>Risk Review Group (RRG): RRG meets quarterly and comprises: University Secretary, Interim Principal & Vice Chancellor, Deputy Principal Academic and Research, Director of IT & Digital Services, Director of Finance, Director of Corporate Governance and Director of Transformation.</p> <p>Agreed Common Risks: The following 13 common risks were developed and agreed in consultation with the Partnership Council. These risks appear on the University's high-</p>		

level risk register and on each academic partner risk register. The risk description is common across each risk register but the scoring and narrative relating to mitigation and planned actions differs depending on local circumstances. All risk owners are asked to update their own registers whenever a change occurs and at least quarterly before 31st August 30th October, 28 February and 31st May each year to ensure that up to date information is available to inform the regular risks reports provided to Court and committees.

1. Institution does not achieve HE student number targets.
2. Institution does not achieve FE credit targets
3. Institution has a poor reputation
4. Disruption to services resulting from loss of key staff member
5. Non-compliance with statutory regulations
6. Governance failure
7. Financial failure
8. Institutions estate is not fit for purpose
9. Academic quality is sub-standard
10. Poor student experience
11. Research outputs are sub-standard
12. Institutional, personal, and sensitive data breach or disruption to services
13. Failure to act appropriately and timeously in relation to climate emergency

Any additional risks identified on risk registers are reported to Court and relevant committees by exception.

Risk Management & Reporting Process: The process for identifying and recording risks across the partnership has evolved over several years in consultation with various committees and groups including the Finance Directors Practitioners Group, Finance and General Purposes Committee, Audit Committee, Risk Review Group, and Partnership Council.

UHI uses a template risk register format and a standard 5 x 5 (likelihood x impact) scoring methodology. All identified risks are scored twice.

- Firstly, to identify a **gross risk** score based on a judgement of the likelihood of the risk occurring multiplied by a potential impact score assuming no mitigations are applied and.
- Secondly, to identify the **residual risk** score that is based on a re-assessment of the risk but considering any mitigation that is **in place and working** to reduce either the likelihood or the impact.

RISK MAP (for Gross risk & residual risk)		TIMESCALE 3 YEARS				
IMPACT						
5 - Catastrophic		5	10	15	20	25
4 - Major		4	8	12	16	20
3 - Significant		3	6	9	12	15
2 - Minor		2	4	6	8	10
1 - Insignificant		1	2	3	4	5
		1 - Very Rare	2 - Unlikely	3 - Possible	4 - Likely	5 - Almost Certain
LIKELIHOOD						

All UHI risk registers are saved to a central location on SharePoint.

	Risk registers are linked to a PowerBI database for reporting and filtering purposes.
Consultation	The risk scoring process was agreed via consultation with FDPG. Risk owners update their own registers, data in the UHI partnership HLRR is collated by the governance team.
Resource implications	Not significant in terms of process. The risk reporting system was developed internally using SharePoint and power bi. The risk management system is currently under development as Microsoft are no longer supporting the InfoPath form tool that we use to amend or enter new risks. A new solution has been identified and is currently under development. Individual risks have substantial resourcing implications.
Risk implications	Risk that registers are out of date or incorrectly scored. This risk is mitigated via scrutiny of risk data at RRG and Partnership Council. The Corporate Systems Officer issues reminders to risk owners to update their registers on a quarterly basis.
Link with strategy	Direct link with corporate governance best practice and compliance with the University's financial memorandum with SFC that requires active and effective risk management processes as a condition of grant.
Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion	Not applicable.
Island Community Impact	Not applicable.
Paper status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open – The paper may be circulated to non-members of the committee and published online without restriction. <input type="checkbox"/> Restricted – The paper must not be circulated to non-members or published online until after the committee meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> Confidential - The paper must not be circulated beyond the committee members and should not be published online. Some information is considered commercially sensitive. [Please note papers may still be subject to Freedom of Information requests – see below].
Freedom of information	Choose an item. If closed/ withheld, select date this will become 'open': Enter a date.