

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Resources

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (SRR) – Q3 2010/11 UPDATE

1. **REPORT PURPOSE**

- 1.1 This is the Q3 strategic risk management report which focuses on the progress made in reducing threat levels for each strategic risk (SR).
- 1.2 At its 17 December meeting the Audit Committee asked that an example of risk management embedded within service management plans be included within the SRR Q3 2010/11 update.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Audit Committee is recommended to:

- 2.1 Consider and critically assess the progress on reducing the seriousness of the Council's strategic risks as reflected by their current threat levels and Direction of Travel (DoT) (Table 1 page 2 and Appendix 1 page 7);
- 2.2 Note the results of the review of the SRR by Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) and consider the revisions to the Strategic Risk SR12 (Risk Management Action Plan (RMAP) included as Appendix 2 page 9). In addition note its re-entry to the Strategic Risk Register following observations made by Audit Committee at its 24 September meeting;
- 2.3 Note the example of risk management embedded within a service management plan as requested by Audit Committee at its 17 December meeting in section 5 page 4;
- 2.4 Select a strategic risk from Appendix 1 (page 7) for specific scrutiny for the SRR Q4 2010/11 update.

3. **REASONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 The Audit Committee's key risk management role is to provide assurance on the adequacy of the Council's Risk Management Framework and the associated control environment by reviewing the mechanisms for assessing and managing risk. Part of this responsibility is to ensure active risk management is undertaken by relevant managers. This report presents the latest CLT review of the strategic risks faced by the Council.

#### 4. THREAT LEVEL REDUCTION PROGRESS

4.1 Progress in reducing the seriousness of our strategic risks is assessed by a combination of each risk's overall threat level and its Direction of Travel (DoT). This rounded assessment gives a clearer picture of progress in reducing the risk threat level. Table 1 (below) lists the 20 risks in the SRR and presents for each the most recent change to the DoT and the overall threat level.

4.2 Overall progress continues in reducing the threat levels of the strategic risks we face, with several risks in the SRR assessed by risk owners as improving, stable or at target. However, a number of risks are red rated and showing a deteriorating position, reflecting the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review and Revenue Support Grant Settlement, the resultant reductions in funding and the range of delivery pressures and challenges the Council has to respond to.

4.3 For the 20 strategic risks within the SRR:

- One strategic risk, *SR13 - Failure to secure additional funding for Decent Homes programme*, shows a significant increase of threat level and a further three risks show a deteriorating Direction of Travel (DoT) since Q2;
- Two risks show an improved DoT. One of these, *SR6 – Failure to safeguard vulnerable children*, has reached target after a significant improvement in the threat level;
- Four risks have remained at their target threat level since Q2 reporting:
  - SR4 - Civil emergencies/service disruption;
  - SR2 - Reputation of the City;
  - SR7 - Crime and fear of crime;
  - SR24 - Local Development Framework.

4.4 **Table 1** shows the 20 strategic risks ranked in order of threat level and DoT (highest to lowest threat level):

<b>TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level &amp; DoT in rank order (Q3 2010/11)</b>			
<b>SR No.</b>	<b>Strategic Risk Description</b>	<b>Threat Level</b>	<b>DoT (Q2–Q3)</b>
<b>Red rated strategic risks</b>			
13	Failure to secure additional funding for Decent Homes programme	16 to 25	↑
11	Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way	16	↑
19	Failure to deliver Council Plan	16	↔
26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms resulting in increased economic hardship <b>(entered the SRR Q2 2010/11)</b>	16	↔
16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in The Nottingham Plan to 2020	12	↑

<b>TABLE 1: Risk Threat Level &amp; DoT in rank order (Q3 2010/11)</b>			
<b>SR No.</b>	<b>Strategic Risk Description</b>	<b>Threat Level</b>	<b>DoT (Q2–Q3)</b>
<b>Red rated strategic risks</b>			
22	Failure to achieve national policy requirements and targets for 'Putting People First'	12	↑
1	Failure to implement harmonised pay, grade & terms & conditions, fair to all colleagues & Equal Pay legislation compliant	12	↔
3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens	12	↔
5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults	12	↔
10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance	12	↔
12a	Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children & opportunities for young people to access further education & skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City <b>(re-entered the SRR Q3 2010/11)</b>	12	↔
14	Failure to deliver culture change	12	↔
25	Failure to develop a strong and well resourced commissioning programme <b>(entered the SRR Q1 2010/11)</b>	12	↓
<b>Amber rated strategic risks</b>			
6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children	15 to 10 At target	↓
4	Inadequate arrangements in place to respond to civil emergencies and / or catastrophic service delivery	9 At target	↔
2	Reputation of the City	8 At target	↔
24	Failure to prevent death, injury and/or ill health in the workplace, on site or visiting a client/service user <b>(entered the SRR Q1 2010/11)</b>	9	↔
7	Failure of NCC's contribution to reduce crime and the fear of crime	8 At target	↔
9	Failure of major project and programmes	8	↔
23	Failure to deliver the Local Development Framework Core Strategy	6 At target	↔
<b>Green rated strategic risks – There are no green rated risks at Q3.</b>			

**Key:** ↓ - Reducing threat level; ↔ - Stable threat level; ↑ - Increasing threat level.

**Appendix 1** shows the detailed risk threat level assessments between April 2010 and January 2011 (Q3 2010/11), each risk owner's assessment of the dates when target threat levels will be achieved and the ownership of each risk.

#### 4.5 Review of new / emerging risks and existing SRR risks

The threat level for *SR13 – Failure to secure additional funding for Decent Homes programme*, has increased since Quarter 2 such that at 25 it is now the Council's highest rated risk. This reflects what is now accepted as an almost certain shortfall in funding.

The shortfall has a number of causes:

- The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) has indicated that the Council will receive significantly less than the original funding of £91m for Decent Homes improvement;
- Decent Homes improvements were anticipated to be funded through the Meadows PFI project. Communities & Local Government (CLG) announced that all PFI projects not under contract would be stopped;
- NCC has a financial contribution which forms part of the capital programme, which is currently under review.

CLT has asked that this Strategic Risk be revised to reflect the recognised shortfall in funding and reported in the Q4 SRR Update for consideration.

- 4.6 For Q3 no new risks have been identified for escalation from the Corporate Directorate Risk Registers to the SRR. However, the former strategic risk *xSR12 – Failure to make improvements in educational outcomes at all key stages including GCSE results*, which was delegated to the Children and Families Corporate Directorate Risk Register has been re-scoped to reflect changes in government policy and observations made by the Audit Committee at its 24 September 2010 meeting.

The re-scoped risk, *SR12a - Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and opportunities for young people to access further education and skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City*, takes into account the changing role of the Local Authority in terms of supporting and intervening in schools and the Local Authority's loss of grant.

CLT has reviewed the re-scoped risk and agreed that it should re-enter the Strategic Risk Register. The updated RMAP is included as Appendix 2 page 9.

#### 5. **EMBEDDING OF RM WITHIN SERVICE MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- 5.1 At its 17 December meeting, Audit Committee asked that an example be included in the Q3 SRR Update of risk management embedded within service management plans and applied below the level of the SRR.
- 5.1 Risk Management is integrated into the Service Planning process. Strategic Service Plans communicate a summary of risks and, coupled with their corresponding risk registers, the level of seriousness using the Council's seriousness scale as described in the Risk Management Framework and key mitigations planned to reduce the level of seriousness.

5.2 For example:

- The Transformation Programme, including Work Place Strategy, workforce reductions and Single Status, was identified as a key driver within the Resources Corporate Directorate Plan with a specific focus for Resources;
- This objective was articulated as an action in the Human Resources Organisational Transformation Strategic Service Plan as:
  - Establishment of programme structure and governance arrangements;
  - Securing organisational commitment and capacity to deliver transformation;
- A key (red) risk was identified around the organisational capacity during a period of high volume change. This risk was also identified as a constituent risk in the Strategic Risk SR14 - Failure to deliver culture change.
- In response an exercise was undertaken to capture the risks around implementation of the transformation programme with Departmental Risk Champions developing Risk Management Action Plans through their respective DLTs and reported back to Transformation Board through Business Representatives;
- The outcome of this work was:
  - Relevant risks were identified and assessed;
  - Risks are widely communicated across the organisation;
  - Proportionate mitigations were implemented;
  - A contribution to successful implementation of Work Place Strategy, Single Status and Workforce Reductions.

5.3 While the above is a practical example of good risk management in action, further work is required to make our risk and opportunity processes more systematic, to ensure risks identified in Service Plans are consistently linked to Risk Registers and that Risk Management Actions link mitigations and resources to commitments in Service Plans so limited resources are most effectively employed.

## **6. FUTURE AUDIT COMMITTEE RISK REVIEWS**

6.1 When considering the Q2 SRR Update, Audit Committee selected SR22 for further review at this meeting. Reporting of this risk has been deferred to the Q4 SRR Update so the outcome of a review currently underway by Internal Audit can be incorporated to the RMAP. The provision to select strategic risks for review allows the Committee to direct attention to areas of risk considered potentially significant to the Committee's operations and remit. The Audit Committee is invited to select a strategic risk from Appendix 1 in addition to SR22 for more detailed examination in the Q4 SRR update.

## **7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Actions to mitigate identified constituent risks are contained within the RMAPs. These actions will be positioned within the Council's Corporate Directorate and Strategic Service Plans and, as appropriate, inform the medium term service and budget planning process.

**8. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

8.1 These are dealt with throughout the report.

**9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION**

9.1 None.

**10. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT**

10.1 None.

**APPENDICIES**

<b>App.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	Strategic Risk Threat Reduction Progress Table	7
2	RMAP re-scoped Strategic Risk <i>SR12a - Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and opportunities for young people to access further education and skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City</i> , included for consideration	9

**Sponsoring Corporate Director**

Carole Mills-Evans – Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director for Resources

**Author(s):**

Simon Burton – Corporate Performance & Quality Officer  
Tel: 0115 8763432 [simon.burton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:simon.burton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

Kevin Banfield – Head of Performance Improvement & Planning  
Tel: 0115 8763437 [kevin.banfield@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.banfield@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

# Nottingham City Council Risk Register - Report Summary

Ref.	Risk	SR criteria						Estimated Threat Level / Seriousness / DoT	DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability						
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being				Financial	Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague				
SR13	Failure to secure additional funding for Decent Homes programme	✓		✓		✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↑	Apr-11	J. Dearing CD-Dev	S. Cheesbrough Head of Housing Strategy	
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)	25 (5x5)		8 (2x4)			
								DoT	Stable	Deteriorating	Deteriorating	Deteriorating					
SR11	Failure to address medium term financial pressures in a sustainable way		✓	✓			✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↑	Mar-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance Director	
								Threat Level	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)		6 (3x2)			
								DoT	Improving	Stable	Deteriorating	Deteriorating					
SR19	Failure to deliver Council Plan			✓				Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Jan-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Org	
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)		4 (1x4)			
								DoT	Improving	Stable	Deteriorating	Stable					
SR26	Failure to support Nottingham citizens and communities to cope with welfare reforms results in increased economic hardship and long term risks to the economy ( <b>new risk added to the SRR November</b> )	✓				✓		Date			Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Jan-11	J. Todd Chief Exec.	P. Wakefield Director Strategic Partnerships	
								Threat Level		New risk	16 (4x4)	16 (4x4)		9 (3x3)			
								DoT			N/A	Stable					
SR16a	Failure of partners including the City Council to work effectively together to achieve vision and outcomes in the Nottingham Plan to 2020 ( <b>including SR15 - Failure of the LAA</b> )	✓		✓		✓		Date		Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↑	2014	J. Todd Chief Exec.	P. Wakefield Director Strategic Partnerships	
								Threat Level	New risk	9 (3x3)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)			
								DoT		Stable	Deteriorating	Deteriorating					
SR22	Failure to achieve national policy requirement and targets for Putting People First		✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↑	Mar-11	K. Foote CD-Comm	H. Jones Director Comm Inclusion	
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		9 (3x3)			
								DoT	Stable	Improving	Deteriorating	Deteriorating					
SR1	Failure to implement harmonised pay, grade & terms & conditions, that are fair to all colleagues & Equal Pay legislation compliant	✓	✓	✓			✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Sep-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Org Transformation	
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		6 (2x3)			
								DoT	Stable	Improving	Improving	Stable					
SR3	Failure to mitigate the impact of the economic climate on the Nottingham City and its citizens			✓		✓		Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Mar-11	J. Todd Chief Exec.	P. Wakefield Director Strategic Partnerships	
								Threat Level	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)		9 (3x3)			
								DoT	Improving AT TARGET	Stable	Deteriorating	Stable					
SR5a	Failure to safeguard vulnerable adults (new risk derived from original SR5 - see report)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	May-11	K. Foote CD-Comm	H. Jones Dir Comm Inclusion E. Yardley Dir Access & Reablement	
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)			
								DoT	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable					
SR10	Failure to maintain good standards of governance	✓		✓			✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Jun-10	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	T. Kirkham Strategic Finance Director	
								Threat Level	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)	12 (4x3)		6 (2x3)			
								DoT	Improving	Stable	Stable	Stable					
SR12a	Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and opportunities for young people to access further education and skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City	✓	✓	✓				Date				Jan-11	↔	Apr-11	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	G. Ellis Director Schools & Learning	
								Threat Level				Updated risk		12 (3x4)			8 (2x4)
								DoT									

Ref.	Risk	SR criteria						Estimated Threat Level / Seriousness / DoT	DoT	Target Threat Level	Managing Accountability					
		Highest Pri	Corp Mit	Legal	Reputation	H & S	Citizen well-being				Financial	Corp. Director (Risk Owner)	Lead Director or Senior Colleague			
SR14	Failure to deliver culture change		✓					Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Apr-11	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	A. Probert Director HR & Org Transformation
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		8 (2x4)		
SR25	Failure to develop a strong and well resourced commissioning programme (added to SRR Q1 2010/11)				✓	✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↓	May-12	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	Candida Brudenell Director Quality &
								Threat Level	New risk	16 (4x4)	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)		6 (2x3)		
SR6	Failure to safeguard vulnerable children		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↓	Jun-11	I. Curryer CD-Ch & Fam	S. Gautam Director Specialist Services
								Threat Level	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	15 (3x5)	10 (2x5)		10 (2x5)		
SR4	Inadequate arrangements in place to respond to civil emergencies and / or catastrophic service delivery failure			✓	✓	✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Oct-10	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	P. Millward Head of Service Emergency Planning
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		9 (3x3)		
SR2	Reputation of the city		✓	✓			✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Mar-10	J. Todd Chief Exec.	S.Barker Director Comms & Mktng
								Threat Level	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		8 (2x4)		
SR24	Failure to prevent death, injury and/or ill health in the workplace, on site or visiting a client/service user (entered to the register May 2010)			✓	✓	✓	✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Feb-12	C. Mills-Evans DCEX/CDR	P. Millward Head of Service Emergency Planning
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	9 (3x3)	9 (3x3)		6 (2x3)		
SR7	Failure of NCC's contribution to reduce crime and the fear of crime	✓	✓		✓		✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Apr-11	K. Foote CD-Comm	E. Orrock Comm Safety Exec. Coordinator
								Threat Level	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)		8 (2x4)		
SR9	Failure of major programmes and projects	✓	✓				✓	Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Jun-10	J. Dearing CD-Dev	J. Whyld Corporate Projects
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	8 (2x4)	8 (2x4)		6 (2x3)		
SR23	Failure to deliver the 'Local Development Core Strategy'.							Date	Apr-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Jan-11	↔	Dec-10	J. Dearing CD-Dev	G. Butterworth Head of Planning, Transport & Intelligence Strategy
								Threat Level	12 (3x4)	12 (3x4)	6 (2x3)	6 (2x3)		6 (2x3)		
								DoT	Stable	Stable	Improving AT TARGET	Stable AT TARGET				

DIRECTION OF TRAVEL (DoT)	
Reducing threat level	↓
Stable threat level	↔
Increasing threat level	↑



**SR12a - Failure to provide the best educational outcome for children and opportunities for young people to access further education and skills training to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the City.**

This Strategic Risk was previously scoped around a failure to make improvements in educational outcomes at all key stages including GCSE results. By Q1 of 2010/11, the risk had previously been reported as being at its target threat level for four consecutive quarters and was delegated to C&F DRR for ongoing monitoring. Audit Committee requested that this risk be reviewed, in response to which the risk was re-scoped by C&F in November 2010 to include risks around a failure to ensure that children and young people thrive and achieve in education, training and employment.

		Impact				
		Negligible (1)	Minor (2)	Moderate (3)	Major (4)	Catastrophic (5)
Likelihood	Remote (1)	1	2	3	4	5
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	Possible (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Likely (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Almost certain (5)	5	10	15	20	25

Owner:	Corp Dir Children & Families			Completed by:	Director of Schools & Learning			Date completed:	Dec 2010	Review date:	TBC		
<b>RISK SUMMARY:</b>													
Opening (Dec 10)			Previous (N/A)			Current (Dec 2010)			Target (April 11)			Overall Risk Mitigation Effectiveness (Effective, May not be enough, Insufficient)	
Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)			Threat level (LxI=??)				
			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating							
3	4	12				3	4	12	↔	2	4	8	Effective

CONSTITUENT RISKS TO BE MANAGED:														
Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8		
<b>1</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for children (Key stage)</b>	3	4	12				3	4	12	↔	2	3	6
1.01	Inability to improve standards in secondary education as a result of growing diversification (e.g. academies) limiting the extent of Local Authority intervention.	4	3	12				4	3	12	↔	4	2	8
1.02	Specialist LA services become uneconomic as schools and academies elect to opt out of agreements.	4	4	16				4	4	16	↔	2	2	4
1.03	LA is unable to maintain good relations with individual schools/school associations and academies	2	3	6				2	3	6	↔	2	3	6
1.04	Failure to reduce poor attendance.	3	4	12				3	4	12	↓	2	4	8
1.05	Failure to recruit and retain effective leaders for schools and federations.	4	4	16				4	4	16	↔	2	3	6
1.06	Failure to manage the LA responsibility for monitoring, challenge and intervention in schools in the face of budget reductions.	4	4	16				4	4	16	↑	2	4	8
1.07	Failure to build a culture and ethos of LA and school partnership based on transparent consultation and communication.	2	4	8				2	4	8	↑	1	4	4
1.08	Failure to provide commissioned support to prevent school failure.	2	4	8				2	4	8	↑	1	4	4
1.09	Failure to provide the best possible educational outcomes for Looked After Children.	3	4	12				3	4	12	↓	2	3	6
1.10	Failure to coordinate admissions and ensure fair access to all schools resulting poor attendance affecting attainment.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↓	1	3	3
1.11	Shortage of school places in areas of significant demographic growth.	5	4	20				5	4	20	↓	2	4	8
1.12	Lack of provision of specialist support to vulnerable groups impacts on pupil attendance and attainment.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↑	2	3	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through further education.</b>	3	3	9				3	3	9	↑	2	2	4
2.01	End to Educational Maintenance Allowance prevents young people from remaining in education or training post 16.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↑	2	2	4
2.02	Reduced funding for post 16 provision results in lower standards, less choice and therefore poorer outcomes.	2	3	6				2	3	6	↑	1	2	2

CONSTITUENT RISKS TO BE MANAGED:														
Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Opening Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Previous Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			Latest Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8			DoT ↓ Improving ↔ Stable ↑ Deteriorating	Target Threat Level e.g. 2x4=8		
2.03	Academies programme produces small, low quality sixth forms.	3	2	6				3	2	6	↑	2	2	4
2.04	Progression between Key Stage 4 and post 16 provision enables learners to continue their progression through the qualification levels.	2	2	4				2	2	4	↔	1	1	1
2.05	Lack of provision of specialist support to vulnerable groups leads to increase in NEET.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↑	2	3	6
2.06	Young people from Nottingham not having the relevant skills or science qualifications to benefit from the jobs created within Nottingham, a designated science and technology City.	4	3	12				4	3	12	↔	2	3	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through vocational qualifications.</b>	3	3	9				3	3	9	↔	2	2	4
3.01	Poor quality vocational qualifications offered by schools, colleges and training providers.	4	5	20				4	5	20	↔	2	4	8
3.02	Low take up of vocational qualifications by young people in Nottingham undermines the offer.	3	4	12				3	4	12	↔	2	3	6
3.03	Wolf Review of vocational education undermines current vocational offer in Nottingham.	5	4	20				5	4	20	↔	4	2	8
3.04	Young Apprenticeship programme is not renewed by government.	2	4	8				2	4	8	↑	2	2	4
3.05	Apprenticeships fail to attract local applicants or employment opportunities.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↑	2	3	6
3.06	Move away from Programme Led Opportunities reduced opportunities for young people to undertake apprenticeships.	4	3	12				4	3	12	↔	2	3	6
3.07	Foundation Learning is no longer funded by the City Council so that provision of vocational and functional skills and Personal and Social Development is no longer available to young people in NEET.	5	5	25				5	5	25	↑	5	2	10
3.08	ASPIRE programme funding reduced.	2	4	8				2	4	8	↔	2	2	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Failure to match education outcomes with the economic need of the City.</b>	3	3	9				3	3	9	↔	2	3	6
4.01	Vocational qualifications offered by FE colleges and schools do not lead to local employment opportunities for Nottingham City young people.	3	3	9				3	3	9	↔	2	3	6

Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Risk Mitigation Effectiveness	Responsibility for action Owner	Support	Completion date/ review cycle
<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:</b>					
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for children (Key stage)</b>				
1.01	LA direct intervention limited to schools in categories.	May not be enough	WM		June 2011
1.02	Building quality LA traded school improvement services and quality commissioned services.	Effective	WM / AP		June 2011
1.03	Ensure regular meetings and effective communications with Head Teachers.	Effective	WM		Ongoing
1.04	Work in partnership with schools to develop strategies to improve attendance.	Effective	VM/ AP/ Mpa		Ongoing
1.05	Exploring new models of leadership when Head Teacher posts become vacant.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.06	Retain key staff and recruit quality school improvement support.	May not be	WM		June 2011
1.07	Construct policy, developments and solutions with head teachers and academy principals.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.07	Commission head teachers to lead school improvement in schools causing concern e.g. NLEs (National Leaders in Education), LLEs (Local Leaders in Education), executive and associate head teachers.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.08	Develop brokered internal and external sources of support.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.08	Direct support to improve school leadership facilitating schools to become effective 'self improvers'.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.08	Develop School to school partnerships to support accelerated improvement and long term sustainability.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.08	Respond quickly as risks arise, improving leadership as a priority.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.08	Signpost schools to where the provision is high quality.	Effective	WM		June 2011
1.09	Continued implementation of strategy to improve educational outcomes for Looked After Children (Separate risk management action plan available.)	Effective	MPa	LB	June 2011

Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Risk Mitigation Effectiveness	Responsibility for action Owner	Support	Completion date/ review cycle
<b>EXISTING MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:</b>					
1.10	Implementing improved responsive admissions processes.	Effective	AP	GH	September 2011
1.11	Programme of Primary Phase capital investment agreed by Executive Board-July 2010. Audit of physical capacity that can be utilised for additional places.	Effective	AP	NL	Ongoing
1.12	Review of core role of LA support services. Development of traded and commissioned services with schools.	Effective	MPa	AW	July 2011
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through further education.</b>				
2.01	Review impact of abolition of EMA and instigate common hardship criteria across Nottingham.	May not be enough	JY	AR	July 2011
2.02	Review of provision available in 2011/12 to ensure sufficient choice for learners.	May not be enough	JY	AR	July 2011
2.03	Discussions with YPLA regarding quality of academy offer and involvement of academies in school sixth form quality dialogue.	May not be enough	JY	AR	December 2011
2.04	Action plan for 14-19 plan to enable transition between KS4 and post 16 to be implemented.	Effective	JY	TK	September 2011
2.05	Review of core role of LA support services. Development of traded services with schools. Transition support for young people with autism 14-19.	Effective	MPa	AW	July 2011
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through vocational qualifications.</b>				
3.01	Monitoring of performance in post 16 institutions.	May not be	JY	AR	September 2011
3.01	Partnership agreement between Unity Learning Centre and city schools (NCSA Ltd) to provide education for 30 year 11 pupils.	Effective	MPa	TD	June 2011
3.02	Promotion of vocational learning through Connexions.	Effective	JY	Connexions	September 2011
3.03	Review of Wolf review and implications for Nottingham.	May not be enough	JY	TK	April 2011
3.04	Review of YA contracts.	May not be enough	JY	TK	April 2011
3.05	Implementation of Apprenticeship action plan.	Effective	JY	AR	April 2011
3.06	Implementation of Apprenticeship action plan.	Effective	JY	AR	April 2011
3.07	Working with YPLA and Nottingham Futures to find alternative provision for young people aged 16-18.	May not be enough	MPa	MPr	July 2011
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through vocational qualifications.</b>				
4.01	Review of provision available in 2011/12 to ensure sufficient choice for learners.	May not be enough	JY	AR	July 2011

Risk Ref.	Constituent Risk Description	Risk Mitigation Effectiveness	Responsibility for action Owner	Support	Completion date/ review cycle
<b>ADDITIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:</b>					
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for children (Key stage)</b>				
1.15	Provision management discussions with schools to identify school responsibilities.	Effective	MP	AW	September 2011
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Failure to deliver improved educational outcomes for young people through vocational qualifications.</b>				
3.08	If funding is reduced, review service needs with existing service function for pregnant teenagers.	Effective	Mpa	MPr	July 2011