

DUNMORE INFANT JUNIOR RISK REGISTER

Children Young People & Families
Educational Effectiveness

Risk Ref	Risk/Uncertainty Identification	Risk/Uncertainty Mitigation	Risk Owner	Original Risk Assessment							Revised Risk Assessment					Reason for any change
				Date Assessed	Impact Category	Description of priority/Target affected	Performance target/priority	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation Status	Risk Reporting Level	Date Revised	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation Status	
1	<p><u>Create a new primary school by closing Dunmore Infant and Dunmore Junior Schools</u></p> <p>H/T may not be appointed until Jan 08. Uncertainty for staff and decreased moral Loss of one set of fixed costs to budget</p>	<p>Continue with present leadership arrangements until January 2007.</p> <p>Create shadow governing body New School allowance for setting up. No redundancies but some restructuring.</p>	EES	04.12.06	3	EES Priority 1 & 2		2	2	1	Director					
2	<p><u>Extend age range of Fitzharrys to 3-19 and close the Dunmore Infant and Junior Schools</u></p> <p>KS2 gap remains as no KS2 leadership experience in Fitzharrys and no recent experience among DI staff</p> <p>Staff fear of loss of jobs Parental distrust of untried structure and size of institution. Few tested models</p>	<p>HT already in post.</p> <p>SMT can be extended to include DI SMT</p> <p>KS2 leader to be recruited by September 2007</p> <p>Extend existing governing body to include primary governors</p> <p>No redundancies but some restructuring and benefits from economies of scale.</p>	EES	04.12.06	3	EES Priority 1 & 2		2	2	1	Director					
3	<p><u>Maintain status quo by keeping separate Infant and Junior schools</u></p> <p>Does not remove Jun School from Special Measures. Does not solve leadership problem in KS2 - no guarantee of recruiting substantive Junior School H/T</p> <p>Interim arrangements not sustainable.</p> <p>Continues pattern of inconsistent communication and liaison between 2 schools</p>	<p>Dunmore Infant HT in post</p> <p>Need to recruit Junior school H/T by September 2007</p> <p>Existing governing bodies work more closely together</p>	EES	04.12.06	5	EES Priority 1 & 2		4	3	3	Director					

DUNMORE INFANT JUNIOR RISK REGISTER

Risk Ref	Risk/Uncertainty Identification Description of the cause, the risk/uncertainty that could happen and the impact (positives or negatives)	Risk/Uncertainty Mitigation Description of actions taken or controls in place to reduce risk/uncertainty, incl. contingency plans (include dates where new actions added)	Risk Owner	Original Risk Assessment							Revised Risk Assessment					Reason for any change
				Date Assessed	Impact Category	Description of priority/Target affected	Performance target/priority	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation Status	Risk Reporting Level	Date Revised	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation Status	
	Limited ways of addressing dip in achievement in Yrs 3 & 4 of Junior school. No financial benefits	EES to contribute support leadership development to increase Leadership capacity EES to facilitate communication between 2 schools														
4	<u>Extend age range of the Infants school to include Dunmore Junior and close Dunmore Junior School</u> KS2 leadership gap remains Untested capacity and willingness of Dunmore Infant H/T and SMT to manage and create new primary school Capacity of Governors to provide strategic direction for a larger primary school Loss of one set of fixed costs Does not qualify for new school setting up allowance but amalgamation allowance available	H/T already in post. Recruit KS2 leader for September 07. No recent KS2 leadership experience among Infant Leadership Team. EES to increase leadership capacity Governing body to extend to include new governors including some from Junior school governing body More effective deployment of staff in restructuring		04.12.06	4	EES Priority 1 & 2		3	2	3	Director					
5	<u>Create a federation of the Infant and Junior Schools</u> KS2 leadership gap remains Leadership of 2 schools rests on Infant School Headteacher and SMT Loss of 2 separate governing bodies No guarantee of improvements if staffing structures, teaching and learning practices remain separate in the 2 schools Both schools retain separate budgets.	Recruit KS2 lead for September 07 EES to support leadership development of IS SMT Opportunity to create 1 governing body from existing governors EES support essential to encourage a holistic approach to teaching, learning and assessment in both schools Budgets to be deployed by new governing body as a shared resource.		02.01.07	4	EES Priority 1 & 2		4	3	3	Director					

CA5 - page 71
RISK MITIGATION/CONTINGENCY PLANS

To be completed for all risks with a mitigation status of 3

Risk Ref	Area of Risk	Specific Action needed to minimise risk	Contingency Plan or Response if risk materialises (e.g. where risk is outside OCC control)	Resource Implications	Outcome/measure of success	Target Impact Score	Target Likelihood Score	Deadline	Lead Officer	Service	Section	Progress
EE7	Traded services income target not being met could impact on HR and other resources in EES thus reducing levels of support available for school improvement work	Complete restructuring of EES as part of realignment	Reduction of HR support for lower priority areas.	Reduction of internal HR and external/consultancy support costs	Reduction of deficit between income target and business costs.	2	2	Oct-06	Irene Kirkman	Educational Effectiveness	School Support Services	
		Produce costings of traded services as part of business plan	Scale down use of outsourcing/consultancy support	Increased income target for high yield low cost areas.								
		Produce a marketing plan as part of the QuEST business plan to improve the promotion of QuEST products and services	Focus on maximising income from high yield areas and eliminate low demand higher preparation cost areas or increase charges for them.									
		Produce a cohesive policy for quality assurance										

GUIDANCE

Directorate and Service Name	This field automatically populates hidden columns A&B which allows the directorate to combine risk registers and analyse their risks for further reporting to Director/CCMT
enter quarter and year here e.g. quarter 4 05-06	This field is used to identify the quarter that the risk register has been updated.
Risk Ref	This must be a unique reference which can identify the risk. For example, use the service initials and then 1,2,3, e.g. BSS1
Area of Risk/Uncertainty Identified	Describe the area of risk or uncertainty and the impact it will have.
	As a result of <Cause> <uncertain event> may occur which would lead to <effect or impact>
Mitigation - Actions taken or controls in place to reduce risk/uncertainty	Describe actions already taken or controls in place to mitigate the risk. Do not include any planned action here as this should be in the mitigation plan. Where new action completed is added include a date.
Risk Owner	Who is responsible for monitoring this risk
ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT	This is the result of the first assessment of the risk taking into account the mitigation actions and controls in place (not planned). This assessment will remain in the risk registers and any changes are recored in the "revised Assessment" fields
Date	Date of first assessment
Category of Impact	Indicate the main area that the risk will impact - Performance (eg priorities), Finance, Reputation/Customers
Priority Description	If the impact category is Performance then indicate priority or BVPI affected
Priority Ref	Use this field to indicate the specific BVPI or Priority Reference
Impact Assessment	See Table:
Likelihood	See table:
Mitigation Status	This is an assessment of whether the level of risk is acceptable or not based on the mitigation action or controls in place. If it is a 3 then a separate mitigation plan is required.
Reporting Level	This will be automatically filled in based on the assessment of risk (See Risk Profile Matrix)
REVISED RISK ASSESSMENT	Any risk with a Mitigation status of 2 or 3 should be reviewed each quarter and where necessary update the risk assessment or add in actions completed and change mitigation status.

GUIDANCE

LIKELIHOOD SCALES

4	Very Likely	This risk is very likely to occur (over 75% probability)
3	Likely	There is a distinct likelihood that this will happen (50%-75%)
2	Possible	There a possibility that this could happen (25% - 50%)
1	Unlikely	This is not likely to happen but it is not possible to say that it won't (less than 25% probability)

IMPACT SCALES

		PERFORMANCE	FINANCIAL	REPUTATION/CUSTOMER/CITIZEN
5	Most Severe	Cross-cutting all directorates or Achievement of Council priority or Achievement of Key BVPI /PSA.	Over £1m	Ministerial Intervention/Public Inquiry Remembered for years!
4	Major	Would be cross-cutting at least two directorates or Council priority impaired or Service priority not achieved or Key BVPI/PSA impaired	Between £500k and £1m.	Adverse national media interest or Recurring or sustained local media attention
3	Moderate	Impact contained within directorate but cross more than one service or Service priority impaired Minimal impact on BVPIs/PSA	Between 100k and £500k.	One off adverse local media interest
2	Minor	Very little impact on service plan priorities or Local PIs not met or Operations disrupted	Between 10k and £100k.	A number of complaints but no press interest
1	Insignificant	Impact would be limited to operational objectives not being met or No impact on Council/service priorities/BVPIs/PSA	Under £10k	Minor complaints

Mitigation Status

3	Not Acceptable as:	Further action/controls or contingency plans need to be determined or next level of management need to make a decision on <u>action required</u>
2	Not Acceptable as:	Mitigation action has been identified but not yet implemented or it is too early to tell whether level of risk has been reduced effectively as a result of recent action or controls or not enough information is available at the moment and the risk needs to be monitored
1	Acceptable as:	Confident that actions taken/controls in place, incl. contingency plans are mitigating risk and uncertainty to an acceptable level or - It is not cost effective to reduce the risk further or- The risk cannot be reduced further as it is outside the control of OCC

GUIDANCE

This table can be used to show the spread of risks across the service/directorate.

RISK PROFILE

5 Most Severe 4 Major 3 Moderate 2 Minor 1 Insignificant				
	1 Unlikely LIKELIHOOD	2 Possible	3 Likely	4 Very Likely

RED
 AMBER
 GREEN

CCMT & Director need to be informed
 Director needs to be informed
 Head of Service monitors