

Osteopathic Practice Con 18 June 2015 Risk Register	nmittee
Classification	Public
Purpose	For consideration
Issue	The two policy committees are asked by Council and to consider the GOsC's high-level Risk Register at least once a year so that members can judge their effectiveness of scrutiny of the activities contained within it.
Recommendation	To provide feedback on assurance mechanisms described in the Risk Register at the Annex.
Financial and resourcing implications	None
Equality and diversity implications	None
Communications implications	None
Annex	Risk Register March 2015
Author	Tim Walker

7

Background

- 1. The GOsC's Risk register is kept up to date by the Senior Management Team and reviewed by Council every six months. It is also reviewed by the Audit Committee at each of its meetings.
- 2. In 2014 Council recommended that the Education and Registration Standards and Osteopathic Practice Committees should consider the Register in relation to their own roles at least annually.

Discussion

- 3. The Committee is invited to review the assurance mechanism column in the Risk Register and consider whether in relation to the risks and mitigating actions described, whether the assurance mechanisms are operating appropriately. In doing so, the Committee may wish to consider the following questions:
 - a. Does the Committee have adequate oversight of the mitigating actions described?
 - b. Are there any areas where Council oversight is the assurance mechanism where the Committee might provide additional supportive assurance or advice?
 - c. Are there any areas where the Committee considers it might be desirable to receive additional assurance (within its terms of reference) but where this is currently missing?
- 4. Feedback from members at this meeting will be used to inform future agenda planning for the Committee and amendments to the Risk Register.

Recommendation: to provide feedback on assurance mechanisms described in the Risk Register at the Annex.

Risk register – March 2015

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
1.1 Pre- registration education and training	 Quality of initial education and training falls below required standards 	External	1x2=L	\checkmark	 Quality Assurance process Training and appraisal of assessors Ongoing engagement with OEIs Course closure review process 	 ERSC oversight of QA reports, Annual Reports, closure plans ERSC biannual review of QAA process
	Initial education does not reflect current healthcare practice and expectations	External	2x2=M		 Guidance for Osteopathic Pre-registration Education Professionalism Working Group looking at supplementary guidance Ongoing engagement with OEIs 	ERSC oversight of activity
	OEI graduates do not exhibit appropriate behaviours and values	External	2x2=M		 Student fitness to practise work Professionalism work Ongoing engagement with OEIs Professional values programme 	ERSC oversight of activity
	Course or institution ceases to function	External	3x1=M		Ongoing engagement with OEIs to alert us to possibility and to put in place plans to move students if necessary	ERSC oversight of Annual Reports and relationships with OEIs
1.2 Confidence in the register	 Registration data is inaccurate or individuals are wrongly registered 	Internal	2x2=M	\checkmark	 Registration manual Good character assessment framework Data quality checks Improvements to online tools Review of EU/international registration 	 ERSC and Council oversight of activity Internal audit reports to Audit Committee
	 Register is not effectively used by patients or promoted by registrants 	External	2x1=L		Improvements to register functionalityPromoting your registration campaign	 Council oversight via Communications Annual Report
	Illegal practice goes unchecked or increases	Internal	1x2=L	\checkmark	Enforcement policyPublicity around prosecutions	 Council oversight of Regulation reports and dashboard

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
	 Registration assessments do not prevent registration of ineligible applicants 	Internal	1x2=L	\checkmark	 Training and appraisal of assessors Moderation meetings with GOsC staff Registration review 	 ERSC Chair/member appraisal of assessors Oversight of registration review by ERSC
	Clinical responsibility clarity required in international registration assessments	External	3x2=H	\checkmark	 Priority action in current registration review 	ERSC oversight
1.3 Transition into practice	 New graduates are unable to meet ongoing standards for registration 	External	2x2=M		 Quality Assurance process Ongoing engagement with OEIs Mentoring project 	 ERSC oversight of QA reports Council oversight of ODG activity
	 Newly registered international applicants are unable to meet ongoing standards for registration 	External	2x2=M	\checkmark	Transition into practice support work	ERSC oversight of policy development and implementation
	Lack of support for improved mentoring among registrants	External	2x1=L		Engagement with OEIs, regional groups and others in profession	Council oversight of ODG activity
1.4 Continuing fitness to practise	Registrants fail to engage with proposed process	External	2x2=M		 Communication and engagement activity 'Pathfinder' groups 	OPC and Council oversight of CFtP process
(revalidation)	Profession lacks capacity to implement new proposals	External	2x2=M		 Communication and engagement activity 'Pathfinder' groups Dialogue with regional groups, OEIs and other bodies 	OPC and Council oversight of CFtP process
	Unable to obtain PSA/DH buy-in to proposals	External	2x2=M		Engagement with key organisationsEffectiveness of regulation research	OPC and Council oversight of CFtP process

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
	Inadequate resources available for current and future work	Internal	2x2=M		Use of reserves for set up costsBudget strategy and reserves policy	OPC and Council oversight of CFtP process
	 Need for new legislation 	External	2x2=M		Engagement with DH	OPC and Council oversight of CFtP process
1.5 Fitness to practise	Legal challenges to ftp and/or registration processes	External	3x1=M	~	 Quality Assurance process Training for non-execs and staff Regulation and Registration manuals FtP and registration reports to Council Recruitment and training of new Legal Assessors 	 Council oversight of Regulation and registration reports and dashboard PSA audits
	Complaint progression is not effective or timely	Internal	2x2=M	\checkmark	 Quality Assurance process Regulation and registration manuals FtP and Registration reports to Council 	Council oversight of Regulation and registration reports and dashboard
	Complaint volumes exceed resource capacity	External/ Internal	2x2=M	\checkmark	 Financial reserves available to meet any surge Implementation of threshold criteria 	Council and Audit Committee oversight
2.1 Continuing fitness to practise (CPD)	Registrants fail to engage with best practice	External	2x1=L		Communication and engagement activity	ERSC/OPC and Council oversight
	Inadequate resources available for current and future work	Internal	2x1=L		Budget strategy and reserves policy	Council and Audit Committee oversight
2.2 Osteopathic practice standards	Registrants fail to engage with standards	External	2x2=M	~	 Communication and engagement activity Provision of learning resources Continuing fitness to practise development Values work 	ERSC/OPC and Council oversight
	Inadequate resources available for current and future work	Internal	2x1=L		Budget strategy and reserves policy	Council and Audit Committee oversight

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
2.3 Quality and patient care	 Partners unable to commit to required work or disengage with process 	External	2x1=L		Engagement with partners	Council oversight of ODG activity
	Inadequate resources available for current and future work	External/ Internal	1x1=L		Budget strategy and reserves policy Engagement with partners	Council oversight of ODG activity
2.4 Professional standards and values	Partners unable to commit to required work or disengage with process	External	2x1=L		 Internal Francis programme board and ongoing activities beyond completion of Action Plan Engagement with partners 	Council oversight
	 Inadequate resources available for current and future work 	External/ Internal	1x1=L		Budget strategy and reserves policy Engagement with partners	Council oversight
3.1 Service quality	Operational activities subject to legal challenge	External	3x1=M	\checkmark	 Quality Assurance process Registration manual	 ERSC/OPC and Council oversight PSA audits
	Failure of IT infrastructure	External	2x3=H	\checkmark	 SLAs with IT providers and regular review meetings Maintenance and service contracts Business continuity planning 	Audit Committee oversightCouncil oversight
	Business continuity failure (non-IT)	External	1x3=M	\checkmark	Business continuity planningMaintenance and service activities	Council oversightAudit Committee oversight
	Failure to deal effectively with information governance requirements	Internal	2x2=M	\checkmark	 Information governance framework Training for staff Non-executive briefings 	Audit Committee oversight

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
	Loss of confidence in quality of service provision	External	1x3=M	\checkmark	Service standards and monitoringUser surveys	Council oversight
3.2 Engagement	 Stakeholders fail to engage with activity 	External	2x2=M		Communication and Engagement Strategy and Annual Report	Council oversight
	Inadequate resources available for current and future work	Internal	1x1=L		Budget strategy and reserves policy	Council oversight
3.3 Governance	Governance processes subject to legal challenge or complaints	External	2x2=M	\checkmark	 Governance handbook and policies/review Appointment processes Induction and training Council review of performance 	 RaAC oversight PSA oversight
	Loss of confidence in work of the GOsC	External	1x3=M	\checkmark	Performance evaluationEngagement with registrants	Council oversightPSA Performance Review
	Breakdown in internal financial controls	Internal	1x2=L	\checkmark	Internal financial controlsInformation governance framework	 External annual audit/Key Issues Memorandum Audit Committee oversight
	Failure to meet Equality Act or employment duties	Internal	1x2=L	\checkmark	 Equality and diversity policy and plan Dedicated HR resource and staff handbook 	 Council oversight of equality and diversity policy RaAC oversight of HR policies
	Adverse audit or Performance Review report from PSA	External	1x3=M	\checkmark	 Established internal Performance Review processes Internal audits of fitness to practise 	Council oversight of reports/ action plans
3.4 Value for money	Poor control of costs resulting in fee increases	Internal	1x3=M	\checkmark	 Procurement rules and monitoring processes Quarterly financial updates 	 Audit Committee Publication of contract data (new requirement in 2014 from ICO)
	Loss of confidence in financial management	Internal	1x2=L	\checkmark	Internal financial controlsQuarterly financial updates	External annual audit/Key Issues Memorandum

Business Plan work stream	Risk description	Risk source	Risk rating LxI=R	Risk averse area	Mitigating actions	Assurance mechanisms
					Audit process	Audit Committee
3.5 Legislative reform	Inadequate resources available for future work	Internal	2x2=M		Use of reserves for legal support if necessary	Council oversight of budget
	Inability to improve processes due to lack of new legislation	External	3x2=H		Engagement with, Department of Health and other regulators	Council oversight

Risk ratings

Lik	elihood	Im	pact
1	Less likely than not to occur or	1	Single area of business subject to
	not expected to occur		disruption
2	May or may not occur	2	Disruption to whole business or single area unable to function effectively
3	Expected to occur or more likely than not to occur	3	Whole business unable to function effectively

Risk level score (Likelihood x Impact)	Overall risk rating
1-2	Low
3-4	Medium
6-9	High