

Transfer Payment Recipient (TPR) Risk Assessment Project

TPR Risk Assessment Questionnaire

TPR RA Questionnaire

December 13, 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Instructions	4
TPR Information	5
Human Resources / People	6
Financial	12
Information & Information Technology.....	20
Program Design & Delivery	24
Legal	28
Emergency Management.....	33
Governance.....	37
Reputational.....	44

Introduction

The Ministry of Children, Community, and Social Services (MCCSS) is introducing a new risk management process with Transfer Payment Recipient (TPRs) beginning in January 2024. TPRs are being asked to complete a self-assessment for organizational risk and work with ministry staff to complete the exercise. The process will require responding to questions across eight risk categories, including: Service Delivery; Stakeholder Relationships; Finance; Governance; Information Technology; Emergency Management; Human Resources and Legal. While the new module the ministry will be using within TPON does not allow for direct input for TPRs at this time, ministry staff will be working collaboratively with TPRs to collect information using this data collection questionnaire and through discussions.

Information sessions for all TPRs will be held in January 2024 and information on the new risk assessment process will be available shortly on the ministry's website.

How to get help

As always, your primary source of support are your Ministry regional office contacts.

Thank you for your support during this important TP Modernization initiative.

Instructions

Transfer Payment Recipient Action Required:

In the TPR Information section (Page 5), please input:

- TPR Name
- Contact Information
- TPR Approver

Review each of the questions from each category and select the appropriate risk rating. Consider “Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?”

Please complete the following sections as they apply to your organization and return your completed form to your lead Regional Office. If you have any questions or would like more information on the TPR Risk Assessment process, you can go to the ministry's TPR RA FAQ webpage.

Fields to be completed by TPRs:

- Select appropriate radio button for risk rating.
- What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required). Please do not attach any supporting documents unless requested by MCCSS staff.
- Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable). The input section has a scrolling option, you can enter multiple dates, as applicable.

Fields for Ministry use only:

- Ministry Risk Assessor Notes
- Contributor(s) Notes

TPR Information

TPR Name:

Contact Information:

TPR Approver:

Human Resources / People

Question 1: Does the management team demonstrate the requisite competencies, knowledge and skills to deliver on contracted services?

1. All (100%) of the management team has the requisite core competencies and the required knowledge, skills, and experience to deliver on contract expectations.
2. A vast majority of the management team (at least 80%) has the requisite core competencies and the required knowledge, skills, and experience to deliver on contract expectations.
3. More than half of the management team (at least 60%) has the requisite core competencies and the required knowledge, skills, and experience to deliver on contract expectations.
4. Less than half of the management team (less than 40%) has the requisite core competencies and the required knowledge, skills, and experience to deliver on contract expectations.
5. A limited number of the management team (less than 20%) has the requisite core competencies and the required knowledge, skills, and experience to deliver on contract expectations.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Performance reviews, auditing reports, client feedback, job descriptions, management team interview questions, team resumes.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Does the TPR have a robust and healthy staffing complement and appropriate plans for recruitment and retention to support delivery of contracted services?

1. TPR has not had difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified staff, has a well-planned process for recruitment and is well-connected to potential sources of new talent.
2. TPR has had some difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining qualified staff, even though it has an adequate recruitment plan, but cannot attract qualified staff due to factors beyond its control.
3. TPR has had significant difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining qualified staff and its recruitment plan is inadequate.
4. TPR has had difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining qualified staff, and its recruitment plan is still under development.
5. TPR has had significant difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining qualified staff and has not developed a plan for recruitment.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Short/long-term recruitment plan, action plan, networking structures, job descriptions, interview processes, HR plans.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the TPR's relationship with their bargaining agent(s) or staff pose a risk to service delivery?

1. TPR has a collaborative and constructive working relationship with staff/bargaining agent. There is no risk to service delivery.
2. TPR has a positive working relationship with staff/bargaining agent. There is no risk to service delivery.
3. TPR has a functioning working relationship with staff/bargaining agent. There is an inherent risk to service delivery.
4. TPR has a strained working relationship with staff/bargaining agent. There is minor risk to service delivery.
5. TPR does not have a collaborative and constructive working relationship with staff/bargaining agent. There is a major risk to service delivery.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Collective agreement, past issues, management complaints and grievances, application to Ministry of Labour, training and skills development, strike actions, no-board report.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

Consider the general nature of the TPR relationship with their bargaining agent(s) or staff over the long term and not exclusively the point in time of the assessment.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Are succession planning and leadership/TPR transition strategies in place to support continuity of service delivery?

1. The TPR has an established succession planning framework and strategies in place to avoid service delivery interruptions during leadership transitions and TPR changes.
2. The TPR has a succession planning framework and strategies in place to avoid most service delivery interruptions during leadership transitions and TPR changes.
3. The TPR has a succession planning framework but no strategies in place. May lead to minor disruptions in service delivery during leadership transitions and TPR changes.
4. The TPR has a weak succession planning framework and no strategies in place. May lead to major disruptions in service delivery during leadership transitions and TPR changes.
5. The TPR has neither a succession planning framework nor any strategies in place to avoid interrupted service delivery during leadership transitions and TPR changes.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Succession management plan, exit interview policy, action plan, meeting minutes, TPR bylaws, change management plan.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 5: Does the TPR have adequate and current training, onboarding and knowledge transfer procedures/policies in place to deliver contracted services?

1. TPR has adequate and current training, onboarding and knowledge transfer policies and been reviewed within the past 2 years. TPR has a process to capture, document and disseminate knowledge. The TPR follows this process consistently.
2. TPR has adequate and current training, onboarding and knowledge transfer policies and been reviewed within the past 3 years. TPR has a process to capture, document and disseminate knowledge. The TPR does not consistently follow this process.
3. TPR has adequate and current training, onboarding and knowledge transfer policies and been reviewed within the past 5 years. TPR has a process to capture, document and disseminate knowledge. The TPR does not consistently follow this process.
4. TPR has adequate and current training, onboarding and knowledge transfer policies and been reviewed within the past 5+ years. TPR has a process to capture, document and disseminate knowledge. The TPR does not consistently follow this process.
5. TPR has no training, onboarding, and knowledge transfer. TPR does not have a process to capture, document and disseminate knowledge.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Employee onboarding package, employee handbook, employee orientation schedule, official staff training roles, exit interview policy, knowledge transfer plans.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 6: Does the TPR provide training regarding Infection Prevention Control (IPAC) and emergency management planning and procedures as part of the onboarding process?

1. TPR has a structured training program and provides dedicated training sessions along with continuous learning resources on IPAC and emergency management planning and procedures.
2. TPR has a structured training program and provides dedicated training sessions but no continuous learning resources on IPAC and emergency management planning and procedures.
3. TPR has a structured training program and provides only optional training sessions on IPAC and emergency management planning and procedures.
4. TPR has an unstructured training program and provides only optional training sessions on IPAC and emergency management planning and procedures.
5. TPR does not provide training regarding Infection Prevention Control (IPAC) and emergency management planning and procedures.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Employee onboarding package, employee handbook, employee orientation schedule, health and safety records including committee information, minutes/inspections, drills, etc.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Financial

Question 1: Does the TPR have current financial policies and procedures to support prudent management of resources and mitigate financial risks?

1. The TPR has detailed financial policies and procedures, including procurement, meals/hospitality, travel, and controllership (e.g., segregation of duties) policies, and they have been reviewed in the past 2 years.
2. The TPR has detailed financial policies and procedures, including procurement, meals/hospitality, travel, and controllership (e.g., segregation of duties) policies, and they have been reviewed in the past 3 years.
3. The TPR has financial policies and procedures procurement, meals/hospitality, travel, and controllership (e.g., segregation of duties) policies, and they have been reviewed in the past 5 years.
4. The TPR has financial policies and procedures, but they are not comprehensive and/or have not been updated or reviewed in the past 5 years.
5. The TPR does not have any financial policies and procedures.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's financial policies and procedures; Travel, Meal, and Hospitality Expenses policies, Procurement of Goods Services Consulting policies; Purchase orders, Contracts, Delegation of Financial Authority documentation

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Does the TPR have mechanisms and protocols in place to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective action when it occurs?

1. The TPR has comprehensive mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions when it occurs. These policies and procedures were reviewed in the last two years.
2. The TPR has put in place mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions when it occurs. These policies and procedures were reviewed in the last three years.
3. The TPR has put in place mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions when it occurs. These policies and procedures were reviewed in the last five years.
4. The TPR does not have adequate mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions when it occurs.
5. The TPR has not developed and put in place mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions when it occurs.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's financial policies and procedures on risk of fraud, whistle-blower policy, a risk registry approach to report organizational risks to the board, internal audit function, correspondence between the TPR and Ministry, stakeholder concerns, complaints, and escalation process.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the TPR have adequate and reliable financial controls, forecasts, and effective plans to deal with variances?

1. The TPR had no variance in the overall interim reporting expenditure projections, and it has adequate and reliable financial controls, forecasts, and effective plans to deal with variances.
2. The TPR had a variance of under 5% in the overall interim reporting expenditure projections, and it has adequate and reliable financial controls, forecasts, and effective plans to deal with variances.
3. The TPR had a variance between 5% and 10% in the overall interim reporting expenditure projections and applied financial flexibility correctly.
4. The TPR had a variance between 5% and 10% in the overall interim reporting expenditure projections, and/or applied financial flexibility incorrectly.
5. The TPR had a variance over 10% in the overall interim reporting expenditure projections, and/or applied financial flexibility incorrectly.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's financial policies and procedures; copies of approved forecasts and budgets, copies of variance analysis with a materiality threshold, copies of dashboards, correspondence with the Ministry.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Based on the year-end funding reconciliation, have there been significant recoveries/deficits from this TPR?

1. This TPR had no recoveries/deficits based on the settlement letter.
2. This TPR had insignificant recoveries/deficits for immaterial amounts.
3. This TPR had recoveries/deficits less than 1% of the annual budget due to causes not under the control of the TPR and/or flagged the variance to the ministry prior to the annual reconciliation.
4. This TPR had recoveries exceeding 1% of the annual budget, due to issues largely controllable by the TPR and plans are in place to address those issues.
5. This TPR had recoveries exceeding 2% of the annual budget, due to issues largely controllable by the TPR. The TPR does not have plans in place to address recoveries/deficits in the future and/or didn't flag the variance prior to the annual reconciliation.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Ministry annual reconciliation and settlement letter, The TPR's Financial Policies and Directives, TPR bylaws, financial management plan (in-year and multi-year), action plan.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 5: Has a recent third-party review raised any financial concerns about the TPR’s financial health that pose a risk to service delivery? This may include the Financial Review Engagement or Post Audit Management Letter/Audited Financial Statement from an audit, a consultant, external boards, and/or ministry review.

1. No financial concerns raised by a third-party review.
2. A third-party review raised financial concerns in the last 12 months that the TPR has addressed, and the results of the implementation will be monitored.
3. A third-party review raised financial concerns in the last 12 months that the TPR has partially addressed.
4. A third-party review raised financial concerns in the last 12 months that the TPR has not fully addressed. The financial statement audit has raised an unusual note disclosure that may raise financial concerns.
5. A third-party review raised financial concerns in the last 12 months that the TPR has not addressed. The financial statement audit has raised an unusual note disclosure that may raise financial concerns and/or the TPR is not a going concern.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Financial Review Engagement or Post Audit Management Letter, audited financial statement from an audit, a consultant, external boards, and/or ministry review, financial review recommendations, performance reports, action plan.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 6: Based on the TPRs regular ministry submissions (e.g., Interim and Final Report Back), are there any financial health concerns that pose a risk to service delivery?

1. No concerns from the financial analysis, it has no recent real deficits on an annual basis in the last three years. It has a current ratio greater than 1.2 and a surplus in unrestricted net assets (e.g., a positive balance in board funds).
2. No concerns from the financial analysis, it has no recent real deficits on an annual basis in the last three years. It has a current ratio between 1 and 1.2 and a surplus in unrestricted net assets (e.g., a positive balance in board funds).
3. A recent real deficit on an annual basis in the last three years. The current ratio is less than one, consistent with past patterns.
4. A recent real deficit on an annual basis in the last two years. The current ratio is less than one, inconsistent with past patterns.
5. The financial analysis has raised concerns in its debt liabilities, it has a real accumulated deficit in net assets and the current ratio has significantly changed, inconsistent with past patterns.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Ministry submissions (e.g., interim, and final report backs, ad hoc reporting), the TPR's Financial Policies and Directives, TPR bylaws, financial management plan (in-year and multi-year), action Plan, financial statements, ratio analyses, benchmarking, comparison to other similar agencies, audited financial statements and segmented information.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 7: Has the TPR had funding reductions from other funders that affect MCCSS service delivery?

1. The TPR's funding from another funder is secure, or the TPR only receives funding from MCCSS.
2. The TPR's funding from another funder has been reduced and will only minimally affect its MCCSS service delivery.
3. The TPR's funding from another funder has been reduced and will likely affect its MCCSS service delivery.
4. The TPR's funding from another funder has been substantially reduced, impacting its MCCSS service delivery.
5. The TPR's funding from another funder has been completely cut, impacting its MCCSS service delivery.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Identified off-setting revenue in the TPBP and Audited Financial Statements. Other Potential Risks would include investment risk; segregation of duties and oversight of financial functions; knowledgeable staff in the finance unit, pay equity plans, EHT audits, WSIB audits etc., labour negotiations/collective agreements.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 8: Does the TPR have the ability to provide complete and timely financial reports as per ministry requirements?

1. The TPR always provides complete and timely financial reports to the ministry.
2. Financial reports are complete, but they are sometimes late in their submission, with a reasonable explanation.
3. Financial reports are complete, but they are consistently late in their submissions.
4. Financial reports are incomplete and/or are always/usually late in their submission.
5. The TPR does not provide financial reports to the ministry.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR has documentation to support timely submission of copies of Ministry required submissions.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Information & Information Technology

Question 1: Are IT Policies and technology in place to protect and back up data and prevent access/disclosure?

1. Policies exist and have been reviewed within the last 12-18 months. Technology matching the policy is in place to prevent unauthorized access and back up data.
2. Policies exist and have been reviewed within the last 2 years. Technology matching the policy is in place to prevent unauthorized access and back up data.
3. Policies exist and have been reviewed within the last 4 years. Technology matching the policy is in place to prevent unauthorized access and back up data.
4. Technology exists but Policies do not. **OR** Policies exist but Technology is not in place. **OR** both exist but have not been reviewed or matched in more than 4 years.
5. No IT policies exist, and no technology is in place to back up data or prevent unauthorized access.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's IT security architecture model, certification of security for Software as a Service (SaaS) providers.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Are contingency plans in place to recover from system outages up to and including Disaster Recovery?

1. Contingency plans are in place for system outages and a full Disaster Recovery Plan is in place and these have been reviewed within the last 12-18 months.
2. Contingency plans are in place for system outages and a full Disaster Recovery Plan is in place and these have been reviewed within the last 3 years.
3. Contingency plans are in place for system outages and a full Disaster Recovery Plan is in place and these have been reviewed within the last 4 years.
4. A contingency plan, reviewed within the last 4 years, exists but a Disaster Recovery Plan does not. **OR** A Disaster Recovery plan exists, reviewed within the last 4 years, but a contingency plan does not. **OR** both exist but the last review was more than 4 years ago.
5. No contingency plans in place for system outages or Disaster Recovery.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's disaster recovery plan, business continuity plan.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Have there been any identified data breaches within the last 3 years?

1. There have been no identified data breaches, related media reports, or resulting litigation during this time period.
2. A breach was identified but there was no resulting media report or litigation. Policies and technology have been updated to prevent future breaches based on the forensic review.
3. A breach was identified and there was no resulting media report or litigation. Policies and technology have not been updated to prevent future breaches based on the forensic review of the breach.
4. A breach was identified and either a media report or litigation resulted. Steps have been taken to update policies and technology resulting from the forensic review of the breach, but the issue remains contentious.
5. There has been an identified data breach that has resulted in a media report and/or litigation. No remediating action has taken place as a result of the forensic review of the breach.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR's server records, audit records, Software as a Service (SaaS) attestations.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Does the TPR have technology and training in place to protect against a cyber attack?

1. TPR has had technology refreshed and has delivered cyber-training to staff within the past 12-18 months.
2. TPR has had technology refreshed and has delivered cyber-training to staff within the past 2 years.
3. TPR has had technology refreshed and has delivered cyber-training to staff within the past 3 years.
4. TPR has had technology refreshed but has never delivered cyber-training to staff within the past 4 years or has delivered cyber-training to staff but has not refreshed technology within the past 4 years.
5. TPR has either no technology or has technology that has not been updated in more than 4 years **and** has never delivered cyber-training to staff.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR training material and proof of delivery.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Program Design & Delivery

Question 1: Does the Transfer Payment Recipient (TPR) have established service policies for continuous improvement and processes to monitor and identify risks related to the service standards?

1. TPR has established policies that have been reviewed/updated by board of directors within the past two years. TPR has monitoring processes in place to identify, mitigate and address risks to service standards. Information is reported to senior management / board regularly.
2. TPR has established policies and been reviewed within the past three years. TPR has monitoring processes in place to identify, mitigate and address risks to service standards. Collected information is not regularly reported to senior management / board.
3. TPR has established policies and been reviewed within the past five years. TPR in some instances identifies risks and reports it to senior management / board but there is no system to mitigate or address the identified risks.
4. TPR has established policies, but they are out-dated and latest versions are more than five years old. TPR does not regularly identify risks to report to senior management / board. Risk management is not addressed or documented consistently.
5. TPR has no policies in place. TPR has no monitoring processes in place to identify, mitigate and address risks to service standards.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Ministry policies, directives, service contracts, service description schedules in Service Objectives. Review organization's program manuals, policies and procedures, assessment/evaluation processes and service delivery standards. TPR Website can be reviewed for items identifying methods of improvement.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

The following link will take you directly to the Service Objectives Document website:

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/ministry-children-community-and-social-services-service-objectives>

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Does TPR have policies and procedures that support continuous improvement of client outcomes to protect the health, safety, and wellbeing of clients?

1. Policies and practices are in place and have been reviewed and updated within the past 2 years. Monitoring and outcome tracking processes are in place to identify opportunities to improve health, safety, and wellbeing of clients. Information is reported to senior management / board.
2. Policies are in place and have been reviewed within the past 3 years. Monitoring and outcome tracking processes are in place and information is not regularly reported to senior management / board but when reported appropriate action is taken.
3. Policies are in place and have been reviewed within the past 5 years. TPR in some instances monitors and tracks outcome processes. Information is irregularly reported to senior management / board and there is no system to mitigate/address the identified opportunities, or no action taken.
4. TPR has established policies and practices, but they are out-dated and latest versions are more than five years old. TPR does not regularly monitor or track outcomes to report to senior management / board. Opportunities are not addressed or documented consistently.
5. TPR has no established policies. TPR has no monitoring or outcome tracking processes in place and senior management / board are not informed.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Ministry policies, directives, service contracts, service description schedules in Service Objectives. Review organization's program manuals, policies and procedures, assessment/evaluation processes and service delivery standards. TPR Website can be reviewed for items identifying methods of improvement.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

The complaint process outcomes/follow up demonstrates the commitment to address or improve the health, safety, and wellbeing of clients. The TPR has mechanisms in place to collect and incorporate feedback from a variety of sources (i.e., clients, community partners, etc.) with the intent to incorporate information back into policies and make improvements.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the TPR correctly report program results, performance measures and risks to the ministry within required timelines?

1. Results are consistently reported on-time and cover ministry-specified issues in sufficient detail.
2. Results are occasionally delayed but cover ministry-specific issues with sufficient detail.
3. Results are occasionally delayed but do not cover ministry-specified issues in sufficient detail.
4. Results are reported late and do not cover ministry-specified issues in sufficient detail.
5. The TPR is often late in reporting results or does not report results, or risks.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

The TPR consistently reports back on the programs and services and communicates results in accordance with the requirements outlined in the legal, financial and service target data portions of the service contract; agreements, including: budget submissions, Report Backs, year-end reconciliation reports, and Serious Occurrence reporting (SOR).

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

Looking for timeliness of reporting against deadlines, guidelines for SOR, business cycle timelines

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Does the TPR have diversity, equity, inclusion policies and processes to support programs and services that are accessible and respectful?

1. TPR has established diversity, equity and inclusion policies and been reviewed within the past 2 years.
2. TPR has established diversity, equity and inclusion policies and been reviewed within the past 3 years.
3. TPR has established diversity, equity and inclusion policies and been reviewed within the past 5 years.
4. TPR's policies and processes are under development and incomplete.
5. TPR doesn't have diversity, equity and inclusion policies and processes in place.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

The TPR may have posters in their main lobby that reflect the population/demographic that they serve. Board of Directors should reflect the community that they serve. Services are culturally appropriate. Policies and procedures in place. TPR Website to identify diversity in/of services. Review licencing reports to see any EDI services and supports identified.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

Checking if the office is accessible and whether documentation can be found in an alternative format, if required.
Checking that service delivery space is inclusive for LGBTQIA+ community through an environmental scan of location and meeting spaces.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Legal

Question 1: Does the TPR have comprehensive and updated process, policies, and procedures in place to ensure compliance with applicable legislation, regulations, and policy requirements?

1. The TPR actively assesses its compliance; has specialist support that is accountable for this function, updates its requirements and monitors them on a regular basis.
2. The TPR assesses its compliance; has specialist support that is accountable for this function, updates its requirements, but only does this on an ad hoc basis.
3. The TPR has a process in place, it has the specialist support that is required to ensure compliance with applicable legislation, regulations, and policy requirements, but it is not utilized adequately.
4. The TPR has a process in place, but it does not have the specialist support (e.g., finance, HR, IT*) that is required to ensure compliance with applicable legislation, regulations, and policy requirements.
5. The TPR does not have a process in place to ensure compliance with applicable legislation, regulations, and policy requirements.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Conflict of interest policy and process, TPR bylaws, Board minutes, presence of legal counsel on the Board of Directors (or contact with external counsel), auditing reports.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Is the TPR in compliance with all legislated and/or licencing inspection requirements?

1. There were no areas of non-compliance or licensing issues (if applicable).
2. There were no significant areas of non-compliance or licensing issues (if applicable) and the TPR response addressed the issues adequately.
3. There were areas of non-compliance or licensing issues (if applicable) and the TPR response addressed these issues.
4. There were areas of non-compliance or licensing issues (if applicable) and the TPR's response was inadequate, maintaining their non-compliant status.
5. There were significant areas of non-compliance or licensing issues (if applicable) and the TPR did not take responsive action.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Results of licensing or compliance review, Board minutes, changes to TPR bylaws, policies or training materials.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Has the ministry or TPR received feedback within the past three years from stakeholder(s) signaling legal concerns or alleged improprieties?

1. The ministry or TPR has received no communication signaling concerns or alleged improprieties. There are mechanisms and protocols in place to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions.
2. The ministry or TPR has received communication signaling concerns or alleged improprieties. There are mechanisms and protocols in place to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions.
3. The ministry or TPR has received several communications signaling concerns or alleged improprieties. There are mechanisms and protocols in place to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions.
4. The ministry or TPR has received several significant communications signaling concerns or alleged improprieties. The TPR has not yet developed mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and take corrective actions.
5. The ministry or TPR has received multiple significant communications regarding potential improprieties that could have a negative impact on service delivery and service continuity. The TPR has not yet developed mechanisms and protocols to identify risk of fraud or misconduct and a protocol to take corrective actions.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Correspondence between the TPR and Ministry, stakeholder concerns, complaints and escalation process.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Have there been legal actions in the last three years that have resulted in fines, penalties, personal liabilities, financial settlements (net of any insurable proceeds, if applicable) for management/employees and/or stoppage of work?

1. There has been no litigation, legal proceedings, or settlements.
2. There has been litigation, but has not resulted in fines, penalties, personal liabilities, financial settlements for management/employees and/or stoppage of work.
3. The TPR is in the midst of a legal proceeding that could result in result in fines, penalties, personal liabilities, financial settlements for management/employees and/or stoppage of work.
4. There has been a single legal proceeding with fines, penalties, personal liabilities, financial settlements for management/ employees, stoppage of work.
5. There has been more than one legal proceeding resulting in fines, penalties, personal liabilities, financial settlements for management/ employees, stoppage of work.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Information/summaries of legal proceedings, court orders, meeting minutes, financial statements, financial review recommendations.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 5: How well are risks associated with pending legal actions managed?

1. The TPR has no pending legal actions or has explored the financial consequences and the insurance aspects of managing lawsuits, and they have addressed the underlying cause. The ministry was informed of pending legal actions in a timely manner.
2. The TPR has explored the financial consequences and the insurance aspects of managing lawsuits, and they have addressed the underlying cause. However, the ministry was not informed of pending legal actions in a timely manner.
3. The TPR has only partially explored the financial consequences and the insurance aspects of managing these lawsuits, and they have partially addressed the underlying cause. The ministry was not informed of pending legal actions in a timely manner.
4. The TPR has explored the financial consequences and the insurance aspects of managing lawsuits but has not addressed the underlying causes of the lawsuits to avoid re-occurrences.
5. The TPR has not explored the financial consequences or the insurance aspects of managing lawsuits.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Information/summaries of legal proceedings, court orders, meeting minutes, action plan.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Emergency Management

Question 1: Does the TPR have a comprehensive and updated Business Continuity Plan (BCP), including an emergency management (EM) plan, for all sites and locations where services are delivered, including its head office?

1. BCP has been updated within the last year or when changes occur and is on site or easily accessible at all locations including head office. EM component includes detailed actions/measures to be taken to address a comprehensive range of issues influencing service delivery disruption for clients.
2. BCP has been updated within the last two years or when changes occur and is on site or easily accessible at most locations. EM component includes actions/measures to be taken to address issues influencing service delivery disruption for clients.
3. BCP has been updated within the last three or when changes occur years and/or is not on site or accessible at some locations. EM component includes some actions/measures to be taken to address some issues influencing service delivery disruption for clients, but the plan lacks adequate detail and scope to effectively minimize client service disruption.
4. BCP is significantly incomplete and/or has not been updated within the last 5 years and/or is not on site or accessible at most locations. EM component is significantly outdated and incomplete lacking specific actions/measures to address issues influencing service delivery disruption for clients.
5. There is no BCP or no EM component.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

BCP (EM Component), board minutes, EM policies and procedures.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

BCP should include staffing contingency plans, service disruption plans including communications plan. Plan should also be current with latest health system partners' (IPAC hubs, Ontario health teams, Public Health Units) best practices and information updates.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Has the TPR implemented effective practices to regularly review and update its Business Continuity Plan?

1. TPR has practices in place to review and update BCP at least annually. The plan is reviewed by the board of directors.
2. TPR has practices in place to review and update its BCP at least every two years. The plan is reviewed by an internal committee or the board of directors.
3. TPR has practices in place to review and update its BCP at least every 3 years. The plan may not have been reviewed by an internal committee or the board of directors.
4. TPR has practices in place to review and update its BCP at least every 5 years. The plan may not have been reviewed by an internal committee or board of directors.
5. TPR does not have practices in place to review and update its BCP. The plan is not reviewed by an internal committee or board of directors.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

BCP (EM Component) BCP related process document, board minutes, review process document.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

Plan should be current with latest health system partners' (IPAC hubs, Ontario health teams, Public Health Units) best practices and information updates.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the TPR have policies and procedures in Infection Prevention and Control (IPAC) that reflect current local public health recommendations?

1. TPR has current IPAC policies and procedures which have been updated within the past year or as required to align with available guidance and direction.
2. TPR has IPAC policies and procedures which have been updated within the past 2 years or as required to align with available guidance and direction.
3. TPR has IPAC policies and procedures which have been updated within the past 3 years or as required to align with available guidance and direction.
4. TPR has IPAC policies and procedures which have been updated within the past 5 years and which may be incomplete and outdated.
5. TPR has no IPAC policies or procedures.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

IPAC Policies & Procedures, training and orientation materials, onboarding materials for both board and staff.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

Policies and procedures should include training for both board and staff.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: What has been the frequency and impact of any service delivery disruptions in the past 3 years?

1. There have been no service disruptions in the past 3 years.
2. There have been some service disruptions but the impact on service delivery has been limited due to the timely response of the TPR.
3. There have been some service disruptions and service delivery has been impacted. TPR has struggled to respond appropriately in a timely manner.
4. There have been multiple service disruptions and service delivery has been impacted. TPR has repeatedly failed to respond appropriately in a timely manner.
5. There have been routine service disruptions and service delivery has been substantially impacted. TPR has failed to respond.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Ministry reports (Serious Occurrence Reporting), service delivery disruption summary.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Governance

Question 1: Can the board of directors effectively make decisions, considering their capacity, composition in terms of skills and community perspectives, and quorum for decision making as per their mandate?

1. The board has a governance model with clear, formal lines/systems and involves broad participation and appropriate dissemination/ implementation of decisions. Its decision-making process is transparent, and data based. The governance model has been reviewed within the past 2 years.
2. The board has a governance model that guides their decision making. Clear, largely formal lines/systems for decision-making are used, but decisions are not always appropriately implemented or followed; transparency of decision-making and dissemination of decisions is generally good, and data based. The governance model has been reviewed within the past 3 years.
3. The board has a governance model under development that will guide their decision making. Clear, largely formal lines/systems for decision-making are used, but decisions are not always appropriately implemented or followed; transparency of decision-making and dissemination of decisions is generally good but is inconsistent. Its decision-making process is transparent and often data based. The governance model has been reviewed within the past 5 years.
4. The board does not have a governance model in place to guide their decision making. The appropriate decision makers are known; decision making process is fairly established and process is generally followed, but often breaks down and becomes informal. Its decision-making process is less transparent and rarely data based.
5. The board does not have a governance model in place to guide their decision making. Decisions are made largely on an ad hoc basis and is highly informal. The decision-making process is not transparent and rarely data based.

Recommended Impact: Critical

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

TPR bylaws, governance policies and procedures, meeting schedules, board minutes and recordings of decisions, strategic documents, skills inventory, client/customer surveys.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Is there a current orientation/training manual and process that is used for onboarding of new members of the board of directors?

1. There is a current orientation/training manual and process in place and have been reviewed within the past 2 years.
2. There is a current orientation/training manual and process in place and have been reviewed within the past 3 years.
3. There is a current orientation/training manual and process in place and have been reviewed within the past 5 years.
4. There is a current orientation/training manual and process in place and have been reviewed in the past 5+ years.
5. There is no orientation/training manual and process in place.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Onboarding training manual, governance policies, orientation process for board members, training lists including IPAC training, board recruitment nomination process.

Additional guidance to help determine the risk rating:

TPRs are responsible for meeting legislative and contractual requirements associated with programs and service delivery activities. Ideally TPRs should be current on best practices including those associated with occupational health and safety, IPAC training and practices, service delivery models, sector/association guidelines/standards (e.g., VAW Shelter standards)

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the board of directors utilize a strategic plan to guide their oversight and decision making for the TPR?

1. The TPR has a board approved strategic plan that has been updated within the past 2 years. The strategy consistently supports board decision making and drives day-to-day operations at all levels of the TPR.
2. The TPR has a board approved strategic plan that has been updated in the past 3 years. The strategy generally supports board decision making and generally drives day-to-day operations at all levels of the TPR.
3. The TPR has a board approved strategic plan that has been updated in the past 5 years. The strategy somewhat supports board decision making and but doesn't consistently drive some day-to-day operations at all levels of the TPR.
4. The TPR has a board approved strategic plan that has been updated in the past 5+ years. The strategy somewhat supports board decision making and but doesn't consistently drive some day-to-day operations at all levels of the TPR.
5. Strategy is either non-existent, unclear, or incoherent (largely a set of scattered initiatives) or has not been approved by board. If strategic plan exists, has no influence over day-to-day operations or board decision making.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Strategic plan, Board minutes, operational plan, annual reports.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 4: Is the board effectively performing its roles and responsibilities to help the TPR achieves its stated mission and mandate?

1. Board demonstrates a thorough understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Board has identified financial limits and controls (e.g., spending limits; spending approvals; sign-off procedures) and has a designated board member/committee responsible for this function and monitors the limits and controls on a regular basis.
2. Board members demonstrate a basic understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Board has identified financial limits and controls (e.g., spending limits; spending approvals; sign-off procedures) for the TPR, has a designated board member responsible for this function, but rarely monitors the limits and controls on a regular basis.
3. Board members demonstrate a basic understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Board has identified financial limits and controls (e.g., spending limits; spending approvals; sign-off procedures) but does not have a designated board member or committee responsible for ensuring appropriate financial systems are developed and implemented. Board does not monitor the limits and controls on a regular basis.
4. Board members demonstrate a partial understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Board has identified financial limits and controls (e.g., spending limits; spending approvals; sign-off procedures) for the TPR but does not have a designated Board member or committee responsible for ensuring appropriate financial systems are developed and implemented. Board does not monitor the limits and controls on a regular basis.
5. Board members demonstrate a limited understanding of their roles and responsibilities as it relates to strategic planning, governance policies, accountability, oversight and performance management. The board of directors has not established financial limits and controls (e.g., spending limits; spending approvals) for the TPR, and does not have a designated board member or committee responsible for this function.

Recommended Impact: Major

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Bylaws, governance policies and procedures, board minutes, financial policies & procedures, treasury/finance committee reports.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 5: Is there a clear differentiation and understanding of roles and responsibilities between the board and Executive Director/CEO?

1. Roles and responsibilities clearly reflect distinct lines of responsibility and delegation of authority. Board consistently adopts appropriate governance versus management roles. ED/CEO consistently provides sufficient and appropriate level of information to board members to enable effective decision-making.
2. Roles and responsibilities clearly reflect distinct lines of responsibility and delegation of authority. Board mostly adopts appropriate governance versus management roles. ED/CEO mostly provides sufficient and appropriate level of information to board members to enable effective decision-making.
3. Roles and responsibilities reflect distinct lines of responsibility and delegation of authority. Board sometimes adopts inappropriate governance versus management roles. ED/CEO rarely provides sufficient and appropriate level of information to board members to enable effective decision-making.
4. Roles and responsibilities reflect distinct lines of responsibility and delegation of authority. Board routinely adopts inappropriate governance versus management roles. ED/CEO does not provide sufficient and appropriate level of information to board members to enable effective decision-making.
5. Little differentiation between the governance roles/functions of board and ED/CEO. ED/CEO does not provide sufficient and appropriate level of information to board members to enable effective decision-making.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Bylaws, governance policies and procedures, board minutes, job specs, orientation materials, CEO/ED board report.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 6: Does the board assess the performance of the Executive Director/CEO?

1. The board has completed and documented the results of an annual performance appraisal of the ED/CEO with a review of previously set goals.
2. Board has completed and documented the results of a performance assessment of the ED/CEO in the last two years with minimal follow-up on previously set goals.
3. Board has completed and documented the results of a performance assessment of the ED/CEO in the last two years, with no follow-up on previously set goals.
4. Board has completed/ documented the results of a performance assessment of the ED/CEO, but it was two or more years ago.
5. The board has not completed and documented the results of a performance assessment of the ED/CEO.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Performance appraisal/evaluation, performance review process, governance policies and procedures.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 7: Does the board have a process to regularly assess performance of board members?

1. Board has a process to assess performance of board members and they have been assessed within the past 2 years.
2. Board has a process to assess performance of board members and they have been assessed within the past 3 years.
3. Board has a process to assess performance of board members and they have been assessed within the past 5 years.
4. Board has a process to assess performance of board members and they have been assessed in the past 5+ years.
5. Board has no process to assess performance of board members.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Performance reviews, process related documentation, board member succession planning, board recruitment nomination process.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Reputational

Question 1: Does the TPR have policies and procedures in place to respond to all types of media inquiries and releases and are they followed?

1. Policies and procedures to respond to all types of media inquiries and releases, they are followed and reviewed in the last **two years**. In the past **three years**, there has only been positive or no media coverage.
2. Policies and procedures are in place to all types of respond to media inquiries and releases, they are followed and reviewed in the last **three years**. In the past **two years**, there has only been positive or no media coverage.
3. Policies and procedures are in place to all types of respond to media inquiries and releases, they are followed and reviewed in the last five years. In the past two years, there has been negative media coverage and it has been addressed.
4. Policies and procedures are in place to all types of respond to media inquiries and releases, and they have not been reviewed in the last five years. In the past two years, there has been negative media coverage but the basis for the negative coverage have not been addressed.
5. The TPR does not have policies and procedures in place to respond to all types of media inquiries and releases and/or it has received only negative media coverage in the past two years and has not actively managed it and negative coverage continues.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Policies and procedures for addressing media risk. Risks associated with media coverage may include reputational risks, legal risks, financial risks, risks to client outcomes, etc. An examination of mitigation plans, if they exist, along with the type and number of media occurrences will help determine the most appropriate rating for this question.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 2: Does the TPR collaborate with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients?

1. The TPR is actively engaged with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients and contributes input regularly. It attends and participates in local planning mechanisms e.g., Community Planning Tables, Individual Support Plans, Business Improvement Association, Provincial Networks, Sector Associations.
2. The TPR is engaged with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients. It attends and participates in local planning mechanisms.
3. The TPR is sparsely engaged with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients. It attends local planning mechanisms but does not fully participate.
4. The TPR has limited involvement with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients. It does not fully utilize local planning mechanisms that are available.
5. The TPR does not collaborate with other organizations and local community partners to coordinate services for clients and works in isolation of the local community and other service providers.

Recommended Impact: Minor

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

Evidence of proactive engagement of the TPR with diverse stakeholders can be found in a variety of communications (e.g., websites, emails, memos, meeting minutes, list of attendees, town hall meeting minutes and/or agendas, participation in networks and working groups, etc.) and strategic actions (e.g., community consultations, surveys/evidence of positive feedback from stakeholders, community awards and recognitions, etc.).

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes:

Question 3: Does the TPR have a complaints process that responds to complaints in a timely manner and addresses the complaint?

1. The TPRs complaints process is followed and well-known to staff and clients (e.g., in a brochure or on its website), it addresses reasonable complaints and has been updated in the last **two years** and the TPR always submits serious complaints in accordance with the ministry serious occurrence reporting (SOR) guidelines.
2. The complaints process is followed and well-known to staff and clients, it addresses reasonable complaints and has been updated in the last **three years** and it submits serious complaints in accordance with ministry's SOR guidelines.
3. The complaints process is followed and communicated and has been updated in the last **five years** but is not readily available and/or not effective in resolving reasonable complaints and it usually submits serious complaints in accordance with ministry guidelines.
4. The complaints process has not been updated in the last **five years**, and/or is not followed or communicated and it does not submit serious complaints in accordance with ministry guidelines.
5. The TPR does not have a complaints process in place and/or it does not submit serious complaints in accordance with ministry guidelines.

Recommended Impact: Moderate

Where can you find evidence to answer the risk assessment question above?

MCCSS service providers are required to have procedures in place to handle complaints and hold entities and individuals accountable for their actions. The complaints policies and procedures identify how the TPR receives and documents complaints/feedback; the process for investigating the matter including timelines, transparency and conflict of interest considerations, the process for responding to complaints; and the roles and responsibilities of various parties involved in the process. The ministry can find evidence in a variety of communications (e.g., emails, phone call summaries with clients, issues management) and serious occurrence reporting and submissions.

What evidence do you have to support this rating? Also provide any additional information that will assist the ministry in determining your final risk rating (required):

Date TPR last reviewed this document (as applicable):

FOR INTERNAL MINISTRY USE ONLY

Ministry Risk Assessor Notes:

Contributor(s) Notes: