

## Annex B: Thematic review of Prevent duty training

### Introduction

1. Training is a key area of the Prevent duty, which enables providers to better support their staff and students in preventing others being drawn into terrorism. A well-developed training plan can be successful in ensuring that:
  - key staff are able to identify those at risk of radicalisation
  - key staff are aware of, know how to, and are able to, access appropriate referral systems
  - staff and students have access to suitable and appropriate support services.

### What are the regulatory expectations?

2. The OfS's regulatory expectations for training are set out in the supplementary information note to the monitoring framework<sup>1</sup>. The key points are that:
  - A training plan will set out an ongoing identification of staff roles for Prevent-related training, and a clear programme for refreshing this training.
  - The plan will identify the level of knowledge that is proportionate for different roles.
  - Training should link with a provider's own policies.
  - Training covers staff, as well of members of the provider's governing body, or proprietor(s). (Providers need to consider whether there is a need to train self-employed workers or contractors.)
  - Records are kept of training, including broader awareness-raising on Prevent.
3. We expect that providers continue to refresh training for staff and that induction training is given to new staff on a regular basis. We recognise that there is a diverse range of

---

<sup>1</sup> Available as supplementary material at: [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/).

approaches being undertaken by the sector with regard to Prevent-related training, from which staff are identified as key, to the type of training delivered (and how), and when staff receive refresher training.

## Review scope and aims

4. This thematic review looks at different training approaches within the sector to determine how effective they are. It also captures examples of effective practice from providers in relation to training to share with the sector.
5. We also look to explore whether Prevent training is fully linked to, and embedded within, providers' approaches to wider safeguarding.
6. To test providers' approaches, we used a bank of questions, combined with scenarios within the Prevent review meetings. We linked any findings to the welfare thematic review (see **Annex C**) where appropriate.

## Findings from the annual data return (ADR) and Prevent review meetings

### Prevent training

7. From a detailed qualitative analysis of narratives from the ADR and Prevent review meeting processes, providers have described a range of approaches to Prevent training. This covered initial or induction Prevent training as well as refresher training. Methods for both types of training include: online training modules, face-to-face training from either external partners or internal trainers, and a blend of both. We also explored further quantitative analysis of data sets from the ADR and previous data returns submitted to HEFCE through annual reports. This did not provide any further substantive findings than what we have published previously in 'Prevent monitoring accountability and data returns 2017-18: evaluation report'<sup>2</sup> (OfS 2019.22).
8. Several providers raised in review meetings that Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent (WRAP) training is no longer being run and supported by the Government and that, although it is still used, they are also using alternatives to this training package. These include:
  - Online modules offered by the Home Office, or Advance HE through the Safer Campus Communities website.
  - Inviting external partners to give training to staff, including Department for Education (DfE) Regional Prevent Coordinators, the police or Local Authority.
  - Creating bespoke training tailored to their context, for example using historic WRAP material as a starting point and then updating this to include more relevant higher

---

<sup>2</sup> Available at [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-monitoring-accountability-and-data-returns-2017-18-evaluation-report/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-monitoring-accountability-and-data-returns-2017-18-evaluation-report/).

education information, as well as information specific to the provider's location (e.g. to counter a local radicalisation risk such as far right activity).

- Using historic case studies from the provider, or scenarios from other sources, as examples (both as part of the training session and at the end of session) to test staff understanding of the provider's processes and procedures.
9. The inclusion of Prevent induction training into that of broader safeguarding and welfare also varies across the sector. Many providers include Prevent within their broader training; some run discrete Prevent sessions, in addition to broader safeguarding and welfare training.

### **Refresher training**

10. The OfS Prevent monitoring framework states that we expect providers to refresh Prevent training over time. Providers have commented that this can vary from every year, to every three years. It has also been raised that not all providers run mandatory refresher training; while staff are able to request it, there is no expectation that it has to be completed. As it is now over four years since the introduction of the Prevent duty, many providers are now looking to refresh staff training.
11. The approaches taken on refresher training also vary, as with induction training, from staff undertaking the same training as carried out previously to fully updated bespoke sessions. Some providers give updates to staff by email, or in general briefing sessions or notes in between training sessions, for example if there have been changes in local risk.

### **Governing bodies and proprietors**

12. The second component of the ADR is the accountability statement. This is signed off by the chair of the governing body, or proprietor, explaining how the governing body is assured that the provider has demonstrated due regard to the Prevent duty through the reporting period. We have therefore asked providers during Prevent review meetings whether members of the governing body have received Prevent training.
13. The responses ranged from none, to annual updates from the provider, to Prevent-specific training from either the provider's Prevent lead or DfE Coordinator. Several providers are currently arranging for their DfE Regional Prevent Coordinator to attend a Board meeting to provide training. Other providers are asking governors who have attended Prevent training through their other roles outside the provider to provide evidence of this. Some governing bodies have been given a more general overview of Prevent during broader safeguarding training. However, in the review meetings which had a member of the governing body present, they commented that they felt sufficiently assured by the provider that the Prevent duty was being complied with.

### **Student union officers and representatives**

14. We have found through the review meetings that Prevent training in some providers also extends to student union sabbatical officers, with further training also given to the

permanent student union staff. A small number of providers also noted that they extend Prevent training to student representatives.

### **Taking a tiered approach to training**

15. Within the ADR, we ask for details of training of key staff as well as broader welfare and safeguarding training. We define key staff as members of staff that providers identify as central to protecting people from radicalisation. This is likely to include the Prevent lead, staff in student support, IT, and staff working in external events<sup>3</sup>. However, we appreciate that this will vary between providers. The monitoring framework notes that consideration in training may include the 'differentiation of levels of Prevent training from general awareness to detailed specific training'<sup>4</sup>, with the expectation that key staff receive additional training to the broader induction training given to all staff.
16. We found that the majority of providers we held Prevent review meetings with had chosen to tier their training, though this was not always the case. This training often provides further information about contacting external partners for advice, and the Channel referral process, for example. Some providers run an online module for the induction training, with the key staff training run face-to-face. Other providers nuance this training further – for example, for key staff in different areas within the provider, such as student services, security and house wardens, due to the differing nature of their roles and the type of contact that they are more likely to have with students, staff and visitors. The tiered approach to training can also differentiate how often training is refreshed, with one provider running refresher training every two years for staff generally, and every year for student support staff.
17. Providers were also asked about providing training for contact staff; several, but not all, include this in the broader induction training. One provider mentioned that, following contract cleaning staff raising concerns about students, they have further extended their training to include basic Prevent awareness for these staff.

### **Record keeping**

18. Responses from providers during Prevent review meetings regarding maintaining a record of staff who have received Prevent training also varies across the sector. A small number of providers were found to not have a consistent approach regarding refresher training, while the majority do maintain a record of some form. Some providers noted that there were no systems in place to identify which staff members required further, or refresher, training, or even which staff had undertaken initial Prevent training.

---

<sup>3</sup> See 'Guidance for the Prevent monitoring accountability and data return available at: [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-wellbeing-and-protection/counter-terrorism-the-prevent-duty/how-we-monitor/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-wellbeing-and-protection/counter-terrorism-the-prevent-duty/how-we-monitor/).

<sup>4</sup> See 'Supplementary information note' available at: [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/).

## Effective practice

19. One aim in the review meetings was to collect examples of effective practice to include in the thematic reviews. Case studies are included in the main body of the findings report<sup>5</sup>. However, in summary, more effective approaches around training included:

- **Tailoring training to the institutional context:** training was tailored to the institutional context in which staff were working. This could include relating training and awareness-raising to local risks and threats, and also the operating context of the provider.
- **Linking training back to institutional policies:** staff training packages clearly related back to key institutional policies. For example, when raising awareness of Prevent the provider ensured that staff knew how to report any Prevent-related welfare concerns, and how that links back to a cause for concern policy.
- **Systematic refresher training:** there was a clear programme for refreshing staff training within a reasonable timeframe. This also included the provider giving consideration to how refresher training could add value to the baseline training staff had already received, either in terms of content or the mode of delivery, e.g. online training supplemented by face-to-face training.

## Evaluation

20. Evaluation is a key part of the formulation and implementation of any process, project or training. We asked providers during the review meetings whether they evaluated the effectiveness of their Prevent training to ensure that it was suitable and achieving the desired outcome. This includes people receiving training having gained a greater understanding of the Prevent duty, and that they are confident in being able to report a potential concern (whether safeguarding or Prevent), or if further training is being given, whether staff are confident in making a Channel referral.

21. Providers gave mixed responses when asked whether they carry out any evaluation, varying from: no evaluation at all, use of a scenario at the end of the training session to test understanding/learning, to a feedback form at the end of the session. However, the majority of providers reported they do not evaluate their training.

22. We recognise the initial priority for providers in complying with the duty was to deliver training to staff using appropriate resources in order to develop their capabilities in preventing people from being drawn into terrorism. However, as providers are now looking to refresh their Prevent training for staff in the coming months they should include evaluation as a key part of their revised training plans. The OfS is currently exploring what tools it could provide, alongside other partners, on how to support evaluation as part of future training plans from providers. In the interim, we would

---

<sup>5</sup> See 'Prevent review meetings findings', published alongside this report at: [www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-review-meetings-programme-findings/](http://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-review-meetings-programme-findings/).

encourage providers to give consideration to the following questions to support evaluation on training plans:

- What is Prevent? What is the participants' understanding of the duty both before and after the training? Has this changed as a consequence of the training, and if so in what way?
- What do participants see as the requirements of Prevent before, and after, the training? Has this changed as a consequence of the training, and in what way?
- Which departments within your institution do participants think should have an awareness/understanding of the Prevent duty?
- Why are you delivering this training, and what are you aiming to achieve by the end of it? How will you measure this?
- How will you use the answers to these questions to inform the type and style of training that you use in future?

## **Next steps**

23. We use the Prevent review meeting programme as a mechanism to gain feedback from providers on future training needs. The main areas of feedback we received were:

- More specific higher education focus to training content: providers felt some of the training packages did not relate to their own context or their sector.
- Greater use of case studies: providers' feedback stated that this would help improve staff understanding using real Prevent examples to help cement learning.
- More examples of effective practice from a range of different providers: it was felt that training materials catered mainly for larger providers; materials and examples of effective practice should be included that are relevant to smaller providers and that represent the diversity of the sector more broadly.

24. Over the coming months, the OfS will work with the DfE, sector representative bodies, and other partners on how to develop training materials that address the feedback from the sector. We will also be working to develop further information, advice and guidance to support providers' evaluation of Prevent duty training.