Prevent monitoring

**Summary of annual accountability and data returns:
2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20**

Contents

Prevent monitoring: data from accountability and data returns

Introduction

1. The Prevent duty aims to safeguard people from becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism. The Office for Students (OfS) works on behalf of the government to monitor what higher education providers[1] in England do to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

2. As part of our monitoring, the OfS requires providers to report to us their Prevent-related activities, including their approach to the management of welfare cases, external speakers and events, and staff training. This report presents sector-level data from providers' accountability and data returns (ADRs) for academic years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.[2] We have chosen to republish the data from 2017-18 alongside the 2018-19 and 2019-20 data to show a time series of the data we have collected.

3. As set out in our published monitoring framework, the OfS publishes Prevent data in aggregate for all the providers subject to the duty.[3]

The OfS's role in Prevent

4. The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (CTSA) 2015 requires providers subject to the duty to have 'due regard' to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism (the Prevent duty). The OfS is responsible for monitoring providers' implementation of the duty in the higher education sector in England. As part of this responsibility, providers must have particular regard to the duty to ensure freedom of speech. This means that as part of our monitoring role, the OfS will consider how providers have acted on this requirement.

5. Providers subject to the duty ('relevant higher education bodies') comprise:

- Higher education providers registered with the OfS[4]

---

[1] The Prevent duty applies to the governing bodies or proprietors of 'relevant higher education bodies' (RHEBs). For more information about which providers are RHEBs for monitoring purposes, see https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/3e9aa5d3-21de-4b24-ac21-18de19b041dc/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards-updated-22-january-2019.pdf [PDF].

[2] The 2017-18 data was published in 2019 (see www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-monitoring-accountability-and-data-returns-2017-18-evaluation-report/) and is included here for completeness. We did not publish data in 2020 for pandemic-related reasons.

[3] See 'Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England' at www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/.

[4] We do not monitor OfS-registered publicly funded further education and sixth-form colleges, as they are subject to Prevent monitoring by Ofsted. Providers with degree awarding powers (DAPs) and providers that provide designated courses in accordance with section 22 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 (THEA1998) are registered with the OfS and are classified as RHEBs; therefore all OfS-registered providers are subject to Prevent monitoring.

- Higher education providers with 250 or more students studying on a recognised higher education course under the Education Reform Act 1988

- Higher education providers with course designation for student support purposes

- The autonomous colleges, halls, and schools of the universities of Cambridge, Durham, and Oxford.

6. Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the duty rests with the governing body or proprietor of the provider. While the OfS monitors providers' compliance, enforcement action can only be taken by the Secretary of the State, who may decide to give a direction to a provider that is not complying with the Prevent duty.

> For more information on the OfS's Prevent monitoring role, see
> https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-wellbeing-and-protection/counter-terrorism-the-prevent-duty/

The Prevent accountability and data return

7. One of the ways we require providers to report on their Prevent-related activity is through the Prevent accountability data return (ADR).[5] The return covers data relating to the core areas of the Prevent duty: welfare, staff training, and external speakers and events. It provides information about how a provider is implementing their policies, processes and systems to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. These datasets provide us with a picture of all relevant activity in each of these areas. Our assessment of a provider's compliance takes this data into account alongside broader sources of evidence as part of our risk-based monitoring approach.[6]

8. The data collected through the ADR is designed to inform the OfS's Prevent monitoring activity. While recognising the limitations of the data in this respect, if we consider it to be relevant we may use this information to inform other areas of regulatory activity. For example, if a registered provider is not compliant with the Prevent duty, we may see this as an indication of concerns about its compliance with its conditions of registration.

9. Some of the data we collect is contextual and allows us to understand a provider's approach to implementing the duty. This data provides us with:

- a better understanding of any Prevent-related activity in a given year. For example, we collect the total number of events and speakers approved by a provider to provide us with greater context of its Prevent-related events.

- broader evidence of activity to assess whether a provider is showing due regard to the Prevent duty. This is both because many providers subject to the Prevent duty may not

---

[5] We ask for this information from 'established providers': providers with whom we have already done an initial test of compliance, under our monitoring framework.

[6] See 'Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England' at www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/prevent-duty-framework-for-monitoring-in-higher-education-in-england-2018-19-onwards/.

have examples of Prevent issues faced in a reporting period, and broader activity beyond Prevent may also indirectly support efforts to safeguard people from radicalisation. For example, broader safeguarding training may help identify vulnerable individuals who may be at risk of radicalisation even if the focus of this training is not on Prevent.

10. It should be noted that while all providers were given the same guidance and responded to the same questions for each annual ADR submission, every provider has its own policies and procedures which may impact how data was reported to us. For example, each provider's definition of key staff for training purposes may differ.

The ADR data

11. The data required through the ADR process has generally remained the same since we published the Prevent Monitoring Framework in 2018. However, we have made the following changes over the past three years:

- We removed the requirement to report 'Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support' from the 2019-20 data return. This return was due in December 2020 so we wanted to reduce the burden on providers during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Providers were required to give an exact figure in each of the data returns, with two exceptions. For 'Number of events/speakers approved' we accepted estimates from providers throughout the three reporting years. For 'Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support' we accepted estimates for the 2018-19 return.

12. The tables below set out ADR data returns for 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20. Full definitions for the data requirements of the questions were included with the ADR submission template and can be found in Annex A. A glossary of terms is at Annex B.

Welfare

Data return 2017-18

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support	83,419	203	66%
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	174	78	25%
Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to external advice being sought from Prevent partners	122	68	22%
Number of formal referrals to Channel	15	15	5%

Note: 'Sector percentage' refers to the percentage of total providers returning a non-zero value to the particular question, where blank is counted as zero.

Data return 2018-19

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support	94,428	251	83%
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	365	83	27%
Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to external advice being sought from Prevent partners	135	66	22%
Number of formal referrals to Channel	24	17	6%

Data return 2019-20

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	146	72	24%
Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to external advice being sought from Prevent partners	106	65	22%
Number of formal referrals to Channel	37	24	8%

External speakers and events

Notes on the data

13. In relation to the external speakers and events data, the following points should be noted:

- A provider subject to the duty is required to have systems in place to approve external speakers and events. Given the diversity of the higher education sector, there are different systems in place depending on each provider's operating context. These systems are expected to ensure that the provider considers the risk of radicalisation for students, staff and visitors while having particular regard to ensure freedom of speech as part of its decision-making processes. These systems are also expected to ensure the provider considers other issues relevant to hosting external speakers and events such as health and safety, and whether there is space to host an event.

- The OfS collects data on all external speakers and events approved by a provider, not just those that relate to Prevent, to provide broader context.

- From the 2018-19 return, providers were asked to report instances where an external speaker or event was rejected for Prevent-related reasons. This helps us to understand whether a provider has given particular regard to the duty to ensure freedom of speech. There were fewer than five events reported because they had been rejected for Prevent-related reasons for 2018-19 and 2019-20 combined.

- Where a provider has reported that an event has been rejected but that this was for a reason not related to Prevent, we have not (to date) asked for further information about that event.

- The data question 'Number of events/speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process' indicates the extent to which a provider has escalated decisions about events or speakers to a senior manager. However, some smaller providers only have one decision maker in their decision-making process. This may mean that all speakers and events requests are reported by the provider as being referred to the highest decision maker.

- We made a minor amendment to the wording of the question 'Number of events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations' used in 2017-18 to 'Number of Prevent-related events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations' from 2018-19. We did this to confirm that our focus in this return is on Prevent-related mitigations throughout the three reporting years.

Data return 2017-18

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of events/speakers approved	59,574	254	82%
Number of events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations[7]	2,153	65	21%
Number of events/speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process	314	68	22%
Total number of events/speaker requests rejected – for any reason	53	17	6%

Note: 'Sector percentage' refers to the percentage of total providers returning a non-zero value to the particular question, where blank is counted as zero.

Data return 2018-19

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of events/speakers approved	59,782	256	84%
Number of Prevent-related events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations	1,093	56	18%
Number of events/speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process	376	78	26%
Total number of events/speaker requests rejected	141	18	6%

---

[7] This refers to the number of Prevent-related events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations. Please see Annex A for definitions.

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of events/speaker requests rejected for Prevent-related reasons[8]	[N]	[N]	[N]

Note: '[N]' indicates a non-zero number less than 5 which has been suppressed. Where the provider count is suppressed, the associated sector percentage is also suppressed.

Data return 2019-20

Dataset	Number reported	Provider count	Sector percentage
Number of events/speakers approved	43,337	239	80%
Number of Prevent-related events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations	854	42	14%
Number of events/speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process	362	52	17%
Total number of events/speaker requests rejected	94	18	6%
Number of Prevent-related events/speaker requests rejected for Prevent-related reasons[9]	[N]	[N]	[N]

Note: '[N]' indicates a non-zero number less than 5 which has been suppressed. Where the provider count is suppressed, the associated sector percentage is also suppressed.

Staff training

Note on the data

14. In relation to the staff training data, the following point should be noted:

- An increase or decrease in the figures over three years does not necessarily indicate negative or positive training trends. The fluctuation in numbers seen across this period reflects a variety of different factors specific to each provider's circumstances, including for example: staff retention leading to a decrease in induction training, increased staff recruitment resulting in an increased rate of staff induction, or the cyclical nature of refresher training. Overall, the proportion of staff receiving Prevent training at any given time may remain fairly constant.

---

[8] The figures for the number of Prevent-related events/speaker requests rejected were not provided in numerical form. The figures quoted in this table were arrived at through manual inspection of free text comments made by providers as part of the ADR submission.

[9] The figures for the number of Prevent-related events/speaker requests rejected were not provided in numerical form. The figures quoted in this table were arrived at through manual inspection of free text comments made by providers as part of the ADR submission.

Data return 2017-18

Dataset	Number reported
Number of staff identified as key to Prevent delivery	66,478
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	27,391
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	8,024
Number of staff receiving broader welfare/safeguarding awareness training or briefing	73,860

Data return 2018-19

Dataset	Number reported
Number of staff identified as key to Prevent delivery	68,007
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	23,791
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	9,322
Number of staff receiving broader welfare/safeguarding awareness training or briefing	84,837

Data return 2019-20

Dataset	Number reported
Number of staff identified as key to Prevent delivery	68,399
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	22,363
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	11,151
Number of staff receiving broader welfare/safeguarding awareness training or briefing	102,527

Annex A: ADR datasets and definitions

1. The below table contains the definitions accompanying the accountability and data returns (ADRs) submission template for academic years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Dataset	Definition
Welfare	
Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support	This refers to cases which have been 'actively managed', i.e. a provider has taken action in response to a welfare concern or need. This would normally include referrals reported to and managed by central student services or being managed by a designated safeguarding or welfare lead. It does not include self-referrals by students or staff, or other referrals where the provider has taken no action. This data provides the Office for Students (OfS) with assurance that providers are implementing their welfare policies or processes in the absence of any Prevent-related concerns.
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	This refers to cases reported to the provider's Prevent lead (or appropriate group or committee where this does not reflect its referral process). This provides some information and assurance that the provider's welfare processes are being implemented.
Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to external advice being sought from Prevent partners	This refers to cases where a provider has sought advice and information from a multi-agency partner for a Prevent-related case, e.g. a Department for Education Co-ordinator. This provides some information and assurance that its welfare processes are being implemented, and that it is working effectively with Prevent partners.
Number of formal referrals to Channel	This refers to cases where a provider has made a formal referral to the Channel process regarding a case. This provides some information and assurance that a provider's welfare processes are being implemented and the appropriate referral pathways with multi-agency partners are in place.
External speakers and events	
Total number of events and speakers approved	The total number of events and speakers approved through a provider's external speakers and events process (i.e. not related to the academic curriculum). Note: there is a choice of providing an exact figure, or an estimate to the nearest 10. This contextualises the other data provided on events and speakers.

Dataset	Definition
Number of events and speakers approved with conditions or mitigations	This refers to the number of events and speakers that have required some form of mitigation related to Prevent (or associated free speech[10]) following a risk assessment as part of the speaker process.
Number of events and speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process	This refers to the number of events and speakers that have required a decision by the highest decision maker within the process, i.e. where the request has been escalated through the process. This provides information that the process is being implemented and concerns escalated where necessary.
Number of events and speaker requests rejected	This refers to the number of events and speakers that have not been approved through the process. This should include decisions on risk and on process. This will help inform how a provider is balancing its other legal duties in respect of Prevent.
Staff training	
Number of staff identified as key to Prevent delivery	The current number of staff the provider has identified as key in relation to Prevent. This provides further contextualisation of data submitted.
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	Training related to their Prevent role or responsibility. This provides assurance that key staff are receiving training on the duty.
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	Refresher training related to their Prevent role or responsibility. This provides assurance that key staff continue to have skills and knowledge to support their role or responsibility.
Number of staff receiving broader welfare or safeguarding awareness training	The number of staff being made aware through guidance, advice or instruction. This provides assurance that staff are able to use relevant policies (i.e. to report concerns where they have them), or are being signposted to key staff.

---

[10] We have mentioned free speech given that RHEBs need to give particular regard to secure freedom of speech when giving due regard to the Prevent duty.

Annex B: Glossary of terms

Term	Explanation
Accountability and data return	This is one of the monitoring activities in our Prevent monitoring framework. Each return covers the previous academic year and is submitted in December each year, e.g. the 2019-20 return was submitted in December 2020.
Channel	Channel is a multi-agency approach to identify and support individuals at risk of being drawn into terrorism.[11]
Channel referral	Channel referral is a term that the higher education sector has used to describe when a provider has chosen to make an external referral to local Prevent police, or the local authority about someone they believe may be at risk of radicalisation. Some other agencies use the term Prevent referral.
Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (CTSA)	This is the legislation that imposes the statutory Prevent duty: giving due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. This legislation sets out the legal responsibilities of relevant higher education bodies in complying with the Prevent duty and sets out that the OfS acts as the delegated monitor for the higher education sector.
Established providers	The OfS separates monitored providers into two categories: new entrant and established. Established providers are those that are subject to the duty, have been through an initial test of their compliance and go through the cycle of accountability and data returns.
Highest decision-maker	This term is used to describe the person in a provider's external speakers process who considers external speakers or events that are thought to be high risk. The highest decision maker is a senior person within a RHEB who has been delegated the responsibility to approve these types of events or speakers.
Monitoring framework	The OfS has a monitoring framework that sets out how we monitor compliance with the Prevent duty in the higher education sector in England.
New entrant providers	The OfS separates monitored providers into two categories: new entrant and established. New entrant providers are those that are newly subject to the duty and are undergoing an initial test of their compliance before they are required to go through the cycle of accountability and data returns.

---

[11] More information on Channel can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/channel-and-prevent-multi-agency-panel-pmap-guidance.

Term	Explanation
Prevent lead	This is the person at a relevant higher education body who is the named OfS contact for the Prevent duty.
Prevent partners	These are different agencies that work together to help prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. These agencies include: local authorities, the police, the Department for Education further education/higher education co-ordinators. Prevent partners are able to give advice to providers on how people can become radicalised, and on vulnerable individuals who may be at risk of being radicalised and whether they should be referred for further support, including being considered by Channel.
Relevant higher education body (RHEB)	This is a higher education provider that has a duty to show due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism under section 26(1) of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (2015). Compliance with the Prevent duty is monitored by the OfS.
Welfare	The OfS uses this term to describe the systems, policies, and processes used by a provider to exercise its duty of care towards its staff and students. Relevant higher education bodies often use this term, as well as 'safeguarding' or 'safeguarding from radicalisation', to describe how they prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

OGL