Prevent monitoring

Summary of 2021-22 annual accountability and data return

Contents

Prevent monitoring: data from 2021-22 accountability and data return

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 the academic year 2021-22. A separate workbook has been created to show the data over a time series, show proportions, and show a breakdown of how many providers reported various matters in the data e.g. how many providers reported that it rejected an external speaker or event.

3. As set out in our published monitoring framework, the OfS publishes Prevent data in aggregate for all the providers subject to the duty.[2]

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 and to the importance of academic freedom.[3] 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 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] 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/.

[3] See section 31: Counter-terrorism and Security Act (2015) at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/6/enacted.

[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 may be 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
> 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 providers are 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.

8. The data collected through the ADR is designed to inform the OfS's Prevent monitoring activity. If we consider it to be relevant we may use this information to inform other areas of regulatory activity, although we recognise the limitations of the data in this respect. 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. We undertake other monitoring activities which are set out in our monitoring framework. 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 the ADR submission, every provider has its own policies and procedures which may affect 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 that we require to be reported through the ADR process has generally remained the same since we introduced it in 2018. However, we have made the following amendments for the return covering the 2021-22 year:

    a. We required actual rather than estimated numbers for 'Total number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions' and the reasons for rejection that were not Prevent-related. This was because we introduced these for the first time in 2020-21 and accepted an estimate for that year as a transition. The one exception continues to be 'Total number of events and speakers approved through the external speakers process', where we allow an estimate to the nearest 10.

    b. We required providers to give a brief description in the text box to provide further information about the reason for all events and external speaker rejections, rather than just reasons for rejections related to a Prevent risk.

12. The tables below set out ADR data returns for 2021-22. 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.

13. We have rounded numbers in this publication to the nearest five for data protection reasons. The exception is the 'total number of events and speakers rejected for reasons related to a Prevent risk' which has been assigned '[DPL]' because we use this in data releases for values equal to or less than two.

Welfare

Note on the data

14. Providers were expected to identify the underpinning ideology (if any) behind each case they managed. We acknowledged that providers might not be able to give a definitive view of this for cases which did not progress to an external Prevent referral. Where possible, though, providers should identify the type of concern underpinning the case.

Dataset	Islamist radicalisation	Extreme right-wing radicalisation	Mixed, unclear or unstable ideology	Other radicalisation	Total
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	35	30	75	25	165
Number of Prevent-related cases which led to informal external advice being sought from Prevent partners	25	20	45	15	105
Number of formal external Prevent referrals	15	10	25	10	55

External speakers and events

Notes on the data

15. 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 considered through the provider's external speakers and events process, not just those that relate to Prevent, to provide broader context.

- Where a provider has reported that an event or a speaker has been rejected, we have asked the provider to categorise the reason for this rejection as either health and safety, procedural, reasons related to Prevent risk or due to other matters. Asking providers to categorise the reasons for any external speaker rejections helps us to understand whether a provider has given particular regard to the duty to ensure freedom of speech when giving due regard to the Prevent duty. We have provided descriptors of these categories in Annex A.

- Where a provider has categorised the reason for rejecting an external speaker or event for non-Prevent related reasons, we have not (to date) asked the provider for further information to understand if the external speaker or event then took place at a later date.

- Between 2019-20 and 2021-22 reporting periods, England was subject to various coronavirus pandemic-related restrictions. Although providers were asked to report on external speakers and events held both in person and online, the data for 2020-21 and 2021-22 reflects a reduction in the total number of events approved during these periods against pre-pandemic levels.

Dataset	Health and safety	Procedural	Reasons related to Prevent risk	Other matters	Total
Total number of events or speakers approved through the external speakers process	[z]	[z]	[z]	[z]	31,545
Total number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions	[z]	[z]	[z]	[z]	475
Number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions due to Prevent-related risks	[z]	[z]	[z]	[z]	10
Total number of speakers rejected	25	220	[DPL]	15	260

Note: Cells are marked with a [z] where values were not collected.

Staff training

Note on the data

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

- An increase or decrease in the figures over years does not necessarily indicate negative or positive training trends. The fluctuation in numbers 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.

Dataset	Total
Number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty	86,675
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	23,590
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	20,290
Number of staff receiving broader welfare/safeguarding awareness training/briefing	120,680

Annex A: ADR datasets and definitions

1. The below tables give the definitions accompanying the accountability and data return (ADR) submission template for academic year 2021-22.

Dataset	Definition
Welfare	
Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	This refers to cases reported to a provider's Prevent lead (or appropriate group or committee).
Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to informal 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. DfE Prevent co-ordinator.
Number of formal external Prevent referrals	This refers to where a provider has made a formal referral externally regarding a radicalisation case.
External speakers and events	
Total number of events or speakers approved through the external speakers process	This refers to the total number of events or speakers approved through a provider's external speakers and events process, i.e. not related to the delivery of the academic curriculum. This figure can be an estimate to the nearest 10.
Total number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions	This refers to the total number of events or speakers that have been approved (through the external speakers and events process) subject to some form of mitigation in order to proceed, or where approval is subject to conditions being met by the organiser.
Number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions due to Prevent-related risks	This refers to the number of events or speakers that have been approved (through the external speakers and events process) subject to some form of mitigation in order to proceed or where approval is subject to conditions being met by the organiser because during the risk assessment process the provider has identified a Prevent-related risk, i.e. where it is considered there is a risk of people being drawn into terrorism.
Total number of events or speakers rejected	This refers to the number of events that have been rejected after consideration through the provider's external speakers and events process, including where an individual speaker has been rejected but the event itself has gone ahead.

Dataset	Definition
Staff training	
Number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty	This refers to the current number of staff a provider has identified as key in relation to Prevent implementation.
Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	This refers to the number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty that have received training related to their Prevent role or responsibility.
Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	This refers to the number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty that have received refresher training related to their Prevent role or responsibility.
Number of staff receiving broader welfare or safeguarding awareness training or briefing	This refers to the number of staff (not just key staff in relation to Prevent) being made aware of relevant policies through guidance, training, advice or instruction.

Category	Definition
External speakers	
Procedural matters	This relates to the need for the provider to adhere to its policy and procedure. For example, where the timescales for submission of a request as specified in a policy were not met so there was insufficient time to make a decision about a case and it was therefore not approved on that basis.
Health and safety	This relates to a risk of accident or injury. For example, where the nature of the event itself is deemed to present a risk to safety or a venue offering sufficient capacity for an event to go ahead is unavailable.
Reasons related to Prevent risk	This relates to the risk of radicalisation. For example, where the speaker has previously been found to have promoted a proscribed terrorist organisation.
Other matters	This relates to any other reason. For example, closure of venues due to social-distancing restrictions.

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 2021-22 return was submitted in December 2022.
Channel	Channel is a multi-agency approach to identify and support individuals at risk of being drawn into terrorism.[6]
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. We have used the term external Prevent referral in the relevant data question.
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.
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.
Prevent lead	This is the person at a relevant higher education body who is the named OfS contact for the Prevent duty.

---

[6] 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 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 Prevent 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.