

Annual report on Prevent compliance 2017-18

Report prepared by: Katharine Bock, Deputy College Secretary

Action required: Governors are asked to consider the annual report on compliance with the Prevent duty and agree that the Chair of Governors can sign off the annual assurance return to OFS.

- 1 University governing bodies are responsible, under the Counterterrorism and Security Act 2015, for preventing people from being drawn into terrorism. OFS is responsible for assuring Higher Education provider compliance with the requirements of the CTSA.
- 2 OFS took over Prevent compliance monitoring from HEFCE and has introduced a revised Prevent monitoring framework. This includes a declaration of compliance with the Prevent requirements, a statement outlining how Governors have satisfied themselves in relation to the declaration and to their oversight of implementation of the Prevent duty, and a data return.
- 3 OFS have suggested a set of prompts and questions, in the annex to the accountability statement which is attached at Appendix A, to support governing bodies in confirming compliance. There is no longer an external requirement for an annual report, but Governors are invited to consider the annual report attached at Appendix B which is based on the OFS prompts and questions.
- 4 The data return includes welfare case referrals, external speakers and events and staff training and is attached as Appendix C.
- 5 The return is due to be submitted to OFS by 3 December.

Prevent annual accountability statement

Throughout the year and up to the date of approval, [Provider name]:

- has had due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism (the Prevent duty)
- has provided to OfS all required information about its implementation of the Prevent duty
- has reported to OfS in a timely way all serious issues related to the Prevent duty, or now attaches any reports that should have been made, with an explanation of why they were not submitted
- has reviewed, and where necessary, updated its Prevent risk assessment and action plan

Accountability statement

Governing bodies/proprietors are required to provide a short statement (max 300 words) outlining the mechanisms to which they have been assured that they are able to sign the above declarations satisfactorily.

Governors received and were satisfied with an annual report from the College's prevent working group which is made up of senior staff. They also saw the annual report on Prevent compliance and safeguarding which is made to the Academic Board. Having reviewed these documents Governors confirmed that the College is monitoring its Prevent related policies effectively and proportionately in tandem with Freedom of Speech and Safeguarding policies and procedures, has reviewed its Prevent risk assessment and action plan, acted appropriately in relation to incidents, delivered appropriate staff training and worked in partnership with DfE Prevent advisers and the Students' Union.

Name	[Enter name of Chair of governing body/proprietor]
Signed	[Paste electronic signature or sign here]
Date	[Enter date signed]

Annex – Prompts when considering the declarations

While it is for each provider to determine how best they assure themselves that their institution has demonstrated due regard to the Prevent duty and they are able to sign the declarations to OfS satisfactorily, the prompts below may guide how governing bodies and proprietors can gain the necessary assurance.

- How have Prevent-related policies or processes been monitored e.g. relating to external speakers, welfare or safeguarding processes, and is there assurance that they are effective?
- Have you been provided with appropriate information and evidence that the provider is demonstrating due regard through relevant reports, updates etc.?
- Have staff assured you that the risk assessment has been reviewed in the past 12 months, and outlined any material changes of risk (and mitigations in response)?
- Have staff reported any serious incidents; and if so, have you been assured by how the provider has acted, including responses to any lessons learned? Equally, have you been notified of any near misses, and again, been assured that any lessons learned have been acted upon?
- Have you been assured that Prevent has been implemented in a proportionate and risk-based manner, including considering the duty alongside other statutory obligations e.g. freedom of speech?
- Is there visible and demonstrable ownership of Prevent at a senior level at the provider?
- Are you assured that staff have received sufficient training and awareness raising to implement Prevent effectively?
- Has the provider continued to work in partnership with its Prevent partners, including statutory agencies and students?

Further information and advice available from:

Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England 2018-19 onwards:

https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/3e9aa5d3-21de-4b24-ac21-18de19b041dc/ofs2018_35.pdf

Supplementary information note to our monitoring framework:

https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/19b94eed-d2ad-4a9b-bb92-ee0b410a1f1f/ofs2018_35_a.pdf

Committee of University Chairs illustrative practice note on Prevent:

<https://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Illustative-Practice-Note-2-Prevent-Strategy-REVISIED-2017.pdf>

Annual report on compliance with the Prevent duty

- 1 This report provides an update on activities since the last report, made in November 2017. It covers the period 31 July 2018 to 1 August 2018.
- 2 The Office for Students has taken over from HEFCE as the body responsible for monitoring Prevent compliance by HE providers. Apart from that we have not experienced any serious incidents or changes to policy or operating context. The rest of this report is based on the OFS's suggested prompts and questions to support assurance of Prevent compliance.

How have Prevent-related policies or processes been monitored e.g. relating to external speakers, welfare or safeguarding processes, and is there assurance that they are effective?

- 3 This year the College has embedded its policies and procedures on freedom of speech, external speakers and safeguarding and has made an annual report on these matters to Academic Board (Annex A). These policies and procedures are also monitored by the College Prevent Working Group as part of its annual review of the Prevent risk assessment and action plan (see below)

Have you been provided with appropriate information and evidence that the provider is demonstrating due regard through relevant reports, updates etc.?

- 4 Governors receive this annual report on Prevent compliance, which is produced by the Prevent working group and which is based on the risk assessment and action plan (see link)

Have staff assured you that the risk assessment has been reviewed in the past 12 months, and outlined any material changes of risk (and mitigations in response)?

- 5 The working group reviewed the risk assessment and action plan in October 2017 and November 2018 and will continue to review it annually, or more often if needed.
- 6 There have not been any material changes and the top risks are harm or distress to individuals, mitigated by the introduction of a safeguarding policy and procedures, and the expression of illegal views together with restricted ability to exercise freedom of thought and expression, both mitigated by a revised Freedom of Speech and external speaker policy and procedures.
- 7 The working group was satisfied that these risks are being successfully managed with these mitigations in place and that other risks, including inappropriate use of IT facilities, disruption from external events and reputation management, are also being effectively managed.
- 8 The working group did not make any substantial changes to the Prevent risk register and action plan, except to restate the College's intention to promote freedom of speech within the law, refer to availability of new safeguarding and unconscious bias training and new social media guidelines. It also noted that the plan for the coming

year involves a review of the prayer and contemplation room facilities, and creation of a statement on religious and philosophical beliefs.

Have staff reported any serious incidents; and if so, have you been assured by how the provider has acted, including responses to any lessons learned? Equally, have you been notified of any near misses, and again, been assured that any lessons learned have been acted upon?

9 We have not reported any serious incidents this year. The most impactful event for our community was members of the far right wing group Generation Identity entering one of our buildings and displaying a banner from a balcony. Several days later a second group did a similar thing with a banner expressing opposition to Generation Identity.

10 In both cases we escorted the groups out of the building and liaised with the police. We also discussed this incident with the local DFE Prevent adviser. We took two lessons from this: the impact of right wing groups targeting universities, and the need to maintain security in our publicly accessible buildings. We have not experienced any similar incidents since.

Have you been assured that Prevent has been implemented in a proportionate and risk-based manner, including considering the duty alongside other statutory obligations e.g. freedom of speech?

11 Our work towards Prevent compliance is conducted in tandem with our Freedom of Speech, Safeguarding, Health and Safety and Dignity at Work and Study policies and procedures. We have adopted an open approach and maintain a [website](#) with links our Prevent risk assessment and action plan and related policies and a [website](#) supporting safeguarding, where the formal policy appears along with guidance and information, to raise awareness for all staff and assist staff who may be dealing with concerns about individuals.

Is there visible and demonstrable ownership of Prevent at a senior level at the provider?

12 The College Prevent working group includes the Vice Master, Deputy College Secretary, Academic Registrar, Directors of Facilities, Estates, Human Resources, External Relations and IT Services and the Students' Union Development Manager. It meets annually, or more often if needed, to review the risk assessment and monitor progress on the action plan. It also reviewed and agreed a draft of this report.

Are you assured that staff have received sufficient training and awareness raising to implement Prevent effectively?

13 As set out in the data return we have trained 104 staff this year and offer Prevent awareness training alongside safeguarding and unconscious bias training. This year we identified the groups of staff who are key for Prevent compliance and who should receive training as a priority:

- Front of house staff (attendants)
- Room bookings staff

- Prevent working group
- Master and College Secretary

Has the provider continued to work in partnership with its Prevent partners, including statutory agencies and students?

- 14 We maintain contact with our DfE Prevent adviser and also a member of the London HE Prevent Network and attend their meetings. We liaise with our neighbour institutions on the University of London Bloomsbury precinct on a range of security and event issues including Prevent related matters. The Heads of Administration, and the Heads of Facilities Management of our institutions are in regular contact.
- 15 We are discussing with the Students' Union the possibility of a student joining the College Prevent working group. We also discuss Prevent and related issues at our education committee, with active participation from the student representatives.

**Prevent working group
November 2018**

BIRKBECK
University of London

Student Engagement & Widening Participation Committee
7 June 2018

ACADEMIC BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ABExCo)
13 June 2018

ACADEMIC BOARD
18 June 2018

Annual monitoring Report on Safeguarding and Free Speech 2017-18

Action: ABExCo is asked to note this report.

Background

1. In June 2016, Academic Board approved a revised Policy on Free Speech to comply with the HEFCE requirement of the Counter Terrorism and Security Act known in the sector as Prevent. The Safeguarding Policy and Procedure was also approved to support vulnerable students on campus. This report provides an overview of how these policies have been employed in academic year 2017/18.
2. Again in 2017-18, no concerns have raised by students, academic or professional services staff with the implementation of the Free Speech Policy and Procedure or the Safeguarding Policy. Equally there have been no Free speech panels held and no referrals to Channel or Prevent.

Free Speech Policy & Procedure

3. Room bookings continue to enable internal and external events on campus and over the past 12 months no events have been refused or cancelled as a result of safeguarding or free speech issues. There have however been three issues on campus that contravened the College Principles of Dignity at Work and Study which are reported below.
4. In September 2017 a Birkbeck student made comments about the holocaust at a demonstration in front of SOAS. These comments were recorded and distributed on social media with 12,000 + views. An investigation was carried out under the Code of Student Discipline.
5. In October 2017 a single poster from a far-right group was removed from the 4th floor of Malet Street. There was no evidence to determine who placed this poster in our building.
6. In April 2018 the attendants intervened when a group tried to hang an extremist sign from the 5th floor balcony. The banner was removed.

Safeguarding Policy and Procedure

7. Initial risk to self and others is managed and assessed and initial safeguarding concerns are dealt with through the one or more of the following: Fitness to Study, Counselling Risk Register, meetings with students on probation and a multi-disciplinary Complex Case meeting. Where concerns are deemed to exceed the threshold of these groups, Safeguarding panels are organised. As of 25th April 2018:
8. 20 students have been admitted to hospital since October 2017 under the Mental Health Act and have been automatically been placed on a Break in Studies under our Fitness to Study policy.
9. 39 students have been referred to Complex Case meetings in Student Services (e.g. where behavioural concerns have been raised – e.g. self-harm/abuse, conduct believed to be due to mental health – and there is a concern that they may pose a risk to self or others and this is then monitored)
10. 57 students have been reviewed under Fitness to Study Stage 2; one Fitness to Study Stage 3 panel has met.
11. 56 students have been flagged as at risk of harm to themselves or others by the Counselling Service.
12. Other cases have included
 - A student excluded under the Dignity at Work and Study policy having sent a large number of unacceptable emails.
 - A student attended class while detained in a forensic mental health facility. Following discussion with the facility the student deferred their study for one year.
 - A student was referred to their Community Mental Health Team (CMHT) having displayed delusional behaviour.
 - A student experiencing and at high risk of ongoing domestic violence was provided with emergency temporary housing.
 - Liaising with other agencies to support a student meet the conditions of his license (e.g. the 9pm curfew extended so they could attend classes).
 - A student leaving a 9 year old unaccompanied in the Library.
 - A student referred to Social Services after concerns were raised about their children.
 - A student whose presentation was a cause for concern was accompanied to A&E and admitted to a mental health unit.

Summary

13. The Safeguarding, Free Speech and College Principles of Dignity at Work and Study operated in a complementary manner to support students, staff and visitors as intended. Each issue was specific and complex. All of these issues involved a team of staff comprising of two or more of the following: Academic Registrar, Director of Facilities and Estates Services, Head of Student Services, Deputy Head of Student Services, Mental Health Advisors, Counsellors, Head of Communications plus representatives from the Student Union and the School/Department where the student studied. Given the College's commitment to transparency, these incidents have been highlighted as they cross a number of policies.

Eleanor Mongey
Head of Student Services
April 2018

DRAFT

**Prevent duty monitoring
Accountability and data return 2018**

Provider: Provider A**UKPRN: XXXXXXXX**

Notes:

1. This is a mandatory return.
2. The data to be submitted should cover the year from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2018, and should capture the data below
3. Providers are able to provide further contextualisation of their data through the notes section e.g. role types identified within number of key staff identified for training

Welfare

- i) This refers to cases which have been 'actively managed' i.e. that a provider has taken action in response to a welfare concern/need. This does not therefore include self-referrals or other referrals where no action has been taken. This would normally include referrals reported to and managed by central student services or being managed by a designated safeguarding or welfare lead. This provides some information and assurance that your welfare processes are being implemented in the absence of any Prevent-related concerns. This refers to both students and staff.
- ii) This refers to cases reported to your Prevent lead (or appropriate group or committee where this does not reflect your referral process). This provides some information and assurance that your process is being implemented.
- iii) This refers to where you have sought advice and information from a multi-agency partner for a Prevent-related case e.g. DfE co-ordinator. This provides some information and assurance that your process is being implemented and partnership working.
- iv) This refers to where you have made a formal referral to the Channel process regarding a case. This provides some information and assurance that your welfare processes are being implemented and working in partnership.

External Speakers & Events

- i) The total number of events/speakers approved through your external speakers and events process i.e. not related to the academic curriculum. NB: you have the choice of providing an exact figure, or an estimate to the nearest 10. This provides contextualisation of the other data sets listed
 - ii) This refers to the number of events/speakers that have required some form of mitigation related to Prevent (or associated free speech) following a risk assessment as part of the speaker process
 - iii) This refers to the number of events/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 escalating concerns where necessary
 - iv) This refers to the number of events 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
- NB: the above questions refer to the number of events or speaker requests (i.e. providers should not double count).

Training

- i) The current number of staff the provider has identified as key in relation to Prevent. This provides further contextualisation of data submitted.
- ii) Training related to their Prevent role or responsibility. This provides assurance that key staff are receiving training on the duty.
- iii) 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/responsibility.
- iv) Number of staff being made aware through guidance, advice or instruction. This provides assurance that staff are able to use relevant policies or are being sign-posted to key staff etc.

Validation checks

Within this document there will be a range of technical validation checks, which will ensure consistency of how the spreadsheet is populated, for example: if a provider inputs that the number of key staff that received training during the period is higher than the total number of key staff, this will not pass a validation check.

DRAFT

**Prevent duty monitoring
Accountability and data return 2018**

Provider: Provider A

OfS Prevent Adviser:

UKPRN: XXXXXXXX

Phone:

Email:

In all cases this data should cover the year from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2018.

Welfare	Number
i) Number of welfare cases referred for specialist advice and support	75
ii) Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	0
iii) Number of Prevent-related cases which lead to external advice being sought from Prevent partners	0
iv) Number of formal referrals to Channel	0
<i>Free text box - max 250 words</i>	

Events & speakers	Number
i) Total number of events/speakers approved	750
ii) Number of events/speakers approved with conditions/mitigations	All
iii) Number of events/speakers referred to the highest decision maker in the provider's process	0
iv) Number of events/speaker requests rejected	0
<i>Free text box - max 250 words see 1 below</i>	

Training	Number
i) Number of staff identified as key to Prevent delivery	32
ii) Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	0
iii) Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	10
iv) Number of staff receiving broader welfare/safeguarding awareness training/briefing	94
<i>Free text box - max 250 words see 2 below</i>	

Please add any further technical information in the free text box below which you believe would be helpful or relevant for OfS to know (max. 200 words)

1 We have returned the number of external event bookings and excluded internal meetings.

All bookings are contingent on approval of a mandatory risk assessment

2 The Prevent working group met with the local prevent co-ordinator in January 2018 and received a refresher briefing on current issues

With the new requirement to identify key staff, we will monitor that such staff continue to receive refresher and induction training in line with the plan below.

There are 23 front of house staff in the key group, all will undertake Prevent training, or have a refresher.

Going forward we have a plan to provide refresher training for established key staff and key staff (to include the JISC training). We will continue to include a safeguarding briefing in our core Induction programme as well as run separate briefings for all staff on broader welfare/safeguarding awareness, our safeguarding events include reference to Prevent. We continue to offer an online Unconscious Bias to supplement our Prevent and Safeguarding offering.