

Prevent risk assessment for schools

Person completing:

Date Implemented:

Date for review:

A risk assessment is a core part of implementing the Prevent duty. All providers should read guidance from the department on how to complete a risk assessment and on safeguarding students vulnerable to radicalisation. Schools should assess the risk of children being drawn into terrorism, including support are part of terrorist ideology.

Providers may choose to have a specific separate risk assessment to better communicate to staff and document actions taken to mitigate any risks.

The purpose of the risk assessment is to have an awareness and understanding of the risk of radicalisation in your area and your institution. The type and scale of activity that will address the risk will vary but should be proportionate to the level of risk, type of provision, size and phase of education.

This is an internal document and should be reviewed annually, in line with Keeping Children Safe in Education requirements, or following a serious incident.

National Risks – risk of radicalisation generally

What national risks are you aware of that could impact to your area, setting, students or families? For example, online radicalisation

National risks that could impact Coventry include: the threat of terrorism and radicalization, particularly among vulnerable young people, due to the "Prevent" duty, potential economic downturns impacting employment, severe weather events like flooding, cyber security threats, and broader societal issues like rising cost of living and potential social unrest; all of which require local authorities to have robust contingency plans in place to mitigate their impact on the community. Latest: fall of Assad in Syria. Southport Incident Trial (Feb)

Local Risks – risk of radicalisation in your area and institution

What specific local risks are you aware of that could impact to your area, setting, students or families? E.g. local extremist activity (groups active in the area)

Risk 1 - Exposure to extremist content through social media, websites or in person. Risk 2: Grooming: Exploiting vulnerabilities to form exclusive friendships. Risk 3: Psychological manipulation: being manipulated into adopting extreme views and behaviours. Risk 4: Exposure to violent material: being exposed to violent material or other inappropriate information. LOCAL examples: 45% of WM cases are for U17, predominantly for ERW concerns, highest threat remains ISL. Overall, most cases are within 11-17 age range, importance of educators: highest referrers.

Leadership and Partnership

| Category                         | Risk  | Hazard   | Risk management  | Rag | Further action needed  | Lead officer | Date for completion |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|-----|--|--------------|---------------------|
| Leadership                       | The setting does not place sufficient priority to Prevent and risk assessment/action plans (or does not have one) and therefore actions to mitigate risks and meet the requirements of the Duty are not effective.                      | Leaders (including governors and trustees) within the organisation do not understand the requirements of the Prevent Statutory Duty or the risks faced by the organisation. The Duty is not managed or enabled at a sufficiently senior level.   | Prevent training/briefing for staff (including SLT) and governors.   |     | National College - Annual Certificate in the Prevent Duty (2024-2025) - FL asked governors to read blog on navigating the prevent duty and complete the refresher from the government. | FL           | OLT 2025            |
|                                  |   | Leaders do not have understanding and ultimate ownership of their internal safeguarding processes, nor ensuring that all staff have sufficient understanding and that staff implement the duty effectively.  | Lead governor for safeguarding/Prevent lead is at appropriate seniority.   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Leaders do not communicate and promote the importance of the duty.   | Sufficient leadership ownership – risk assessments, safeguarding policies, etc. being signed off by SLT.   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Leaders do not drive an effective safeguarding culture across the institution.   | Leadership have clear understanding of reporting and referral mechanisms.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Leaders do not provide a safe environment in which children can learn.   | Ensuring the sharing of safeguarding policies – staff sign to confirm the reading of such policies.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | Promotion of a safeguarding culture through regular training, discussions, etc with senior staff visibly involved. Clear induction for new members of staff and trainee teachers   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| Working in Partnership           | The setting is not fully appraised of national and local risks, does not work with partners to safeguard children vulnerable to radicalisation, and does not have access to good practice advice, guidance or supportive peer networks. | The academy does not establish effective partnerships with organisations such as the Local Authority and Police Prevent Team.  | The academy has strong partnerships with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Safeguarding Children's Partnership</li> <li>DSL / headteacher forums</li> <li>LADO</li> <li>Community Safety Partnerships</li> <li>Police Prevent Team</li> <li>Channel panel</li> <li>Child and family</li> </ul>   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | Effective partnerships might include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular attendance at meetings, boards or forums</li> <li>In receipt of newsletters e.g. Educate Against Hate</li> <li>Being able to demonstrate effective partnerships by use of the referral process or involvement in Channel</li> </ul>   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| Capabilities                     | Staff do not recognise signs of abuse or vulnerabilities and the risk of harm is not reported properly and promptly by staff.   | Frontline staff including governors, do not understand what radicalisation means and why people may be vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism  | Training is broader than face to face or e-learning. The academy communicate information to staff e.g. via staff updates, notices/bulletin, emails   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Frontline staff including governors, do not know what measures are available to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and do not know how to obtain support for people who may be exploited by radicalising influences. Staff do not access Prevent training or refresher training. | All staff attend safeguarding training and are familiar with key school safeguarding and statutory policies  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Staff do not access Prevent training or refresher training.  | Ensure all staff attend Prevent training with a focus on Notice, Check, Share  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Governors do not access Prevent training.  | Ensure governors attend Prevent training   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | DSL does not attend the safeguarding briefing, SLT do not attend additional support from the local partnership.  | Ensure SLT and DSL receive additional support from local partnerships and training on local processes for Prevent  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | There is no track record of prevent training   | Maintain records of all staff and governor training - through the governorhub  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| Information Sharing              | Staff do not share information with relevant partners in a timely manner.   | Staff do not feel confident sharing information with partners regarding radicalisation concerns.   | The academy has a culture of safeguarding that supports effective arrangements to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify children who may need early help or who are at risk of neglect, abuse, grooming or exploitation</li> <li>Help children reduce their risk of harm by securing the support they need, or referring in a timely way to those who have the expertise to help</li> </ul> |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Staff are not aware of the Prevent referral process.   | The academy has clear processes for raising radicalisation concerns and making a Prevent referral.   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| Reducing Permissive Environments | Children and young people are exposed to intolerant or hateful narratives and lack understanding of the risks posed by terrorist organisations and extremist ideologies that underpin them.   | The setting does not provide a safe space in which children and young people can understand and discuss sensitive topics, including terrorism and the extremist ideas that are part of terrorist ideology, and learn how to challenge these ideas.   | The academy has code of conduct for all staff, dignity and safeguarding policies   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | The setting does not teach a broad and balanced curriculum which promotes spiritual, moral, cultural mental and physical development of students and fundamental British values and community cohesion.  | The academy carries out safer recruitment checks on all staff  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | Teaching is monitored by senior leaders through observations, book checks and is quality assured   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | The academy provides opportunities within the curriculum to discuss controversial issues and for students to develop critical thinking and digital literacy skills   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | The academy ensures that discussions of controversial issues are carried out in a safe space.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | The academy embeds fundamental British values into the curriculum, while also ensuring specific discussions can take place in a safe environment.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| IT policies                      | Ineffective IT policies increases the likelihood of students and staff being drawn into extremist material and narratives online. Inappropriate internet use by students is not identified or followed up.                              | Students can access terrorist and extremist material when accessing the internet at the institution.   | Appropriate internet filtering is in place.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Students may distribute extremist material using the institution IT system.  | The academy ensures that there is a clear reporting process in place should filtering systems flag any safeguarding or Prevent-related concerns.   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Unclear linkages between IT policy and the Prevent duty. No consideration of filtering as a means of restricting access to harmful content.  | The designated safeguarding lead takes lead responsibility for safeguarding and child protection (including online safety).  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   |  | The academy equips children and young people with the skills to stay safe online, both in school and outside.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
| Visitors                         | External speakers or visitors being given a platform to radicalise children and young people or spread hateful or divisive narratives.  | Leaders do not provide a safe space for children to learn.   | A process is in place to manage site visitors, including sub-contractors.  |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | Settings do not have clear protocols for ensuring that any visiting speakers are suitable and appropriately supervised. The academy does not conduct any due diligence checks on visitors or the materials they may use.   | The academy has a robust risk assessment and carries out due diligence checks on visitors, speakers, the organisations they represent and the materials they promote or share.   |     |  | FL           | u                   |
|                                  |   | The academy seeks advice and support from partners where necessary to make an assessment of suitability.   |  |     |  | FL           | u                   |