**Prevent Risk Register –** *date implemented & for review?*

**Risk Scoring**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | **Severity** |
|  Almost Certain | 5 | Catastrophic | 5 |
| Very Likely | 4 | Major | 4 |
| Likely | 3 | Moderate | 3 |
| Unlikely | 2 | Minor | 2 |
| Improbable | 1 | None or Trivial | 1 |

| **No** | **Risk Title** | **Summary** | **Gross Score** | **Existing Controls** | **Residual Score** | **Further Action Needed** | **Progress** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Online Safety | 1. Extremist organisations are able to radicalise students online and encourage them to commit acts of violence or incite others to commit acts of violence as ‘lone actors’.
2. Learners (and staff) are able to access unlawful radicalising material which promotes proscribed terrorist groups.
 | 4 x 5 =20 **High** | 1. Organisation’s IT useage policy contains specific reference to the Prevent Duty as required by CTSA 2015.
2. Learners are provided with online safety advice as part of initial induction. This includes providing them with a copy of the organisation’s IT useage policy & highlighting where support is available if required.
3. Filtering & monitoring of learners use of the internet is carried out by IT Team & agreed “flags” are reported to Safeguarding/Prevent Lead.
 | 3 x 5 =15**High** | 1. Online Safety to feature prominently as a theme during learners programme for follow up by Tutors/Coaches/Assessors at designated time.
2. Learners are all to complete the ETF Side By Side Online Safety module within 1 month of commencement of programme. Tutors/Coaches/Assessors to document follow up face to face discussion afterwards.
3. Head of IT to agree with SMT a protocol for reporting “flags” to Safeguarding/Prevent Lead identifying urgent & non-urgent issues.
4. Online Safety to be included within learner newsletter/email update 4 months after programme start.
 |  |
| 2 | Partnership | The organisation does not establish effective partnerships with organisations such as the Local Authority, Police Prevent Team, DfE Regional Coordinator and others. The result is that the organisation is not fully appraised of national and local risks and does not have access to developing good practice advice or supportive peer networks.  | 4 x 4 =16 **High** |  |  |   |  |
| 3 | Leadership | Leaders within the organisation do not understand the requirements of the Prevent Statutory Duty or the risks faced by the organisation and the Duty is not managed or enabled at a sufficiently senior level.The result is that the organisation does not attach sufficient priority to Prevent Action plans (or does not have one) and therefore action to mitigate risks and meet the requirements of the Duty are not effective. | 3 x 4 =12**Medium** |  |  |   |  |
| 4 | Staff training and awareness | 1. Staff are not aware of the factors that make people vulnerable to radicalisation and terrorism and are unable to recognise the signs of vulnerability and therefore are unable or unwilling to refer concerns.
2. Leaders and staff feel unable or unwilling to challenge extremist narratives or exemplify British Values throughout the organisation.
3. Staff are unclear on how to deal with or refer concerns resulting in individuals not being supported and potentially radicalisation remaining unchecked.
 | 5 x 5 =25**High** |   |  |   |  |
| 5 |  Speakers and events | 1. Extremist organisations are given a platform to radicalise young people because the organisation has ineffective processes in the place for vetting speakers and events.
2. Inappropriate or extremist materials are shared with learners (face to face or via weblinks) because insufficient checks are made of external speakers and materials that they promote or share.
 | 9Medium |   |  |   |  |
| 6 | Welfare & Pastoral Care | The organisation does not provide effective welfare and pastoral support which results in learners (and staff) being unsupported and the risk of vulnerabilities being exploited. | 9Medium |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Prayer & Faith Facilities | 1. Requirements of learners (or staff) requiring faith support or the use of facilities are not met by the organisation resulting in individuals seeking external support of unknown suitability.
2. Facilities (either prayer rooms or quiet space type facilities) provided are not effectively managed or supervised and become ungoverned spaces where radicalising, inappropriate or dangerous activities can take place.
 | 12 medium |  |  |   |  |
| 8 | Work based learners | 1. The organisation does not have robust processes in place to protect work based students from the risks of radicalisation or views and practices contrary to British Values.
2. Employers within work based settings are unaware of issues relating to Prevent the Statutory Duty and how to report concerns.
 | 9Medium |   |  |  |  |
| 9 | Promoting British Values | 1. The college does not have a culture and ethos where British Values are celebrated, which leads to a culture of disrespect and intolerance and where tensions are allowed to flourish.
2. Staff and learners do not understand BV (or feel confident about) and extremist views and narratives are allowed to flourish unchallenged.
 | 9 Medium |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Campus Security | 1. The organisation does not have sufficient security of it's premises and learners are targeted by individuals or groups seeking to share their extremist views or endanger their personal safety.
2. Charities are allowed on campus without effective checks or charitable collections are inadvertently diverted to inappropriate or unlawful causes.
3. On site dangerous or hazardous substances are not kept secure and are allowed into the possession of individuals or groups seeking to use them unlawfully.
 | 8Medium |  |  |  |  |
| 11.  | National Terrorism Risk Level | 1. The organisation does not know or understand the assessed level of risk from terrorism either nationally or locally & is therefore unable to carry out an effective risk action or put in place mitigating actions.
2. The organisation does not how to respond effectively to changing risk level (either in response to national or local events) to ensure that the risk assessment/action plan remains effective.
 | 4 x 5=20 **HIGH** | 1. The Principal/CEO has been briefed on the way in which the risk from terrorism is assessed & the current risk level via the DfE Regional Prevent Coordinator & also through local Police Prevent team.
2. The Police CTLP briefing document is shared with the organisation/summarised & shared & the Prevent Lead attends the Linc’s FE Prevent Group to receive a briefing & discussion with FE colleagues.
3. The organisation has a process/policy in place that ensures that the Prevent risk assessment/action plan is reviewed annually/6 monthly a process which is facilitated by briefing & support from the DfE Regional Prevent Coordinator.
 | 2 x 4 = 8MEDIUM |  |  |