

'PREVENT' DUTY COMPLIANCE: PROPOSED PRELIMINARY SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT
(entries made into SurveyMonkey return)

HEFCE instructions

On 30 November 2015 HEFCE published the Prevent duty monitoring framework for the higher education sector in England. Among other things, the framework requires all relevant providers to submit by 22 January 2016 a self-assessment against the statutory guidance on implementing the Prevent duty.

In our Circular letter 27/2015 we explained that the self-assessment should reflect the extent to which the provider has addressed the statutory guidance by the beginning of January. It is an assessment at a particular point in time and we expect it to provide an accurate reflection of the provider's then current level of compliance. We do not expect or require that every organisation will have everything in place, but we do expect that each will be able to indicate the date by which they expect to have finalised the relevant policies, processes or arrangements.

Pages 3 to 16 of this survey tool set out each of the factors to be assessed, identifying the paragraph(s) in the statutory guidance from which it is derived. The assessment scale is set out below:

A - Arrangements, including documented policies and procedures, are in place and have been reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect the statutory Prevent guidance. Where appropriate, they have been formally approved. They are active.

B - Arrangements, including documented policies and procedures, are in place, but need to be reviewed against the statutory 'Prevent' duty guidance, updated as necessary and, where appropriate, formally approved.

C - Arrangements, including documented policies and procedures, are in preparation.

D - Arrangements, including documented policies and procedures, have not been prepared yet.

E - This factor does not apply, so arrangements are not in place.

More information about the Prevent duty, the monitoring framework and the other documents mentioned here is available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/reg/prevent/>

Name of institution.....LSE..... UK Provider Reference Number...10004063..... Authorised by (name, position)...[tbc] Professor Craig Calhoun, Director

Signature..... Date...[tbc].....

Factor in the 'Prevent' duty guidance	Self-assessment rating (A to E)	Explanation, for entry into survey where allowed – except text in <i>italics</i> which is for the information of LSE staff only. Ratings B to E require estimates of date by which A will be achieved; these precede any other text.
a. Arrangements for senior management and governance oversight of the implementation of the institution's 'Prevent' duty obligations and engagement with 'Prevent' partners.	A	<i>LSE Prevent Group established January 2015. Actively involved in all relevant major decisions, such as terms of announcement to LSE community on commencement of duty on 18 Sep 2015. LSE Audit Committee taking close interest from governance perspective.</i>
b. 'Prevent' risk assessment.	A	<i>Latest version of initial draft risk assessment approved by LSE Prevent Group on 7 January 2016.</i>
c. Action plan in response to that risk assessment.	A	<i>Latest version of action plan approved by LSE Prevent Group on 7 January 2016.</i>
d. Arrangements for engaging with and consulting students on the institution's plans for implementing the 'Prevent' duty.	C	<i>30 June 2016. LSE Prevent Group held initial discussions on 28 Oct 2015 and 7 January 2016.</i>
e. Staff training plan.	C	<i>30 June 2016. LSE Prevent Group held initial discussion on 28 Oct 2015. May be best to devise own training materials in-house. Trial training session run for LSE staff by legal advisers Pinsent Masons on 9 December 2016.</i>
f. Arrangements for sharing information internally and externally about vulnerable individuals.	A	<i>LSE Prevent Group to discuss and make a recommendation to Director or Provost. Explicit approval of latter required for any external referral. Approval to be given only in cases of serious and well-founded concern.</i>
g. Code of practice for ensuring freedom of speech on campus.	A	<i>Latest revision to be reviewed by Ethics Policy Committee on 21 Jan 2016; thereafter Academic Board and Council.</i>
h. Arrangements to protect the importance of academic	A	<i>Enshrined in School's Memorandum and Articles of Association and</i>

j. Policies and procedures for approving RHEB-branded events taking place off campus.	C	30 June 2016. <i>LSE Prevent Group held initial discussion on 28 Oct 2015. Note that many LSE-branded events are run by research centres, academic departments etc rather than by the School's central administration (implications for information-sharing and monitoring). Need to check whether Annual Fund sponsors student events; also consider alumni-run events.</i>
k. Procedures for sharing information about external speakers with other institutions.	A	<i>Active LSE membership of London HE Prevent Network provides opportunities and forum for this.</i>
l. Arrangements to ensure sufficient pastoral care and chaplaincy support for all students (including arrangements for managing prayer and faith facilities).	B	31 March 2016.
m. Policies for use of the institution's computer facilities (hardware, software, networks, social media), to include filtering arrangements and management of academic activities that might require access to sensitive or terrorism- related material.	B	31 March 2016. <i>Relevant IT policies updated and approved by IT Committee. Some further work to do on latter part of requirement.</i>
n. Policies for engaging with students' unions and societies (which are not subject to the 'Prevent' duty, but are expected to cooperate with their institution).	A	<i>LSESU Gen Sec wrote in October 2015: "At this point I think it is useful to engage in a constructive dialogue – this is what was mandated to me by students – but if things change with respect to how the PREVENT agenda is being enforced then we would by all means consider withdrawing from engagement on this. It's a balancing act between making sure there is oversight and scrutiny and then not engaging in something which has potentially detrimental effects on our students."</i>