1. Introduction
1.1 We are required to submit an annual monitoring report to HEFCE in relation to our implementation of the Prevent duty. This report covers activity during the 2016-17 academic year. Our last annual report covering the 2015-16 academic year was submitted on 1st December 2016, Council were fully appraised of the outcome at subsequent meetings this required some further work with HEFCE and a reissued outcome letter that demonstrated the outcome of ‘Demonstrating due regard’ was last reported to Council in July 2017. HEFCE require Council to make an explicit declaration in relation to this annual report and the data submitted to HEFCE (see para 8.1 below).

1.2 HEFCE require institutions to cover the following areas in the annual report:
   - evidence of any outstanding actions in relation to the last annual report submitted;
   - evidence of engagement with the Prevent duty (for example how related policies have been implemented);
   - comment on any significant changes to institutional Prevent risk assessment;
   - comment on data covering staff training, student welfare and external speakers returned as part of submission;
   - comment on any serious incidents that have been reported to HEFCE during the academic year.

2. Background
2.1 Universities have had a statutory responsibility to have ‘due regard’ to the Prevent duty since September 2015. Guidance on the duty issued by HEFCE outlines obligations in the following areas:
• **External speakers and events** – Striking the right balance in terms of legal duties, ensuring freedom of speech and academic freedom along with protecting staff and student welfare.

• **Partnership** – Active engagement by senior management with students and having a single point of contact for Prevent related activity.

• **Risk assessment** – Risk assessments need to be undertaken to assess where and how students could be drawn into terrorism.

• **Action plans** – Development of action plans to mitigate the risks identified.

• **Staff training** – There should be appropriate staff training programmes in order that staff have an overall awareness of the Prevent duty.

• **Welfare and pastoral care/chaplaincy support** – There is an expectation that RHEBs have policies in place to ensure the safeguarding of students and staff.

• **IT policies** – There should be policies around general usage that cover what is permissible.

• **Student unions and societies** – There should be close working in regard to the Prevent duty and clear policies as to what can and cannot take place on campus and any online activity directly related to the institution.

2.2 Council members have received regular updates on our responsibilities in relation to the Prevent duty throughout the 2016-17 academic year, there was also a presentation from Eversheds to Council members about the duty in September 2017 as part of the Council members’ away day. As well as our responsibilities in relation the Prevent duty, the University also has legal responsibilities in relation to Freedom of Speech – this responsibility is enshrined in the 1986 Education Act. A Governing body of a University “shall take such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured.” (Section 43 Education (No 2) Act 1986). Furthermore, the University also has a responsibility to protect Academic Freedom for academic staff: “freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or
privileges” (Section 202 Education Reform Act 1988, Section 36 Higher Education Research Act 2017).

3. Annual report for 2015-16 – outstanding actions
3.1 HEFCE required further evidence of our plans in relation to staff training in areas related to Prevent following our last annual report submission. The information HEFCE required – which was an assurance of which staff would be covered by the training, what the training events were and when they would be completed – was insufficiently detailed at the point of submitting the annual report in December 2016, at that stage not all of the training for the 2016-17 had been completed.

3.2 Our approach to staff training has focused on broader student safeguarding – with the confirmation of a new safeguarding policy last year – there were a number of staff training and briefing events and a new publication ‘Supporting Staff to Support Students’ which covered safeguarding issues such as how to support all potentially vulnerable students through appropriate internal referral to the Student Wellbeing service. “Vulnerable Adults” are people over the age of 18 years who meet the Governments definition of such through receipt of regular medical or social care. However Goldsmiths considers that students over the age of 18, whilst not meeting the Government definition, may be vulnerable and may require support and assistance to protect their safety. Vulnerable adult students could, for example, include students experiencing mental health problems, abusing alcohol or drugs, international students newly arrived in London and students experiencing significant life event such as bereavement. Information on our training and briefing plans was provided to HEFCE in February 2017 to their satisfaction.

3.3 Goldsmiths was then chosen by HEFCE to take part in a review meeting in May 2017 – this meeting with HEFCE officers provided us with an opportunity to demonstrate through case studies the way in which our new Student Safeguarding policy has worked in practice, as well as provide a further update on our training plans for the year ahead. Following the review
meeting, HEFCE issued an updated outcome letter in July 2017 confirming that we were ‘demonstrating due regard’ for the Prevent duty to their satisfaction. We are able to confirm to HEFCE that all of the staff training and briefing events planned for 2016-17 were completed.

4. Evidence of engagement with the Prevent duty during 2016-17

4.1 Student welfare
4.1.1 A new Student safeguarding policy was introduced and implemented during 2016-17 and as already mentioned, a number of training and briefing events were held to disseminate information about the new policy and the support that can be provided to students primarily through the Student Wellbeing team, including student counselling. There were no external referrals of any student during the 2016-17 academic year.

4.1.2 Student engagement in relation to student safeguarding awareness and the wider student wellbeing agenda was subject of a wider communications campaign at key trigger points during the last academic year. For example, during Assessment periods a ‘Be Well, Do Well’ campaign was launched to support students to access academic support on areas such as revision alongside more subtle messages on mental health and help on managing stress and anxiety. We also provided information to staff through the Supporting Staff to Support Students briefing events and handbook, we included new staff through the staff induction programme where we had a World Café event which gave new staff a chance to talk to staff from the Student Wellbeing team about how to support and safeguard students. Those new staff who gave feedback were very positive.

4.1.3 In relation to student engagement with the Prevent duty it should be noted that there is a Goldsmiths Students’ Union policy of boycotting the Prevent duty and its implementation. In particular, officers have raised concerns about the use of the terms ‘radicalisation’ and ‘non-violent extremism’ where the lack of definition is highly problematic in terms of an objective evaluation. However, we have met with sabbatical officers at their
request to discuss any concerns they have about Prevent-related policy implementation. We also work closely with colleagues in the Students’ Union in relation to the external speaker approval process which student societies have to go through.

4.2 External speakers
4.2.1 We introduced new guidance to support the implementation of our Venue Booking policy with respect to where there were events held on College premises that involved external speakers. The guidance supported a more precise definition of the information that should be given by the event organisers when applying for approval and the criteria used by staff in Conference Services and Communications to assess external speakers. Following consultation with colleagues in the Students’ Union during 2016-17 the guidance has been reviewed and suggestions made to amend some of the language used in the guidance, our intention is to update this during 2017-18. With respect to Student Societies and the support for their event organisation Goldsmiths Students’ Union produced a new societies handbook which will be used during 2017-18 and supported by a range of training events including one specifically on event management training.

4.2.2 During 2016-17 eight out of twenty-nine events involving external speakers were referred to the Registrar & Secretary for approval. All events were approved with the exception of one event which did not meet the required timescales in relation to event arrangement. After the first few weeks of the first term the process for approving external speakers seemed to work well as everyone involved took on the new guidance and ways of working. The majority of the referrals to the Registrar & Secretary took place in the first term when there was perhaps a more cautious approach as the new guidance bedded in.

4.3 IT
4.3.1 We have Appropriate Use of IT policy in place with respect to both staff and students users – this policy clearly references our responsibilities in relation to the Prevent duty. The awareness and acceptance of the policy is
an integral part of the user registration process. In addition, as required by HEFCE as part of the previous annual monitoring, SMT gave due consideration to the introduction of web filtering during the 2016-17 academic year. Following information presented by the former Director of ITIS to SMT and consultation with other universities in the sector, SMT determined that the use of web filters would not be appropriate.

4.4 Staff training

4.4.1 We have identified five areas where there is a need to provide training/briefing sessions which relates to our responsibilities under the Prevent duty:

a) Senior Leadership (including Governance) understand our responsibilities in relation to Prevent;

b) Any staff who are most likely to have contact with vulnerable individuals understand how to appropriately refer for specialist support;

c) Staff with responsibility for physical security of our estate are aware of our responsibilities in relation to the Prevent duty;

b) Staff with responsibility for managing events with external speakers are aware of our responsibilities in relation to Prevent;

e) Staff with responsibility for legal/policy matters understand our responsibilities in relation to Prevent and how they should be balanced with responsibilities in relation to other legal duties such as Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom.

4.4.2 During 2016-17, 144 staff completed staff training or briefing sessions on topics which related to Prevent – these ranged from the Supporting Staff to Support Students briefing sessions for academic and professional staff with a student facing role, annual online training in relation to counter-terrorism measures and duties for security staff and bespoke briefing sessions for professional service teams such as Communications, Legal and Governance and Conference services. This corresponds with the briefing and training plan shared with HEFCE as part of the 2015-16 annual report submission process.

4.5 Partnership and leadership
4.5.1 We are engaged with the local Safer Lewisham Partnership and the Lewisham Prevent Steering Group and the lead officer at Goldsmiths for Prevent attends all local meetings. Within the locality we have not been advised of any particular risk in relation to our campus or location in New Cross by the local Prevent team.

4.5.2 We are also engaged with the London Regional HE Prevent network which is facilitated by DfE Prevent Coordinators. Membership of this group has enabled us to learn from other universities practice and share information where appropriate.

4.5.3 The Registrar & Secretary has operational responsibility for the College’s implementation of the Prevent duty and the designated lead officer for Prevent is the Lead for External Engagement & Strategic Development and is a senior member of professional services staff. SMT reviews the Prevent risk assessment on an annual basis and received regular reports during 2016-17 on issues relating to Prevent.

4.5.4 The rise in the incidence of Hate Crime reporting locally as well as nationally during the last academic year has been an issue discussed with local Safer Lewisham partners as well as on campus. Goldsmiths Students’ Union and Goldsmiths Student Centre have worked together to agree reporting protocols so that Goldsmiths can become a location for third party hate crime reporting. Goldsmiths successfully bid to the HEFCE Catalyst funding stream during 2016-17 to gain external funding to support the full launch of the third party reporting centre during 2017-18 for students, staff and community users.

4.6 Internal Audit
4.6.1 As part of our internal audit programme for 2016-17, there was an audit of arrangements for Prevent duty compliance. The audit report found that ‘the Goldsmiths’ control framework for its compliance with Prevent duty obligations provides satisfactory assurance that associated risks material to the achievement of the College’s objectives are adequately managed and
controlled.’. There were two priority 2 recommendations arising from the internal audit: training for staff employed by external contractors, and availability of key University policies on our website. Both of these recommendations have now been addressed: the updated policies have been posted on our website and external contractors have confirmed their staff training arrangements to our satisfaction.

5. Risk Assessment
5.1 SMT last reviewed the Prevent risk assessment in October 2017 – no significant changes were made in relation to either the assessment of the risk environment or the action plan advised to mitigate against identified risks. The risk assessment was also reviewed by Audit and Risk committee at their November meeting.

6. Data submitted to HEFCE
6.1. We are required to provide HEFCE with data in relation to:
   - Staff training
   - Student welfare external referrals
   - High risk events

6.2 As reported above, 144 staff were engaged in Prevent-related training or briefing sessions; 0 students were subject of external referral; 8 events were referred to the highest decision making.

7. Reporting of serious incidents to HEFCE
7.1 HEFCE requires institutions to report to them in a timely manner any serious incidents in relation to their Prevent duty responsibilities. Whilst it is for institutions to decide what constitutes a serious Prevent-related incident, HEFCE do expect us to include any incidents which have led to broader Prevent policies being fundamentally reviewed or revised, or have caused reputational harm (such as media coverage which raises substantive concerns) or actual harm (such as physical injury) to staff or students.
7.2 During 2016-17 Goldsmiths reported to HEFCE on just one occasion when a Goldsmiths student had been arrested in connection with alleged terrorist offences. Following arrest we understand that the student was released without charge.

8. Declaration from Goldsmiths Council (governing body)
8.1 Council is required to make the following declaration:

‘Throughout the academic year and up to the date of approval, Goldsmiths, University of London:

☐ has had due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism (the Prevent duty)
☐ has provided to HEFCE all required information about its implementation of the Prevent duty
☐ has reported to HEFCE 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.’