

**Prevent risk assessment for schools**

Person completing: Mrs Kendal Date Implemented: 20/10/2025 Date for review: 30/09/2026

**National Risks – risk of radicalisation generally**

<b>Risk 2</b> The threat of terrorism	<b>Risk 2</b> The extreme threat	<b>Risk 3</b> - Online radicalisation	<b>Risk 4</b>				
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	--	--	--	--

**Local Risks – risk of radicalisation in your area and institution**

Local enquiries for prevent duty, North Northamptonshire Council

<b>Risk 1 - Al Qaeda Islamic State (AQ/IS/Da'esh) Inspired Terrorism</b> - There's a significant risk of a terrorist attack inspired by Al Qaeda/Da'esh in the UK. Despite this, we've had few reports about it, even though it's the biggest threat here.	<b>Risk 2 - Extreme Right Wing Terrorism (ERWT)</b> This is the biggest concern in Northamptonshire. It makes up 13% of all the issues we deal with. We've seen this mainly in places like Wellingborough, Kettering, Daventry, and South Northamptonshire. Most of the people involved are young, and they're usually online. They're often influenced by ideas about protecting white people, which can involve racism and support for extreme groups	<b>Risk 3 - Online Extremism</b> Nearly half of the issues we deal with are influenced by online activity. Young people are getting involved in extremism online, especially in the extreme right-wing space. They might start radicalising themselves online and then try to radicalise others by sharing extremist content. Signs to look out for include secretive online behaviour, viewing extreme websites, sharing hateful content, and showing support for previous terrorist acts.	<b>Risk 4 - Self-Initiated Terrorists (S-ITs)</b> These are individuals who plan attacks on their own, without being part of a larger terrorist network. They're a significant threat because they don't need much training or support to carry out an attack.				
--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

**Leadership and Partnership**

Category	Risk	Hazard	Risk management	Rag	Further action needed	Lead officer	Date for completion	
	<i>What is the risk here?</i>	<i>What are the hazards?</i>	<i>What has your institution put in place to ensure sufficient understanding and buy-in from Leadership?</i>		<i>What does your institution need to further action to address the identified risk(s)?</i>			
Leadership and Partnership	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.	RI has completed the Prevent training by the DFE. All staff have conducted an Enable training module for Prevent and this is completed every 2 years. This is part of the induction process. Reporting of these issues is delivered during the safeguarding training every September for all staff.			DSL		
		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.	The Prevent Lead identifies on the Safeguarding policy which is published in the academy website. The Prevent lead is at appropriate seniority. This is quality assured at a Trust level which filters to the academies governance.					
		Leaders do not communicate and promote the importance of the duty.	The duty is communicated during the annual safeguarding training. When applicable, Safeguarding updates are to all staff if there are any significant changes or issues to be addressed.					
		Leaders do not drive an effective safeguarding culture across the institution.	Leadership have clear understanding of reporting and referral mechanisms. These are cascaded down to all staff. QA is provided by the Trust.					
		Leaders do not provide a safe environment in which children can learn.	Safeguarding policies are shared with all stakeholders – staff complete a form to confirm the reading of such policies. Safeguarding assemblies take place at least half term so pupils know how to report concerns					
		Not all adults working at the school are aware of the systems	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			Although we use the enable module which is an internal tool, we should consider completing the Home office free module.	SK	By June 2026
		Systems not being secure for the Prevent agenda	Each term, the leadership team completes a self-review toolkit document to ensure systems are in place. This is quality assured by Trust staff.					
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 organisation does not establish effective partnerships with organisations such as the Local Authority and Police Prevent Team.	The providers 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>		Need to establish further links further with the Channel Panel and Police Prevent Team rather than a contact we know.	DSLs	By June 2026	
	Full up to date with Prevent updates and keeping the agenda high profile.	Not being up to date on Prevent updates	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>		All DSL to subscribe to the Education against Hate newsletter	All DSLs	Dec-25	
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	Face to face training each September during INSET. Updates are given through Teams regularly.		Half termly reminders to staff explaining what radicalisation means and how it could present in our settings.	DSLs	Ongoing	

Category	Risk	Hazard	Risk management	Rag	Further action needed	Lead officer	Date for completion
Staff training		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.	During the September INSET Days all staff attend safeguarding training and are familiar with key school safeguarding and statutory policies. Trust staff are trained annually. Induction processes for new staff are conducted following the Trusts checklist.				
		Staff do not access Prevent training or refresher training.	During the September INSET Days all staff attend safeguarding training and are familiar with key school safeguarding and statutory policies. Trust staff are trained annually. Induction processes for new staff are conducted following the Trusts checklist.				
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.	We promote a strong 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>				
		Staff are not aware of the Prevent referral process.	During the safeguarding training during the INSET training, the clear processes for raising radicalisation concerns and making a Prevent referral are shared with all staff. This is completed induction for new staff				
<b>Reducing Permissive Environments</b>							
Building children's resilience to radicalisation	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 institution has codes of conduct for all staff (teaching and non-teaching staff) There are safeguarding posters that are shared half termly in September during assemblies explaining what to do if children have concerns. DSLs are shared half termly during these assemblies.				
		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.	Our academies have a broad and balanced curriculum. Our assemblies are underpinned by British Values, SMSC and how to be a good Danesholme citizen. We carry out safer recruitment checks on all staff.				
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.	Trust processes have the appropriate internet filtering in place across the academies				
		Students may distribute extremist material using the institution IT system.	There are clear reporting process in place should filtering systems flag any safeguarding or Prevent. These are recorded on CPOMS by the Trust and DSLs follow up all concerns of this nature.				
		Unclear linkages between IT policy and the Prevent duty. No consideration of filtering as a means of restricting access to harmful content.	Designated safeguarding leads take lead responsibility for safeguarding and child protection (including online safety). If there are any patterns occurring further action is taken.				
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.	Safeguarding process are in place to manage site visitors, including sub-contractors. Adults speaking to groups of children are monitored by staff.				
		Settings do not have clear protocols for ensuring that any visiting speakers are suitable and appropriately supervised.	Our academies 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. Adults speaking to groups of children are monitored by staff.				
		The setting does not conduct any due diligence checks on visitors or the materials they may use.	Our academies 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. Adults speaking to groups of children are monitored by staff.				