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**Executive Summary**

This is a report on the Prevent Peer Review of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets which took place over three days over 27 February-1 March 2018.

Tower Hamlets is a Prevent Tier 1 priority area and as such receives additional funding from the Home Office to deliver Prevent projects. Tier 1 status is apportioned as Tower Hamlets is considered to be of significantly higher risk than the majority of local authority areas. Accordingly, expectations of delivery are high.

Given this, the peer review team agreed that Tower Hamlets is delivering Prevent to an extremely high standard. Partnerships are firmly developed, practice is consistently strong, and leaders are aware of challenges. It is notable that service delivery has improved markedly with recent staffing changes across Community Safety and Prevent. The Tension Monitoring Group arrangements are a particular area of national good practice.

Prevent is well embedded across the authority with strong leadership in place from the Mayor and the Chief Executive. Local management is strong with the Prevent Coordinator well supported by senior managements who are increasingly building bridges across departments. There remain significant challenges in the public perception of Prevent, and this is reflected in the attitudes of a significant proportion of council staff. Given the large proportion of council staff who live in the borough, work to tackle this perception should be a priority.

This peer review report should provide a framework to identify areas for development whilst recognising the many areas of strength on show in Tower Hamlets.

**Key Findings:**

* Deep understanding across the partnership at all levels
* Extremely strong approach to Prevent with highly skilled professionals demonstrating genuine leadership and excellence in delivery
* Some sharing of risk and threat to LA stakeholders to achieve buy-in across the council
* Tension Monitoring Group arrangements are particularly strong
* The dedicated Prevent social care team is an area of national best practice and should be protected
* In the main, commissioned projects are strong and delivering good outcomes
* There are challenges over changing perceptions of Prevent in the community and workforce
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**Prevent Peer Reviews – Background**

The Prevent Peer Review programme is a sector led-improvement model which aims to evaluate Prevent delivery structures and processes in a local authority with a view to developing recommendations for improvement and promoting best practice. The programme has been developed by the Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism (OSCT) to support local authorities deliver the Prevent Duty[[1]](#footnote-1). The review process is based on a benchmark of ten key components of Prevent delivery in local areas, which has been designed to assist a review of Prevent delivery in local authorities, proportionate to local threat.

Prevent peer reviews are not an inspection of a local authority or their partners. They are offered with the aim of addressing challenges and accelerating practical improvement in delivering Prevent. The reviews emphasize self-assessment and utilising the peer review team to provide practical improvement, rather than summarising current and past performance of Prevent Duty implementation.

The Prevent Duty came into force in July 2015 (and in September 2015 for higher and further education institutions) and requires specified authorities – including local authorities – to have *‘due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism’.*

Preventing people from being drawn into terrorism is a safeguarding issue. Local authorities understand the vulnerabilities and risks within their communities, and are therefore ideally placed to co-ordinate and lead their partners and communities in Duty implementation. While other specified authorities have specific responsibilities in their direct sphere of influence, Prevent is best delivered in a coordinated partnership manner.

Statutory guidance published in March 2015[[2]](#footnote-2) outlines what is required of specified authorities under the duty. Specific areas of activity for local authorities include:

* **Risk assessment** – assessment of the risks of radicalisation in the local area leading to **action planning** and creating an action plan to address aforementioned risks.
* **Partnership working** – including establishing or making use of existing multi-agency partnerships to drive Prevent work. This needs to include the relevant local specified authorities where appropriate and oversee the action plan and risk assessment.
* **Training** – ensuring appropriate frontline staff are trained to spot the signs of radicalisation and know what action to take.
* **Use of resources** – ensuring publicly-owned venues and resources do not provide a platform for those whose views may draw people into terrorism. Councils should also provide guidance and support for other organisation within their areas to ensure that they do not inadvertently provide platforms for those seeking to radicalise vulnerable people.

**Review Process**

The peer review team consisted of:

* **Lead peer:** Carol Gilchrist, Head of Communities, Kirklees Council
* **Safeguarding Specialist peer:** Dave Richards, MASH Service Leader; Portsmouth City Council
* **Police Specialist Peer:** DI Jonathan Brook, Regional Liaison Officer, National Counter Terrorism Policing Headquarters
* **Prevent Specialist peer:** Nadeem Siddique, Prevent Coordinator, Leeds City Council
* **Community Safety Specialist peer:** Steven Hume, Head of Community Safety, Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
* **Review Manager:** Chris Williams, Senior Prevent Adviser, OSCT

The review consisted of six stages over approximately 12 weeks:

**Stage 1: Self-assessment** – Tower Hamlets’ Prevent partnership provided a review of their delivery against the benchmark of key components of Prevent delivery**.**

**Stage 2: Documentation review –** key documents to support the self-assessment were reviewed by the review team to support key lines of enquiry. **Documents included**: Home Office/LPB Self Assessment tool; Tower Hamlets Prevent Delivery Plan; Tower Hamlets Organisational and Process charts; summary of projects. **Key lines of enquiry included** understanding risk and threat, both from the Counter-Terrorism Local Profile (CTLP) and at a more dynamic, local level; Exploring partnership structures for governance and delivery; Referral pathways and structure; Channel processes; Creation of training programmes; Engagement with civil society groups; Communications and community engagement.

**Stage 3:** **On-site review** – the peer review team visited Tower Hamlets for three days from 27 February-1 March 2018 and held interviews with 27 key stakeholders across the partnership as well as observing the Channel panel and running a number of focus groups.

**Stage 4**: **Presentation of key findings –** at the conclusion of the on-site work initial findings were presented to a small group of relevant senior stakeholders. Slides from this presentation can be found at Annex B.

**Stage 5: Review report –** This report sets out key findings and recommendations for Tower Hamlets to help bring forward its Prevent Partnership. While the focus is necessarily on the local authority, many findings will be applicable to the wider partnership.

**Stage 6:** **Follow-up support –** Tower Hamlets and partners may find that further support is required in order to implement changes. OSCT welcomes ongoing conversations about delivering further support. Detail on next steps and further support is available on page 20.

**Prevent Benchmark**

The following benchmark forms the basis of prevent peer reviews. It includes seven statutory obligations from the Prevent Duty and three in line with best practice. It is used flexibly to consider implementation and improvement in 10 key areas of effective Prevent delivery in local authorities.

1. The organisation has a local risk assessment process reviewed against the Counter Terrorism Local Profile
2. There is an effective multi-agency partnership board in place to oversee Prevent delivery in the area.
3. The area has an agreed Prevent Partnership Plan.
4. There is an agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation.
5. There is a Channel Panel in place, meeting monthly, with representation from all relevant sectors.
6. There is a Prevent problem solving process in place to disrupt radicalising influences.
7. There is a training programme in place for relevant personnel.
8. There is a venue hire policy in place, to ensure that premises are not used by radicalising influencers, and an effective IT policy in place to prevent the access of extremist materials by users of networks.
9. There is engagement with a range of civil society groups, both faith-based and secular, to encourage an open and transparent dialogue on the Prevent agenda.
10. There is a communications plan in place to proactively communicate the reality/ impact of Prevent work/ support frontline staff and communities to understand what Prevent looks like in practice.

**Findings and recommendations**

Tower Hamlets is clearly committed to successful Prevent Duty implementation and has allocated proportionate resource commensurate with the risk.

**Leadership**

Leadership of Prevent is strong in Tower Hamlets. The Mayor, Portfolio Holder and Chief Executive take a strong leadership role with regards to Prevent, with clearly defined roles within their leadership of the delivery structure. However, there is an opportunity for the Corporate Leadership Team to take a firmer lead of Prevent across the local authority to ensure it is truly mainstreamed across the council.

The portfolio lead is a strong advocate for Prevent and has a close relationship with the partnership and the Prevent team, whilst holding it to account, and is increasingly working towards supporting the learning and development of other elected members and challenging some of the myths around Prevent.

Particular note should be given to the leadership demonstrated by strategic leads within the Prevent team, who were universally credited with driving the development and understanding of Prevent across the partnership. Their passion and knowledge was consistently highlighted.

This strong leadership has resulted in the counter-terrorism and counter-extremism picture being well understood by partners. Partnership working is strong and most practitioners understand the threat and are working towards challenging it. There is strong evidence that practitioners understand the Prevent Duty and their obligations within it. However, there remains work to be done to effectively mainstream Prevent throughout the general workforce of the authority. This could be achieved by the use of “Prevent Champions” within departments.

It is crucial that elected members of all parties continue to have access to communications, training and development around Prevent. Elected members should be confident in their understanding of Prevent in the context of conversations they may have with residents in their communities. Delivering a programme of training and engagement to elected members will support this.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure members continue to have access to training and development around Prevent in order that all members appreciate the need to accept a leadership role
2. Prevent needs to be further mainstreamed within the local authority, driven from leadership through “Prevent Champions”

The following findings and recommendations are in line with the Prevent benchmark as outlined above.

1. **The organisation has a local risk assessment process reviewed against the Counter Terrorism Local Profile (CTLP)**

It is clear that risks are well understood across partners, and CTLP recommendations inform the Prevent Delivery Plan. The CTLP has improved vastly over the past 18 months and the council and other partners have the opportunity to contribute information and intelligence to the production of this document.

The partnership structure enables up to date information on threat and risk to be communicated and staff briefed appropriately, with quarterly briefings on emerging risk and threat fed to the partnership structure. However, organisations and professionals at the periphery of the partnership reported that they felt they were unaware of the detail of local risk and threat and were not given the opportunities to contribute to the CTLP nor in receipt of regular updates of emerging risk and threat. Sharing risk and threat information appropriately helps build trust and ensure that stakeholders remain focused on challenging radicalisation. This could also include elected members from all parties to help ensure knowledge of risk is shared across the political spectrum.

Generally speaking, there is a strong culture of information sharing across agencies, with an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect feeding into an increasing catalogue of joint operational experience informing practice. Ensuring this continues down to an operational partnership to identify and disrupt radicalising influences would further develop this; the creation of a dedicated analytical resource at the East London Cluster level would strongly support this understanding and the joint tasking model of partnership disruption. There is a firm sense of learning from historical events and activity and using this to inform current practice.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure East London cluster bid includes access to analytical resource
2. Ensure where appropriate knowledge of local risk and threat is spread across the entire partnership, including elected members from all parties
3. Despite CTLP process having been improved some partners appear to receive no briefing or regular update as part of an ongoing process
4. **There is an effective multi-agency partnership board in place to oversee Prevent delivery in the area.**

Tower Hamlets has an excellent multi-agency governance structure in place to deliver Prevent, with a high-level Prevent board chaired by the Chief Executive and with senior representation from other partner organisations. The Prevent board reports into the statutory Community Safety Partnership (CSP), chaired by the Police Borough Commander and with strategic direction provided by the portfolio holder.

The Prevent Partnership Board would benefit from an effective performance management framework, including regular referral information, updates on training and an evaluation of the priorities and outcomes achieved per quarter. There are strong relationships between partner agencies leading to a mature approach to information sharing and cross-sector challenge. Peers felt this could be strengthened by ensuring the involvement of the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).

Within partnerships administered by the local authority, there needs to be stronger links between the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board (LSCB), Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) and the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). There has been little profile of Prevent at the safeguarding partnerships and only brief references in business planning; despite Tower Hamlets’ prevailing narrative around Prevent being that it is safeguarding. A higher profile for Prevent at these structures may support increased mainstreaming. Within the local authority this would be further supported by Tower Hamlets ensuring that Corporate Leadership Team had oversight of Prevent delivery to encourage the creation of “Prevent Champions” to help senior officers across the authority mainstream Prevent within every Directorate.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure stronger links between Prevent and LSCB, SAB, CSP to explore commonalities
2. Develop a performance management framework to drive the work of the board
3. **The area has an agreed Prevent Partnership Plan.**

There is a strong Prevent Partnership Plan in place and it is shared across partners through the Prevent Partnership Board. The plan is set against risks identified in the CTLP and includes oversight of a number of well-regarded projects. Actions have clear owners, outcomes and timeframes and the plan is used at the board to drive activity.

The partnership plan would be supported by the introduction of a meaningful performance management framework to support delivery and accountability, as well as better understanding of emerging threat and risk and allocating resources as a result. Developing a Community Reference Group to scrutinise the plan would allow for community accountability to the plan.

Tower Hamlets may benefit from exploring good practice in other Prevent priority areas to contrast the development of the performance dashboard and see how these are scrutinised at partnership meetings. OSCT can assist with this if required.

**Recommendations:**

1. Consider good practice from other Prevent plans to ensure document has a meaningful performance management framework to support the delivery plan
2. Develop a Community Reference Group to scrutinise action plans and enable greater transparency
3. **There is an agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation**

Tower Hamlets has a very effective referral pathway with a firm integration of Prevent into safeguarding, with all child referrals washed through the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub to check for additional vulnerabilities and provide support. Referral routes for children are clear and understood by all relevant parties. This has been well communicated across the partnership with professionals largely well aware of processes. The dedicated Prevent Social Care team is a particular strength and area of national good practice.

There is a separate referral pathway in place for adults, although without a single point of entry for adult safeguarding referrals the referral pathway for adults is less clear. Adult services are keen to align with community safety and children’s services. The provision of dedicated social care support for Adult referrals would be beneficial. Tower Hamlets should seek to regularly review referral pathways to ensure they remain fit for purpose, ideally though analysis of referral sources to identify sectors with low referral rates.

The use of the MASH as a first point of call for child referrals is strong, and allows for professionals to seek early advice on matters which may be Prevent relevant. Whilst the advice and guidance offered within these services is of an excellent standard and valued by partners, a formal quality assurance process would ensure that any thresholds are applied correctly and consistently over the long term. In Tower Hamlets this is assisted by a very early conversation for each referral between SO15 and the Prevent Coordinator – this enables for an early identification of risk and potential signposting to other areas of support. It is important that Channel is considered as the default outcome for a referral, rather than Prevent Case Management – which should only be used to manage risk where consent is not granted or likely to be granted.

It is important to ensure that those making referrals receive feedback about the outcome of their referral where appropriate.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure advice and guidance offered in the MASH is quality assured to ensure consistency of threshold application
2. Regularly review referral pathways, driven by analysis of local referral data
3. Ensure that Channel is seen as the default outcome for referrals
4. Consider how feedback mechanisms are working to ensure referrers understand why cases may not be taken to Channel
5. Consider bidding for dedicated Adult Social Care resources from OSCT
6. **There is a Channel Panel in place, meeting monthly, with representation from all relevant sectors.**

The Channel panel is well organised with strong operating procedures and provides a range of partnership opportunities to deliver interventions supportively. There are strong information sharing protocols in place, but information governance arrangements must be reviewed to ensure that information is shared appropriately and securely in line with national standards. There is a strong sense of mutual endeavour and shared responsibility. Hydra training has taken place for the entire panel and this was extremely well received.

Channel members reported difficulties on occasion with accessing Home Office approved Intervention Providers; this is a common concern in high-volume areas and although the Home Office are taking steps to improve this situation, it may be worth considering utilising additional local provision as found in other priority areas.

The development of a performance data pack from Channel to report back to the Prevent Partnership Boards and other associated boards would assist with developing partnership understanding and may have a positive impact on referrals and assisting the garnering of additional resource. The local authority is firmly involved in providing support through formal standing attendance at Prevent Case Management meetings.

**Recommendations:**

1. Consider the participation of additional supplementary intervention providers
2. Information governance procedures around Channel should be reviewed to ensure the security and safe storage of sensitive personal data
3. Develop a performance data pack to enable consistent reporting mechanisms to the Prevent Board, LSCB, SAB and CSP
4. **There is a Prevent problem solving process in place to disrupt radicalising influences.**

The presence of the Tension Monitoring Group provides an excellent opportunity for the development of partnership disruption of radicalising influences across Tower Hamlets. This allows for partners to come together with community representatives to develop collaborative partnership responses to emerging threats, including far right activity coming into Tower Hamlets from other locations. This model of joint tasking, underpinned by a strong culture of information sharing and partnership trust, could become an example of national good practice. Ensuring that residents understand how Prevent is involved in protecting faith communities from far-right extremism will help challenge the negative perceptions of Prevent in Tower Hamlets.

This is supplemented by strong local authority involvement at the Prevent Case Management meeting where opportunities for disruption activities are discussed. Emerging issues are discussed with the Counter Extremism Coordinator and there remains a requirement to understand where responsibility sits for disruption activity. The CE coordinator may benefit from some training to understand opportunities for disruption. Understanding and mapping the networks of extremist groups operating in the borough will help identify opportunities to disrupt their activity in partnership.

The review team heard of some excellent examples of the innovative use of local authority tools and powers to tackle extremist activity, in particular in response to right-wing activity. The local authority recognises that making communities more resilient to extremists will reduce the influence of those who would seek to radicalise.

**Recommendations**

1. Opportunities to train CE Coordinator in disruption techniques
2. Consider ways to map and disrupt extremist groups operating in the borough
3. Options and opportunities to share the good work around problem solving and case studies amongst staff and residents should be considered to accentuate the positive aspects of Prevent
4. **There is a training programme in place for relevant personnel.**

There is a clear commitment to training across Tower Hamlets, with all relevant staff involved in the assessment of vulnerable individuals receiving training on an ongoing basis. This could be supported by incorporating Prevent into the local authority learning and development catalogue.

There are many areas of good practice in the delivery of Prevent training in Tower Hamlets, but in particular the education work is an area of excellence. Peers heard repeatedly praise for the Prevent Education Officer; his work in developing resilient schools and encouraging positive perspectives of Prevent in Tower Hamlets schools is an area of excellence. Added to this is work around teacher training and the development of specific resources for trainee teachers. This is supplemented by the excellent work of Equaliteach operating in the borough.

The proliferation of good work in delivering training in Tower Hamlets would benefit greatly from the coordination opportunity afforded by a unified partnership training strategy, overseen by the Prevent board. This would identify good practice and share capacity issues across partners, as well as identifying gaps in delivery and seeking to fill them with the mixed economy of online training, WRAP, and more in-depth specialist training for practitioners most likely to come into contact with those at risk.

There remains a need for all elected members to better understand Prevent and the local authority responsibilities within this. With a new cohort of elected members likely to join the council in May there is clearly an opportunity for the induction process to include sessions on Prevent alongside a programme of Prevent training and awareness raising for all members, and continuing development for lead councillors. Lead councillors should receive specific training and support.

The development of the new Youth Service provision in Tower Hamlets is vital to engagement and delivery and it is crucial that Youth Service staff receive Prevent training. Practitioners need the opportunity to build on their understanding, confidence and capability around meeting safeguarding expectations where their direct involvements meet the Prevent intervention criteria. All frontline staff would benefit from “Difficult Dialogue” training in order to enable them to withstand challenge from negative voices in the community.

**Recommendations:**

1. Creating a dedicated training strategy and audit for Prevent training across the local authority will help identify areas requiring specific training
2. Ensure that all existing and new councillors receive Prevent briefings
3. Ensure that a training and support package is provided to lead councillors
4. Link Prevent training to the broader council Learning & Development offer
5. Must ensure that the new youth service are fully engaged and trained on Prevent
6. Front line practitioners would benefit from “difficult dialogue” training
7. To use the learning and practice development in the Children Social Care dedicated Prevent Team within the Prevent training programme as a means of demonstrating to other children's work force staff the potential positive outcomes from a formal intervention - especially around the areas of safeguarding and engagement.
8. **There is a venue hire policy in place, to ensure that premises are not used by radicalising influencers, and an effective IT policy in place to prevent the access of extremist materials by users of networks**

Tower Hamlets has a venue hire policy which is rarely used in practice as extremist organisations in the borough no longer seek to use local authority premises. There would be an opportunity to share this with other organisations which may have venues that extremist speakers may utilise. However, there has not been an incident of note for over 12 months in Tower Hamlets.

Sharing a process with other partners in the area including community centres and faith organisations would give a community resilience and common practice to counter those who would seek to use Tower Hamlets venues to radicalise others.

Tower Hamlets has a comprehensive firewall that restricts access to extremist and other dangerous and inappropriate website.

**Recommendations:**

1. Seek to share venue hire policy and speaker checking process with other organisations across the borough
2. **There is engagement with a range of civil society groups, both faith-based and secular, to encourage an open and transparent dialogue on the Prevent agenda.**

Community engagement in Tower Hamlets remains a significant challenge, with an active anti-Prevent lobby in the borough working against opportunities to engage and inform positively. This will be further supported by informed elected members becoming “Prevent Champions” in their own communities and the recruitment of a second Prevent Engagement Officer with a youth focus to operate in the borough. The council should develop a partnership community engagement plan to help map out how, where and who will undertake engagement with communities on Prevent.

While project provision in Tower Hamlets is generally strong, increasing the number of local civil society groups to a have a voice in Prevent in Tower Hamlets would greatly assist the implementation of the Duty and the perception of Prevent in the borough. This could be supported by the development of a Community Reference Group, at which civil society and community groups can hold Prevent delivery to account, perhaps built from the recent community round table event. This would provide an element of transparency and oversight and help assuage some of the fears communities may have about Prevent in Tower Hamlets. Ensuring relevant projects such as Upstanding Neighbourhoods join up with the new Youth Services team will be vital. Prevent is taken to Overview and Scrutiny annually and this assists with accountability and transparency.

There remains work to be done on community perception; we heard about organisations who refused to bid for funding from the Home Office due to a potential association with Prevent and CE. It is vital that the differences between CE and Prevent are communicated to civil society organisations and that the aims of both are clearly delineated and conveyed.

**Recommendations**

1. Need a partnership community engagement plan that will map out how, where, and who will undertake engagement with communities on Prevent in partnership with CE Coordinator
2. There is a need to bring on more local civil society organisations to delivery Prevent – will help to build credibility in the programme
3. Ensure there is better join up between projects like Upstanding Neighbourhoods and Youth Services
4. Elected members need to be supported to develop their local leadership role around Prevent
5. Establishing a Community Reference Group would provide transparency and accountability
6. **There is a communications plan in place to proactively communicate the reality/ impact of Prevent work/ support frontline staff and communities to understand what Prevent looks like in practice.**

Although Tower Hamlets has access to a communications officer dedicated to community safety, there is not a dedicated formal communications plan to support Prevent delivery in partnership with other professionals and communities, and this has been recognised as a gap. Much of the narrative provided by these organisations concerns the supposed demonisation of certain communities.

It is vital that any communications strategy is cognisant of the key message that Prevent deals with all forms of extremism equally, and this is especially important in communities based in localities which have experienced at first hand the fallout from acts of terror. Communicating this effectively – in particular, the notion that Prevent is a form of safeguarding - can help nullify the claims of the anti-Prevent lobby in Tower Hamlets. This is not helped by continued reticence among some partners and practitioners to be open about communicating their work in Prevent. This work should be supported by the development of the East London cluster team, and the opportunities therein to develop consistent messaging across boroughs.

Tower Hamlets is responsible for some excellent good practice in supporting vulnerable individuals and tackling those who would seek to cause division within communities. A more proactive approach to communicating these successes may help change community perception. Tower Hamlets might benefit from being more transparent about Prevent delivery, including removing Prevent from the “No Place for Hate” campaign and allowing it to stand alone.

**Recommendations:**

1. Communicate to communities that Tower Hamlets addresses all forms of extremism
2. Develop a standalone Prevent Communications strategy/action plan with information, events and good news stories planned and supported through the year accessible to all. Align this with the East London Cluster team.
3. Consider better use of positive case studies to share with partners to encourage joint proactive comms around Prevent
4. Still some hesitation in regards to branding some communications as Prevent - “No Place for Hate” may not be appropriate

**Next Steps and Further Support**

A summary of recommendations based on the findings of the previous chapter is included below:

1. **The organisation has a local risk assessment process reviewed against the Counter Terrorism Local Profile**
2. Ensure East London cluster bid includes access to analytical resource
3. Ensure where appropriate knowledge of local risk and threat is spread across the entire partnership, including elected members from all parties
4. Despite CTLP process having been improved some partners appear to receive no briefing or regular update as part of an ongoing process
5. **There is an effective multi-agency partnership board in place to oversee Prevent delivery in the area.**
6. Ensure stronger links between Prevent and LSCB, SAB, CSP to explore commonalities
7. Develop a performance management framework to drive the work of the board
8. **The area has an agreed Prevent Partnership Plan.**
9. Consider good practice from other Prevent plans to ensure document has a meaningful performance management framework to support the delivery plan
10. Develop a Community Reference Group to scrutinise action plans and enable greater transparency
11. **There is an agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation**
12. Ensure advice and guidance offered in the MASH is quality assured to ensure consistency of threshold application
13. Ensure that Channel is seen as the default outcome for referrals
14. Consider how feedback mechanisms are working to ensure referrers understand why cases may not be taken to Channel
15. Consider bidding for dedicated Adult Social Care resources from OSCT
16. **There is a Channel Panel in place, meeting monthly, with representation from all relevant sectors.**
17. Consider the participation of additional supplementary intervention providers
18. Information governance procedures around Channel should be reviewed to ensure the security and safe storage of sensitive personal data
19. Develop a performance data pack to enable consistent reporting mechanisms to the Prevent Board, LSCB, SAB and CSP
20. **There is a Prevent problem solving process in place to disrupt radicalising influences.**
21. Opportunities to train CE Coordinator in disruption techniques
22. Consider ways to map and disrupt extremist groups operating in the borough
23. Options and opportunities to share the good work around problem solving and case studies amongst staff and residents should be considered to accentuate the positive aspects of Prevent
24. **There is a training programme in place for relevant personnel.**
25. Creating a dedicated training strategy and audit for Prevent training across the local authority will help identify areas requiring specific training
26. Ensure that all existing and new councillors receive Prevent briefings
27. Ensure that a training and support package is provided to lead councillors
28. Link Prevent training to the broader council Learning & Development offer
29. Must ensure that the new youth service are fully engaged and trained on Prevent
30. Front line practitioners would benefit from “difficult dialogue” training
31. **There is a venue hire policy in place, to ensure that premises are not used by radicalising influencers, and an effective IT policy in place to prevent the access of extremist materials by users of networks**
32. Seek to share venue hire policy and speaker checking process with other organisations across the borough
33. **There is engagement with a range of civil society groups, both faith-based and secular, to encourage an open and transparent dialogue on the Prevent agenda.**
34. Need a partnership community engagement plan that will map out how, where, and who will undertake engagement with communities on Prevent in partnership with CE Coordinator
35. There is a need to bring on more local civil society organisations to delivery Prevent – will help to build credibility in the programme
36. Ensure there is better join up between projects like Upstanding Neighbourhoods and Youth Services
37. Elected members need to be supported to develop their local leadership role around Prevent
38. Establishing a Community Reference Group would provide transparency and accountability
39. **There is a communications plan in place to proactively communicate the reality/ impact of Prevent work/ support frontline staff and communities to understand what Prevent looks like in practice.**
40. Communicate to communities that Tower Hamlets addresses all forms of extremism
41. Develop a standalone Prevent Communications strategy/action plan with information, events and good news stories planned and supported through the year accessible to all. Align this with the East London Cluster team.
42. Consider better use of positive case studies to share with partners to encourage joint proactive comms around Prevent
43. Still some hesitation in regards to branding some communications as Prevent - “No Place for Hate” may not be appropriate

OSCT and the peer review team are keen to support Tower Hamlets’ ongoing performance in delivering these recommendations, and we encourage the authority to continue to draw upon the advice and support of the peer review pool when required. This will include:

* Supporting Tower Hamlets’ next multi-year bid for resources identified within the peer review findings
* Exploring opportunities to highlight Tower Hamlets as an exemplar of good practice
* Supporting a request for analytical support in the East London Cluster Bid
* Supporting the development of the Prevent Partnership Performance Dashboard
* Supporting the understanding of the relationship with CE
* Support with refreshing the communications plan and ongoing member engagement

In addition to theoretical and practical support in implementing each of the above recommendations, support is available through the following mechanisms:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Informal Visits and mentoring** | OSCT Prevent officers or Prevent Peers can arrange to meet lead officers in local areas to informally review policies and procedures. This can be expanded to a more formal mentoring programme if beneficial. |
| **Prevent Board observation and engagement** | OSCT Prevent officers or Prevent peers can attend Prevent Partnerships and develop a set of recommendations for improvement, as well as presenting on the latest direction from the government. |
| **Channel observation**  | OSCT Prevent officers or Prevent peers can attend Prevent Partnerships and develop a set of recommendations for improvement. |
| **Desktop Document Reviews** | Prevent peers can review and advise on strategies, action plans, policies and procedures remotely. Three peers will review submissions and return comments within 15 working days. |

**The review team will seek to review progress on implementation in six months’ time.**

1. **Disclaimer:** The recommendations offered in this report are based on the discussions and evidence considered during the Prevent peer review. The paper is intended to be advisory and as such judgement and discretion should be exercised over how best to implement. It covers the substance of the review and as such there may be elements which have not been considered. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/445977/3799_Revised_Prevent_Duty_Guidance__England_Wales_V2-Interactive.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)