



Home Office

**Prevent Peer Review Report
Kent and Medway
June 2021**

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Prevent Peer Reviews – Background	6
Review Process	7
Prevent Benchmark	8
Findings and Recommendations	9
Next Steps and Further Support	27
Annex A: Participating agencies	32
Annex B: Presentation slides	34

Executive Summary

This is a report on the Prevent Peer Review of Kent and Medway (K&M) which took place over four days on 14-17 June 2021.

Kent and Medway are a regional Prevent priority area and as such receive additional funding from the Home Office to deliver Prevent outcomes. This status is apportioned as Kent and Medway are considered to be of significantly higher risk than the majority of local authority areas; although only medium risk when measured against other areas in receipt of Prevent funding, Kent is deemed to be one of the highest-risk county council areas in the country. Accordingly, expectations of delivery are high.

Homeland Security Group (HSG) consider Kent and Medway to be high-performing, but are aware that there have been issues between partners – not least between local government and Counter-Terrorism Policing – as well as debates about practice in some spheres of Prevent delivery – and hence agreed to commission a peer review to seek to understand these issues and help support Kent and Medway resolve them in order to enhance performance.

The peer review team agreed that the Kent and Medway team is delivering Prevent to an extremely high standard. The review team also saw evidence of issues between partners, and of unnecessary stretch in the remit of Prevent team leadership; the Prevent team leader is also the Channel chair, which the review team felt focused too much responsibility onto one post.

Partnerships within Kent and Medway are firmly developed, practice is consistently outstanding, and leaders are aware of challenges and have firm plans in place to tackle them. Many elements of Kent and Medway's approach have been recognised as an exemplar of good practice and the peer review team saw nothing to challenge this perception.

Kent have had a strong Prevent delivery for a number of years, being an original Dovetail site from 2016 and being funded as a Prevent priority area since 2019. More recently the role of the Kent Prevent team has expanded to incorporate delivery of Prevent and Channel across Medway, as a regional model. Whilst this could be a difficult arrangement, Prevent is well embedded across both authorities with strong leadership in place from the elected members and the Chief Executives, although there remain some concerns over the overarching strategic direction given to Prevent delivery, with only tenuous links to strategic boards. Links from Prevent into other statutory partnerships are exceptionally strong.

The Prevent team in K&M are exceptional officers, passionate and skilled, who carefully consider every element of the Prevent Duty and measure it against local risk. However, the team's eagerness to deliver can sometimes lead to over-enthusiastic mission creep – for example, the review team heard about the Prevent team working in counter-extremism and community cohesion work - and moving forward the focus should remain on delivering core Prevent outcomes. In particular, the Dovetail team and the Prevent Education Officers should be highlighted as exceptional, and Kent's Channel Panel is exceedingly well-organised and professional.

Risk would be better managed should the difficult relationship with Counter-Terrorism Policing South East (CTPSE) be improved. Negative relationships between organisations is leading to poor communication, which is impacting upon data sharing and risk management, although junior officers work well together. Repairing this relationship must be an absolute priority.

This peer review report should provide a framework to identify areas for development, whilst also recognising the many areas of strength on show in Kent and Medway.

Key Findings:

- There is an extremely strong approach to Prevent with highly skilled professionals demonstrating genuine leadership and excellence in delivery.
- There is a need to repair the relationship and trust between Kent and Medway and CTPSE
- There is unnecessary stretch in the remit of Prevent team leadership, and steps should be taken to reduce the burden and share the workload.
- Data sharing between the police and the councils needs to improve.
- Governance links across statutory partnerships are very strong.
- Exceptional professionalism in Channel and Dovetail delivery

Acknowledgements

Homeland Security Group (HSG) is grateful to Kent and Medway for volunteering to receive the Prevent Peer Review. The peer review team is appreciative of the support provided by the partners and would like to thank everybody they met for their time, contributions and transparency. The team would particularly like to thank Nick Wilkinson, Prevent and Channel Strategic Manager, and Hannah Chandler, Business Support Officer, for their support both in advance and during the review.

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 Homeland Security Group (HSG) to support local authorities deliver the Prevent Duty¹. 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 utilise 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 2015² 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.

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.

²https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/445977/3799_Revised_Prevent_Duty_Guidance_England_Wales_V2-Interactive.pdf

Review Process

The peer review team consisted of:

- **Lead Peer:** Odette Robson, Head of Safer Communities, North Yorkshire County Council
- **Safeguarding Specialist Peer** - Sara Rahman, Head of Service – Family Support and Protection, London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- **Police Peer** - Bill Knopp, Regional Prevent Coordinator, East Midlands Special Operations Unit
- **Prevent Peer** - Sean Arbuthnot, Prevent Coordinator, Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
- **Channel Specialist Peer** - Tony Jenkyn, Jenkyn Prevent Consultancy and Training
- **Review Manager** - Chris Williams, Senior Prevent Advisor, CJW Consulting

The review consisted of six stages over approximately 12 weeks:

Stage 1: Self-assessment – Kent and Medway’s Prevent partnership provided a review of their delivery against the benchmark of key components of Prevent delivery in the form of an annual review and a broad range of background documents.

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:** Kent and Medway Prevent Annual Report; Kent and Medway Prevent Action Plan; Kent and Medway Prevent Partners Action Plan; Prevent Corporate Risk Register Entries; CSP Action Plan; Draft Community Safety Agreement; Prevent Medway CMT report; Prevent Kent CMT Report; Kent comparison to national Prevent statistics; Channel Panel Annual Assurance statements; Channel Panel Development Day slides; KCC Channel information guide; Kent and Medway Prevent Newsletter; Online tension monitoring; Sticker and graffiti log; Kent and Medway Prevent training offer; Venue hire guidance for partners; Prevent team working practice. **Key lines of enquiry included** understanding risk and threat; Exploring partnership structures for governance and delivery; Referral pathways and structure; Dovetail Channel processes; relationships with statutory partners; working practices across Kent and Medway LAs; Creation of training programmes; Engagement with civil society groups; Communications and community engagement.

Stage 3: On-site review – the peer review team undertook a virtual peer review in Kent and Medway for four days from 14-17 June 2021 and held interviews with 67 key stakeholders across the partnership as well as observing the Channel panel, the Prevent Duty Delivery Board, 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 Kent and Medway to help bring forward its Prevent Duty Delivery Board. While the focus is necessarily on the local authorities, many findings will be applicable to the wider partnership and agencies within that.

Stage 6: Follow-up support – Kent and Medway and partners may find that further support is required in order to implement changes. HSG welcomes ongoing conversations about delivering further support. Detail on next steps and further support is available on page 19.

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

Kent and Medway are clearly committed to successful Prevent Duty implementation and has allocated resource to manage the risk in excess of other county councils.

Leadership

Leadership of Prevent is strong in Kent and Medway and it is clear that Prevent has a high profile amongst senior leadership across both authorities. Prevent is a regular item at both councils' Corporate Management Team meetings and there is a sense that these meetings hold Prevent delivery robustly to account. There is a general confidence that strategic leaders are briefed upon and aware of Prevent, including responsible elected members in both authorities.

There is a sense from senior leaders that the merged team has been beneficial for both councils and has overcome any longstanding political issues which may have lingered since the reform of local government in Kent in the 1990s. In particular, leaders in Medway consistently expressed the sense that delivery had improved markedly since the handover of responsibility to Kent's Prevent team. Similarly, there are extremely strong links with district councils in Kent, with clear lines of communication, representation, and tasking and support made and given. This is in excess of the majority of most two-tier authorities in England.

The Kent Prevent Team have an exceptional reputation across Kent and Medway, and are seen not only as local experts but as a dynamic, high-achieving team, enthusiastic and capable. However, given the requirement to mainstream Prevent effectively across the local landscape, there is a sense that a broad range of partners are happy to allow the Prevent team to take on almost all of the responsibility for delivery.

The Prevent team should consider how to make space for others to lead and accept responsibility; this would make delivery more resilient. Currently there is an over-reliance across the partnership on the knowledge and expertise of the team, despite the vast amount of training they have provided. This has led to the partnership relying on the dedicated resources within the Kent Prevent team, which are grant-funded and cannot be guaranteed in the long term. The Prevent team leader is also the Channel Chair, which leads to a concentration of responsibility and does not allow for a broader sharing of responsibility. Peer reviewers felt that the partnership would benefit from these roles being separated.

The portfolio leads in both authorities are strong advocates for Prevent and have a close relationship with the partnership and the Prevent team. 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. More elected member briefings – especially in Medway – would be welcomed, as would the inclusion of Prevent as a theme on future Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

Despite all the positivity around the leadership of the Prevent team, there is a significant concern regarding the relationship between Kent and Medway's Prevent team and Counter-Terrorism Policing South East (CTPSE). There is a sense of mistrust and unprofessional relationships on both sides, and this has impacted upon data sharing and joint working; it is imperative that steps are taken to repair this relationship as not to do so will impact upon public safety. HSG would like to see details of plan to resolve this situation within three months of the receipt of this report.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a plan to resolve the professional relationship between Kent and Medway and CTPSE within three months. HSG and CTPHQ will work with both parties to progress this.

2. Prevent needs to be further mainstreamed within both local authorities and partnerships, with other teams given the space to lead effectively on Prevent where appropriate.
3. Consider the suitability of the Prevent lead also being the Channel chair, and explore potential options to resolve this.
4. Deliver a programme of elected member briefings, especially in Medway.

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 (CTLTP)

Partners across Kent and Medway have a strong understanding of the risks and threats present across the area. The situational risk assessment is among the best we have seen across the country, and the contributions from district councils are outstanding. This should be made available, in a secure fashion, to other county councils as an example of best practice.

It is clear that risks are well understood across partners, and CTLTP and risk assessment recommendations inform the Prevent Delivery Plan. The CTLTP has improved over the last 12 months although there is still a sense that this is given “to” the Prevent team rather than developed in partnership with local stakeholders. The CTLTP would benefit from being co-produced, with stakeholders able to express their requirements, provide data, and work with the CTLTP author to provide a genuinely useful product.

Despite this, it is clear that the CTLTP briefing process is inadequate. The hosting of the CTLTP on the Resilience Direct platform has led to many partners losing sight of the product, and peers heard how the Kent and Medway team provided CTLTP briefings to stakeholders across Kent, as opposed to the authors from CTPSE as is the nationally recommended model. This leads to a disconnect between counter-terrorism policing and local delivery.

The Kent and Medway Prevent team provide an excellent array of briefing products, written and in person, which help support the understanding of risk and threat across the broader range of partners. These products – and the accompanying explanations – are highly regarded by the recipients. However, there is a sense that these could be improved with information from CTPSE, and stakeholders often reported that they would benefit from police products with the adequate protective marking enabling them to share briefings with officers in their departments.

The result of these briefings is the higher profile of vulnerability to radicalisation as a theme amongst the daily working practices of partners; in particular, it was clear that this was present in safeguarding partnerships and Community Safety Partnerships across the area.

There is some innovative work under way regarding the online space and in particular gaming as a source of vulnerability, and Kent and Medway can consider themselves leaders in this field, with their expertise being drawn upon nationally.

Prevent is well represented in the Corporate Risk Register for Kent County Council, and the impact of non-delivery is well understood, with firm mitigations in place to address this. Ideally this would be replicated in Medway. It may be worth considering an expanded risk register purely for the Prevent team, to help identify potential risks of non-delivery and mitigating activities to address this.

Whilst Kent and Medway have developed a strong local understanding of risk and threat, informed by an improving CTLTP, there remain concerns that this understanding should be improved by the provision of better data regarding referrals to be brought to the Prevent Duty Delivery board every quarter. It is vital that the board understands changing threats in order to inform its dynamic action plan, and to this end the referral data provided at the board should be of a similar depth to that provided in the CTLTP itself. Ideally, data on the particular sources

of referrals by institutions (say, schools and colleges) could be shared directly with relevant practitioners in the Prevent team in order to inform their practice and engagement. This should be in the form of percentages and not included in the minutes. More detailed updates can be shared verbally but this information should not be recorded in the minutes.

Nationally, it is vital that partner information sharing and risk analysis remains at the forefront of operational consideration, given upcoming Terrorist Act (TACT) and active Pathfinder prison releases into the community. Where there is a lawful route, details of these releases should be shared appropriately from Probation CT leads to the relevant local authority to ensure the creation of partnership risk management plans. This information should include:

- Offender's locality- for example, their current Approved Premises (AP) and where it is expected they will be placed following their AP.
- General info e.g. release date, cause of concern, contextual safeguarding, behaviour in custody, children and families.
- Scope of Pathfinder work
- Probation Risk assessment management plan, including probation conditions.

Recommendations:

- a) Work with CTPSE to ensure partners contribute intelligence to the CTLP process
- b) CTPSE to take more responsibility for the effective briefing of specified authorities of CTLP findings via arranging direct briefings and considering the efficacy of access to the CTLP via Resilience Direct, ensuring that all specified authorities in Kent and Medway have access to the document.
- c) Ensure where appropriate knowledge of local risk and threat is spread across the entire partnership, including the provision of appropriately-marked briefing products from CTPSE
- d) CTPSE to provide better quality referral data – on a quarterly basis for the Prevent Duty Delivery Board, and seek to share information on referral sources with the relevant officers in the Prevent team. This should be undertaken in accordance with published guidance.
- e) Consider developing a standalone risk register for the Prevent team
- f) Probation to ensure details of forthcoming TACT and pathfinder prison releases are shared appropriately to inform partnership operational plans from Probation CT leads to local authority leads.

2. There is an effective multi-agency partnership board in place to oversee Prevent delivery in the area.

Kent and Medway have a comprehensive multi-agency governance structure in place to deliver Prevent, with Prevent extremely well connected into the full gamut of multi-agency partnership thematic boards across both authorities. Whilst the profile of Prevent at these boards is resoundingly positive, there remains work to be done to ensure strong governance of Prevent throughout Kent and Medway.

The schematic representing the relationships between partnerships in Kent and Medway has Prevent subordinate to the Kent CONTEST board. This is an increasingly common arrangement across the UK and one which may be best suited for strategic oversight, given the breadth of content present within standard traditional community safety structures. However, Kent's CONTEST board is largely a police-led body, unlike in other areas which are heavily partnership-oriented. Only the Prevent and Channel strategic lead from Kent CC is a partnership member of the CONTEST Board, and there is little sense that CONTEST in its current guise provides strategic direction and holds Prevent delivery to account. A revamping of CONTEST arrangements to place them on a partnership footing, as in other parts of the country, may lead to better governance of Prevent delivery.

The Prevent Duty Delivery Board (PDDB) is well-established in Kent and Medway and has excellent representation from a broad range of partners (although CTPSE representation is inconsistent), and is chaired by a senior officer from Kent CC. However, the PDDB as the peers witnessed it had a significant focus on hearing updates from the Prevent team rather than holding the broader partnership to account for delivery. There was little sense of challenge, and in particular peers felt that given the length of Channel panels in Kent (and the implications upon resourcing) there could have been a firmer holding to account of the Channel Chairs. To do so would allow for a focus on outcomes (for example, Kent's data shows that only 8% of Channel cases are discharged with a satisfactory conclusion, which would seem to be a low return given the resources involved; and yet this is not addressed by the board). It may be prudent to undertake local analysis into this situation.

The PDDB received a short presentation on the content of the Prevent Plan (see section 4 below), but not the detail of the plan, and nor were partners reminded of their required contributions to deliver the plan – although they were asked to agree it. The plan should be wholly owned by PDDB, with actions shared amongst specified authorities, and the monitoring of the plan should drive the activity of the board through exception reporting.

The referral data brought to the PDDB is insubstantial and not sufficient to drive the performance management role of the board. CTPSE should consider the level of detail provided and work with the board to reach a satisfactory solution allowing for partners to understand emerging risk and threat and the roles of each sector in identifying those vulnerable and referring them into Prevent as appropriate. The PDDB 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. CTPSE have shared a draft of the new dashboard which would seem to address these requirements and should be available for the next PDDB meeting. We look forward to seeing the impact of the improved provision of performance data.

The PDDB is well linked into other boards, including all statutory safeguarding boards (where Prevent is given adequate profile) and in particular into Community Safety Partnership (CSP)

arrangements, including at district, county and unitary levels. The Prevent team make a point of sitting on each CSP to enable real crossover into district-level delivery, which supports districts with understanding the role they have to play in Prevent.

The development of the Joint Exploitation Group³, with its firm links across statutory partnerships and its focus on reducing duplication of effort and identifying commonalities in vulnerability, is a success for Kent and Medway, and other areas would benefit from exploring the opportunities provided by this model.

Recommendations:

- a) Kent Police to revamp their CONTEST arrangements to provide true senior multi-agency governance not only of Prevent, but of Protect and Prepare obligations, in particular given the likely forthcoming adoption of the Protect Duty.
- b) Ensure the PDDB holds all partners to account for the delivery of actions contained within the action plan.
- c) Ensure that Channel chairs are held to account by the PDDB for Channel outcomes
- d) CTPSE to provide meaningful data for the development of an active performance management framework in the form of an improved dashboard, allowing for Prevent plans to be dynamic in the face of shifting threat.
- e) Prepare a briefing for other areas around the Joint Exploitation Group and opportunities this may provide as an example of best practice.

³ The Joint Exploitation Group is a joint group combining the Kent Safeguarding Children Multi-Agency Partnership (KSCMP), Medway Safeguarding Children Partnership (MSCP), and Kent and Medway Safeguarding Adults Board (KMSAB). The Group oversees multi-agency activity around:

- Sexual Exploitation
- Gangs / County Lines
- Human Trafficking / Modern Slavery
- Online Safeguarding
- Radicalisation / Extremism
- Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC)

3. The area has an agreed Prevent Partnership Plan.

The Peer Review team were provided with both the Prevent delivery plans for 2020-2021 and 2021-22. Whilst the plans are comprehensive in terms of their description of the activities of the team, they are limited entirely to actions for the Kent and Medway delivery team, despite being called the “partners” plan. This is indicative of the general situation the peer review team discovered, where there are significant efforts delivered by the core team but further responsibility not being shared equally amongst statutory partners – not least, other elements of the local authority.

Although the Prevent plans refers to the CTLP and Situational Risk Assessment as drivers for the plan, there is not a clear link between the activity outlined in the plan and the identified risk and threat known in Kent. Ideally the plan should be in two parts (or at least be clear in distinguishing between the elements) – activity to deliver the Prevent Duty, and actions to work to mitigate an identified risk.

Actions in the plan have identified owners and a timeframe, but would benefit from being more clearly linked to outcomes. There would also be scope for measurable outputs to be added to certain lines in the plan, for example ambitions around training numbers in key sectors. Once these are in place they could feed into a strong performance management framework, driving the work of the Prevent board.

The ambition outlined in the plan is for the plan to be “monitored via the Prevent Duty Delivery Board (PDDDB). The PDDDB meets quarterly and will review progress and outstanding actions at each meeting. Agencies will be responsible for ensuring updates against actions are provided and seeking support from the Prevent Coordinator where required.” This is the ideal ambition and it may be that in normal circumstances the board takes that role; the meeting observed by the peers may have been an aberration where the new plan was shared for the first time. Certainly we would expect to see the PDDDB holding reviewing progress against the plan at each meeting. However, the ambition for “all agencies to ensure updates against actions are provided” will need to see more agencies in receipt of actions in the plan if they are to be successful.

Recommendations:

- a) The action plan should include contributions from all partners.
- b) The inclusion of measurable outputs would allow for the development of a performance management framework for the PDDDB.
- c) Actions in the plan should be in place to mitigate risks identified in the situational risk assessment and CTLP.

4. There is an agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation

There is a clearly defined referral route mapped out for Kent and Medway. The use of the National Referral Form (NRF) has been adopted and all agencies are directed to make a Prevent Referral by completing the NRF and submitting it to a single email address: 'prevent.referrals@kent.pnn.police.uk'. The email address is for the whole of Kent and Medway and has an automatic redirect in receipt of a referral email. This automatic email 'bounces' the email to three locations: 1) CTPSE Intelligence Management Unit 2) CTPSE Prevent Gateway team 3) Kent Central Referral Unit (CRU), the entry point for all safeguarding concerns in Kent and Medway. If used, this is a clear method of reporting a Prevent concern and a single defined pathway, although the referral route is less clear to Medway practitioners.. The referral pathway is seen as very positive as the referral, once reported by this method, is shared with both police and local authority via the dual pipeline.

The referral form is easily found for partners and a simple google search for 'Kent Prevent Referral' yielded a direct return linking the searcher to KCC website and the ability to download the form with relevant instructions on. The Peer Review team could not find any reference to Prevent referral pathways on the Medway website; this should be resolved.

The referral pathway was widely known by partner agencies (especially in Kent), and they explained that they found the process easy to use. Some reported this method of referring to be very clear and easy to use and those who had made referrals were contacted regarding their concern and invited to participate in the subsequent Channel panel. This involvement led to a very positive experience for the partner. Referral pathways are a core element to training delivered to partner agencies and it the incorporation of this into all products is a real positive strength.

Data regarding referrals has been an issue of concern for Kent and Medway for some time. It is important that those receiving the referral form share relevant data so Local Authorities and other statutory partners can understand the threat, risk and vulnerability at a local level (for example, by district council) and thereby direct resources through the PDDb. CTPSE have committed to sharing a more comprehensive dashboard to facilitate this information sharing (not received at the time of drafting). This particularly pertains to referrals made that are closed by police before any are transferred to the Dovetail team at KCC.

There is an opportunity, however, for KCC to gather their own referral data they already hold for analysis. The referral route includes KCC CRU and so there may be an opportunity to gather and analyse data at point of entry into the CRU. There was no data collection and analysis at point of receipt in the CRU and referrals were handled using only a 'case management' lens, so data analysis had not been considered. Using anonymised data from the CRU would help understand the full picture of Prevent referrals in Kent and Medway and hence inform strategic decisions.

There was concern from the police of potential to triage referrals prior to submitting the NRF. Although refuted by the KCC Prevent team, this was supported by many of the training products signposting a partner to 'discuss' the concern with KCC Prevent team prior to submitting the NRF. This had the potential to dissuade a referral on limited information. This is not uncommon across the country. HSG are aware of concerns raised around potential

triaging and are reviewing this nationally. If deemed necessary, further guidance will be published; Kent and Medway should ensure that they adhere to this.

Recommendations:

- a) Medway should review their referral pathway to ensure it reflects that in Kent.
- b) Ensure that there is clear information on the Medway website around making Prevent referrals.
- c) CTPSE to prioritise the development of the data dashboard to support strategic decision making.
- d) CRU to gather anonymised data on referrals to feed into the KCC Prevent team and the PDDB. This should be provided in accordance with national guidance.
- e) Ensure training materials are clear about the importance of making referrals directly through the NRF.
- f) Adopt Homeland Security guidance on providing advice to potential referrers once issued.

5. There is a Channel Panel in place, meeting monthly, with representation from all relevant sectors.

During the review there was the opportunity to observe a full Kent and Medway (K&M) Channel panel and speak to a significant number of individuals who both delivered Channel locally and participated at the Channel panels. Overall, there was an exceptionally positive experience articulated from those who attended the meetings.

Kent and Medway have recently joined their Channel Panels together resulting in a single panel in place for the combined area. There is a co-chair arrangement in place, so each local authority is represented as chair, with the police as standing members. This complies with current guidance regarding combined panels and creates resilience for the chairing position.

Channel Panels are diarised, meet monthly and are currently being hosted on Microsoft Teams. This creates some security concerns for the Panel to be aware of; the Panel meeting peers observed were certainly alive to potential security breaches and the Chair ensured that only relevant attendees were present for each case which is excellent practice. The Chair asked that no personal information was placed into the 'chat' function as this information could be collected by Microsoft and viewed by attendees who may not have been invited to that particular section of the meeting; when this did happen, it was immediately identified, and the person asked to delete it. Invites were sent to all attendees by calendar invite and it was made clear that by accepting the invite constituted agreement to abide by the Confidentiality statement (which was also available to read on the invite). Participants were regularly reminded of the confidential nature of the meeting. This demonstrated strong leadership from the Chair. Invitees were very well organised and the whole Channel Panel superbly choreographed to enable bespoke partners to attend, via Teams, at their allotted times. Timings for each case had been predetermined enabling a high degree of successful coordination.

Kent and Medway's Channel Panel minutes are extremely comprehensive and as such are reviewed at the start of the meeting by the Chair giving all in attendance the opportunity to raise any corrections. These can be lengthy documents to read through for members but is certainly a comprehensive reflection of the meeting. It may be worth considering means to reduce the length of the minutes (perhaps by just capturing key actions per case rather than notes of all discussions), or otherwise extending the working hours of the Business Support Officer.

When reviewing cases, the Channel Case Officer (CC) opened each with a review of why the case was in Channel. This is positive practice and would assist any new members / partners to quickly understand why the case was being heard. This overview was also displayed visually via PowerPoint slides on Teams. All new cases also displayed the Section 36(3) decision, another demonstration of excellent practice which clearly articulated why the individual had been referred to the Channel Panel for consideration.

Vulnerability Assessment Framework documents (VAFs) were not reviewed during the Channel Panel, but these were circulated prior to the meeting for new cases. It may be worth periodically reviewing the VAFs for cases that are live to identify to the panel any escalation or de-escalation in vulnerability. The VAFs circulated were very professionally written.

Reviews of closed cases are scheduled in advance and all panels made aware using the agenda. Reviews are conducted at the panels allowing both the police and partners the opportunity to comment. These reviews did not take any further time than was necessary and were conducted succinctly. On concluding the panel, the date for the next meeting was identified for all.

Channel Case work is completed by the CC as part of the 'Dovetail team'. Personal interaction with the individuals supported through Channel are conducted appropriately and on a case-by-case basis. Interacting with individuals is essential to quality VAF writing and understanding the individual's needs.

There was good resilience at the panel from the Medway co-chair who was able to step into the Chairing role during the meeting. This occurred seamlessly and there was no interruption in the flow of the meeting. The K&M Channel Panel also conduct their own regular Continuing Professional Development days which is another real positive. Feedback regarding these days is incredibly positive and members feel that they can participate in shaping the days and have their voices heard. In addition to this the KCC Chair established and organises the South East Regional Channel Chairs and Prevent network meeting which is held regularly and viewed very positively by other chairs.

The current rejection rate by K&M Channel Panel is currently 42%. An objective for the panel could be to reduce this figure and potentially reduce the numbers being heard at a panel. Consideration should be given to ensuring the Information Gathering phase is completed before the section 36(3) decision is made, potentially reducing the numbers referred and hence subsequently rejected by panel. It may also be of value to conduct a study to understand why 42% are rejected by panel which may help inform enhanced decision making prior to referral to panel. That said, it was felt that all new cases brought to the panel were appropriate for discussion and the 42% rejection is broadly in line with the national average⁴.

Some of the cases heard had elements of CT risk and the police could consider transferring these into police led partnerships (PLP) to better manage the risk. There are several cases which have been closed as the individual did not consent to support or withdrew their consent. Given there does not appear to be any current cases in PLP, it is unclear who is managing the risk for those closed cases. It was felt at times the police were viewed themselves as a separate entity to the panel and not an integral partner; for example, there was a discussion regarding locating an individual - it seemed the police had many more tools at their disposal to conduct these enquiries on behalf of the panel, but the task had fallen to the CC.

For each case there was not a clearly defined support plan that was built on identified vulnerabilities to being drawn into terrorism. Identifying CT vulnerability using the VAF will enable any support plan to target that particular factor. Structured identified support plans can then be regularly contributed to by panel members and reviewed on a regular basis to insure they are effective in reducing /mitigating the vulnerability. Each case should have a clearly defined plan pegged to the VAF.

The main contributors to panel discussions were the Chair, Channel Case Officers and the police; it was felt that other partners could have contributed more to discussion and formulating plans for the individuals. This may have been due to time pressures for each case but eliciting the views of panel members is essential to the multi-agency working. However, the Chair did allow for several opportunities where panel members could contribute to discussions, but few

⁴ National average was 51% at time of drafting (June 2021)

took this. It felt that the Chair conducted most of the thinking on behalf of the panel and at times needed more support from members to aid discussion.

Consideration should be given to replacing the Chair for several reasons. The KCC chair is an exceptional chairperson with considerable skills to chair a multi-agency meeting and fits the core competencies laid out in the Channel Duty Guidance. However, the current chair could be considered as not having the independence to manage the cases. The current Chair is also the Prevent Lead for KCC and manages the Prevent and Dovetail Teams. In doing so, they have sight of all cases as they progress through the process and then chairs the Channel Panel. Consideration should be given to allowing a 'fresh pair of eyes' to view the cases that are referred to the Channel Panel. If this is considered, then the new chair must also match the level of competency of the current Chair to insure there is no loss of capability in this role.

Recommendations

- a) Ensure the information gathering phase is completed prior to the section 36(3) decision.
- b) Undertake analysis to understand why 8% of cases are satisfactorily resolved,
- c) Ensure PLP is active and able to receive cases with CT risks present who the panel think should be accepted but do not consent to interventions.
- d) Consider reducing the bureaucratic burden on the minute-taker or increasing the working hours of the business support officer.
- e) Police and other partners to take more responsibility for undertaking actions and contributing to discussions at Panel.
- f) Develop a clearly defined support plan for each case at Panel, pegged to the VAF.
- g) Consider replacing the Channel Chair to a senior alternative more removed from Prevent and Dovetail operations.

6. There is a Prevent problem solving process in place to disrupt radicalising influences.

Kent (and, to a significantly lesser extent, Medway) face a number of challenges in the form of extremist activity. The south coast – in particular, emotive sites such as the White Cliffs of Dover – have become a rallying point for far-right extremists, and high-profile issues such as Small Boats, Brexit and the housing of asylum seekers at Napier Barracks have had a significant impact on community tension in some parts of Kent as the far right seek to exploit the arrival of migrants to undermine community resilience.

The Prevent team have taken an active leadership role in managing the impact of these events. Whilst this proactive work has been welcomed, there is a clear distinction between incidents of this nature and the counter-terrorism space Prevent operates in – although involvement in these incidents and exposure to extreme views may well leave a subject vulnerable to radicalisation. Peers were impressed at how the Prevent team had morphed from a leadership role to one of support for more appropriate, desecuritisised functions who are better placed to lead, such as district Community Safety Partnerships. There is clearly a delicate balance to be struck around the requirement for expert support in this area, and the potential for “mission creep” away from counter-terrorism concerns.

The Prevent team provide support for this work through their excellent online tension monitoring process, which enables partners to quickly identify emerging concerns and draw up plans to counter this. KCC has developed some excellent resources for countering extremism, for example products to help parents identify online hate and fake news. The Kent and Medway team are considered to be at the forefront of counter-extremism practice and understanding.

Processes to deal with these situations would be greatly enhanced by the development of Police-led Partnership (PLP) meetings, as occur elsewhere in the country. These meetings would not only allow for the risk management of Prevent nominals outside of the Channel process, but would provide a forum for sharing information and action planning around events and venues of concern. The provision of PLP should be happening in every part of the country and Kent and Medway are behind the curve in the rollout of PLP, although the review team saw outline plans for the imminent utilisation of PLP in Kent which appear encouraging. This should be addressed as a matter of urgency; although there are concerns that the allocated number of Prevent police officers to the Kent Police area is inadequate given the breadth of the challenge facing the area.

Peers heard of some excellent practice in finding alternative ways to manage emerging tensions; for example, in Medway issues around threats to statues were met through direct engagement with those leading the protests and successful invitations to join in with existing engagement structures to ensure those voices were heard in a constructive manner.

Recommendations

- a) Be clear on the delineation between Prevent and CE when tackling extremism
- b) Instigate PLP as a matter of urgency as a process to manage extremist activity and risk.

7. There is a training programme in place for relevant personnel.

Prevent training is a real strength in Kent and Medway. There is a clear commitment to training across both authorities and their broader partners, with over 2,100 people trained across a variety of courses in 2020 according to the Annual Report. The Prevent team have developed a Prevent Workforce Development Strategy which is well established and based upon a training needs assessment following a survey of key stakeholders. This wide training offer includes mandatory e-learning and a broad range of face-to-face inputs, including a range of seven locally devised courses developed as a response to local need (for example, online gaming, extremist exploitation of Covid, incels, school massacre etc). These different levels of learning are tailored to a range of roles across each authority, with differing methods of delivery aligned to the most effective learning methods.

There is a clear training process in place, with a well-communicated booking system and records being kept by the Prevent team of those who have been through each course; although there is inconsistent auditing of training attendance amongst partners; working to support partners to develop a training needs assessment, promotion of the training offer, and to retain records for their own organisations would be beneficial.

The peer review team observed a training session on Extreme Identities which was extremely well delivered, well attended, and with strong engagement. Peers heard excellent feedback from those who have attended Prevent training in the past and there was a great deal of enthusiasm and positivity for the quality of training on offer.

The Prevent team provide training for a broad range of partners, way beyond their statutory obligations, including to groups as diverse as Kent Police officers, General Practitioners, Probation trusts and a local business forum. This helps raise the profile of the Prevent team as local experts and builds networks. The Prevent team have also begun to provide training as examples of national good practice, for example to the Special Interest Group for Countering Extremism and SO15.

There remains a need for all elected members to better understand Prevent and their local authority's responsibilities within this. There is clearly an opportunity for induction processes to include sessions on Prevent alongside a programme of Prevent training and awareness raising for all members, and continuing development for lead councillors. This is particularly relevant in Medway, where councillors seem to have had less access to Prevent.

It is vital that all training materials produced include information on referral pathways, and that this information encourages all referrals made to be directed to CT policing rather than any alternative route. The Channel guidance (s.55) is clear that all referrals should be made directly to the police. Existing training materials should be changed to reflect this.

Recommendations:

- a) Ensure that all new councillors receive a Prevent briefing on induction
- b) Ensure all lead members continue to receive professional development on Prevent
- c) Develop a programme of elected member briefing in Medway
- d) The K&M team should support partners to undertake training needs assessments and develop recording mechanisms for those receiving training.
- e) Ensure training materials are clear about the importance of making referrals directly through the NRF

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

The Kent and Medway Prevent team have developed a strong venue hire guidance which has been well communicated to partners. This good practice – including a due diligence checklist - is now shared with other partners in the area including community centres and faith organisations, giving a community resilience and common practice to counter those who would seek to use Kent and Medway venues to radicalise others. Schools and colleges receive support from the local authority, and the Prevent team work closely with counter-extremism colleagues on this agenda as there are obvious overlaps.

Despite these efforts, those organisations who are most likely to own hireable venues could not confirm whether it has been implemented and whether practices have changed as a result. Clearly there remains work in this space to support public sector bodies to ensure that hireable venues are resilient to efforts to be used by extremists. The Prevent Duty places the responsibility on the local authority to ensure that any “publicly-owned” venue is resilient to being used by extremists. This would include town and parish council venues; the Prevent team has a strong relationship with local councils across Kent and Medway and a firm communication to the 300+ town and parish councils would likely be well received.

Kent and Medway both have comprehensive firewalls that restricts access to extremist and other dangerous and inappropriate website.

Recommendations:

- a) Kent and Medway’s work on communicating how venues should develop policies and seek support is strong and the partnership should consider how this good practice could be shared.
- b) Kent and Medway should ensure that they test the adherence to the venue hire guidance they have circulated through an audit of public sector organisations likely to own a hireable venue.

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.

The Kent and Medway Prevent team have developed a Prevent Engagement strategy which gives a direction of travel and a foundation for community engagement work moving forward. The strengths of this strategy are its links to CT and extremist threats and the targeting of action by district council area. This strategy links to Section 3 of the Prevent Action Plan – dedicated to community engagement - which would benefit from allocating actions further than just the Prevent team.

The size of Kent and Medway – at 1.58m people Kent is the largest local authority in terms of population in Britain – makes it vital to be targeted and data-driven in the direction of community engagement activity. The strategy makes a start at this – highlighting the prioritisation of Dover and Folkestone for engagement activity – and an advancement on this would be to work with the district councils in each area to identify specific neighbourhoods, communities, or key community stakeholders and organisations in these priority areas to target activity.

Kent and Medway have developed a programme of community roundtables and Prevent Advisory Groups, which is in line with best practice arrangements. Understanding who the key community stakeholders and organisations are in both boroughs will be vital to making these structures work; using existing arrangements with networks, community forums and third sector leads will support this. Including this information in the strategy will help develop these plans.

Kent and Medway's success in this will be through a focus on capacity building civil society groups and community engagement. Mapping these groups and communities will help inform activity. The provision of a dedicated Community Engagement officer in the Kent and Medway team has been a significant positive contribution to engagement, with the postholder developing a strong plan for formal and informal engagement as well as online outreach work through the development of a dedicated Facebook page.

Currently much of the engagement is with statutory partners. Moving towards identifying those community groups of relevance, and providing opportunities for them to genuinely contribute and have their voices heard, will move Kent and Medway into the next phase of excellence in community engagement. Focusing this on the areas most at risk will be more successful than a broad-brush approach across the whole of Kent. Empowering the Community Engagement lead to develop this, working in partnership with other community engagement leads and existing networks from partner organisations, will lead to successful outcomes.

Ensuring Prevent is taken to Overview and Scrutiny in both councils will help support transparency in this area.

The K&M Engagement Officer might benefit from partnering with more experienced community engagement leads in other Prevent priority areas such as Kensington and Chelsea or Luton.

Recommendations

- a) Encourage other partners to support community engagement for Prevent
- b) Target community engagement activity into specific neighbourhoods and communities at risk

- c) Map existing networks for engagement and leads in other organisations who can support this.
- d) Ensure Prevent is brought to Overview and Scrutiny.
- e) Provide mentoring and observation opportunities for the Kent and Medway Prevent Community Engagement Officer

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.

Kent and Medway have recognised the need for a dedicated Communications plan and the development of this has been tasked to the Prevent Coordinator, who is due to deliver this in September 2021. The Coordinator would benefit from working with the HSG Local Delivery and Communities team to find examples of best practice from across the country to inform the development of this plan.

A single standalone Prevent Communications Plan with information, events and good news stories planned and supported through the year accessible to all and would help to strengthen the messaging in regards to Prevent information that can be shared amongst partners. Most importantly, Kent and Medway need to ensure that they communicate effectively to communities that Prevent in Kent and Medway addresses all forms of extremism.

Internal communications around Prevent, across council departments and statutory partners, are excellent, with a bi-monthly Prevent newsletter produced and sent to all council staff.

“The internal communications on Prevent in Medway are way in advance of anything I’ve seen in other councils I’ve worked in” – a senior professional interviewed by the review team.

The Prevent team should consider building on their good practice in internal communications to develop a similar focus on external communications. It may be beneficial to seek the support and guidance of local authority communications professionals to undertake and develop this.

Communications products such as the Kent website should reflect agreed practices around providing advice to potential referrers. Advice on this is expected to be distributed to Prevent leads shortly, and Kent and Medway should consider their practices to reflect this.

Recommendations:

- a) Develop a standalone communications strategy in line with current approaches.
- b) Seek support from HSG and other areas of good practice to develop this.
- c) Communicate to communities that Kent and Medway address all forms of extremism

Next Steps and Further Support

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

Leadership

1. Develop a plan to resolve the professional relationship between Kent and Medway and CTPSE within three months. HSG and CTPHQ will work with both parties to progress this.
2. Prevent needs to be further mainstreamed within both local authorities and partnerships, with other teams given the space to lead effectively on Prevent where appropriate.
3. Consider the suitability of the Prevent lead also being the Channel chair, and explore potential options to resolve this.
4. Deliver a programme of elected member briefings, especially in Medway.

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

- a) Work with CTPSE to ensure partners contribute intelligence to the CTLP process
- b) CTPSE to take more responsibility for the effective briefing of specified authorities of CTLP findings via arranging direct briefings and considering the efficacy of access to the CTLP via Resilience Direct, ensuring that all specified authorities in Kent and Medway have access to the document.
- c) Ensure where appropriate knowledge of local risk and threat is spread across the entire partnership, including the provision of appropriately-marked briefing products from CTPSE
- d) CTPSE to provide better quality referral data – on a quarterly basis for the Prevent Duty Delivery Board, and seek to share information on referral sources with the relevant officers in the Prevent team. This should be undertaken in accordance with published guidance.
- e) Consider developing a standalone risk register for the Prevent team
- f) Probation to ensure details of forthcoming TACT and pathfinder prison releases are shared appropriately to inform partnership operational plans from Probation CT leads to local authority leads.

2. There is an effective multi-agency partnership board in place to oversee Prevent delivery in the area.

- a) Revamp CONTEST arrangements to provide true senior multi-agency governance not only of Prevent, but of Protect and Prepare obligations, in particular given the likely forthcoming adoption of the Protect Duty.

- b) Ensure the PDDB holds all partners to account for the delivery of actions contained within the action plan.
- c) Ensure that Channel chairs are held to account by the PDDB for Channel outcomes
- d) CTPSE to provide meaningful data for the development of an active performance management framework, allowing for Prevent plans to be dynamic in the face of shifting threat. This should be undertaken in accordance with published guidance.
- e) Prepare a briefing for other areas around the Joint Exploitation Group and opportunities this may provide as an example of best practice.

3. The area has an agreed Prevent Partnership Plan.

- a) The action plan should include contributions from all partners.
- b) The inclusion of measurable outputs would allow for the development of a performance management framework for the PDDB.
- c)** Actions in the plan should be in place to mitigate risks identified in the situational risk assessment and CTLP.

4. There is an agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation.

- a) Medway should review their referral pathway to ensure it reflects that in Kent.
- b) Ensure that there is clear information on the Medway website around making Prevent referrals.
- c) CTPSE to prioritise the development of the data dashboard to support strategic decision making.
- d) CRU to gather anonymised data on referrals to feed into the KCC Prevent team and the PDDB. This should be provided in accordance with national guidance.
- e) Ensure training materials are clear about the importance of making referrals directly through the NRF.
- f) Adopt Homeland Security guidance on providing advice to potential referrers once issued.

5. There is a Channel Panel in place, meeting monthly, with representation from all relevant sectors.

- a) Ensure the information gathering phase is completed prior to the section 36(3) decision.
- b) Undertake analysis to understand why 8% of cases are satisfactorily resolved,

- c) Ensure PLP is active and able to receive cases with CT risks present who the panel think should be accepted but do not consent to interventions.
- d) Consider reducing the bureaucratic burden on the minute-taker or increasing the working hours of the business support officer.
- e) Police and other partners to take more responsibility for undertaking actions and contributing to discussions at Panel.
- f) Develop a clearly defined support plan for each case at Panel, pegged to the VAF.
- g) Consider replacing the Channel Chair to a senior alternative more removed from Prevent and Dovetail operations.

6. There is a Prevent problem solving process in place to disrupt radicalising influences.

- a) Be clear on the delineation between Prevent and CE when tackling extremism
- b) Develop PLP as a process to manage extremist activity and risk.

7. There is a training programme in place for relevant personnel.

- a) Ensure that all new councillors receive a Prevent briefing on induction
- b) Ensure all lead members continue to receive professional development on Prevent
- c) Develop a programme of elected member briefing in Medway
- d) The K&M team should support partners to undertake training needs assessments and develop recording mechanisms for those receiving training.
- e) Ensure training materials are clear about the importance of making referrals directly through the NRF

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

- a) Kent and Medway's work on communicating how venues should develop policies and seek support is strong and the partnership should consider how this good practice could be shared.

- b) Kent and Medway should ensure that they test the adherence to the venue hire guidance they have circulated through an audit of public sector organisations likely to own a hireable venue.

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.

- a) Encourage other partners to support community engagement for Prevent.
- b) Target community engagement activity into specific neighbourhoods and communities at risk
- c) Map existing networks for engagement, and leads in other organisations who can support this.
- d) Ensure Prevent is brought to Overview and Scrutiny.
- e) Provide mentoring and observation opportunities for the Kent and Medway Engagement Officer

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.

- a) Develop a standalone communications strategy in line with current approaches.
- b) Seek support from HSG and other areas of good practice to develop this.
- c) Communicate to communities that Kent and Medway address all forms of extremism

HSG and the peer review team are keen to support Kent and Medway's 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 Kent and Medway's next bid for resources identified within the peer review findings
- Exploring opportunities to highlight Kent and Medway as an exemplar of good practice
- Supporting mentoring opportunities for new staff in the Prevent team
- Supporting the development of the Prevent Community Engagement and Communications strategies
- Supporting the improvement of the relationship with CTPSE

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

HSG Prevent team 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**

HSG 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

HSG 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.

Homeland Security will seek to review progress on implementation in twelve months' time.

Roles and Agencies participating in the peer review

Kent County Council

- Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services, Strategic and Corporate Services
- Head of Paid Service
- Corporate Director, Adult Social Care and Health (also Prevent Board Chair)
- Assistant Director, Adolescent and Open Access (West), Children, Young People and Education
- Strategic Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Manager, Adult Social Care and Health
- Senior Safeguarding Planning Officer, Adult Social Care and Health
- Service Manager – Front Door Service, Integrated Children's Services
- Head of Community Safety
- County LADO Manager
- Corporate Risk and Assurance Manager
- Prevent and Channel Strategic Manager
- Former Prevent Coordinator
- Prevent Coordinator
- Prevent Education Officers
- Focus group of Channel Coordinator and Channel Supervisors
- Prevent Community Engagement Officer
- Prevent Business Support Officer

Medway Council

- Portfolio Holder for Resources
- Chief Executive
- Interim Assistant Director, Children's Social Care
- Head of First Response and Family Solutions
- Operational Safeguarding lead (Adults)
- Head of Safeguarding and Quality Assurance, Children's Services
- Business Manager, Safeguarding Children Partnership
- Community Safety and Enforcement Manager
- Operations Manager, Youth Service

District Councils

- Focus group of community safety managers

Kent Police and Counter Terrorism Policing South East

- T/ACC Operations, Kent Police
- Superintendent, Tactical Operations, CT and Borders, Kent Police (FPSL)
- Regional Prevent Coordinator, CTPSE
- DI and PS, CTPSE
- Chief Inspector, Hate Crime, Kent Police
- Community Engagement and Hate Crime Manager, Kent Police
- Head of Policy Coordination and Research, Kent OPCC

Health

- Head of Safeguarding, Kent and Medway NHS & Social Care Partnership Trust
- Designated Nurse for Safeguarding Children, NHS Kent and Medway CCG

Probation and Prisons

- Regional Counter Terrorism Lead (SE Prisons), HMPPS
- Senior Probation Officer, NPS

Education

- Regional HE/FE Coordinator
- Project Manager – Prevent, University of Kent
- Assistant Principal, Canterbury College
- Focus group of schools safeguarding leads
- Acting Head of Pastoral Care, St Edmunds School
- Education Safeguarding, The Education People

Immigration Compliance and Enforcement

- HM Inspector

Third Sector organisations

- Kent Equality Cohesion Council
- Kent Association of Local Councils

Annex B

Slides from the final presentation



Kent%20and%20Me
dway%20Peer%20Re