

# Prevent Risk Assessment 2025 / 2026

Risk Area	Specific Hazard / Scenario	Likelihood (1-5)	Impact (1-5)	Risk Rating (L x I)	Existing Controls	Action to Mitigate Risk
Online Technical Vulnerability	Apprentice uses unmonitored personal devices/network to access, share, or upload extremist content during the 90% online delivery, going undetected by ESF.	4	5	20 (High)	Secure sessions (MFA/2FA). Tutors present in live sessions. Learners complete DfE Prevent training.	Action 1.1 (Priority 1: Technical Control): Procure and implement a keyword-based monitoring system that scans and flags content in VLE discussion forums, shared drives, and/or recorded live-session transcripts for extremist/hate speech keywords.
Vulnerable Adult Learners	Staff fail to identify signs of radicalisation in the large 25+ adult cohort due to a lack of specialised knowledge regarding the narratives (e.g., conspiracy, anti-government) that target this age group.	3	4	12 (Medium - High)	Staff hold Safeguarding Awareness Certificates (updated every 3 years). DSLs hold full DSL Safeguarding training (updated every 2 years).	Action 2.1 (Priority 2: Targeted CPD): The DSL must mandate and deliver an annual CPD session for all Tutors/Skills Coaches specifically on adult radicalisation narratives and vulnerability factors most relevant to the 25+ age group.

External Speakers & Events	An approved speaker exposes learners to extremist views through subtle, unscripted comments or unvetted public materials, thereby creating a permissive environment.	2	4	8 (Medium)	Strong Controls: All speakers are supervised by ESF staff; sessions recorded; content reviewed and approved prior to delivery.	Action 3.1 (Priority 3: Vetting Policy): Update the External Speaker Policy to formally mandate a pre-engagement online/social media check of the speaker's public profile to proactively assess for any views that may contravene the Prevent Duty.
Sector-Specific (Inside Job) Risk	Apprentices (staff in educational/sporting settings) use their position of trust with children/vulnerable people to promote extremist ideologies in the workplace.	2	5	10 (Medium)	All staff/apprentices are DBS checked. Employer's DSL is responsible for day-to-day safeguarding. Signed Apprenticeship Agreement outlines shared responsibilities.	Action 4.1: Formalise a risk-sharing agreement with all employers, explicitly detailing the employer's responsibility to report any safeguarding/Prevent concerns about the apprentice to the ESF DSL immediately.
Work-Based Permissive Environment	An employer's safeguarding culture is weak, leading to an environment where an apprentice may be exposed to radicalising influences without ESF's knowledge.	2	3	6 (Low)	Reliance on the employer's established status as an educational/sporting body with mandatory Safeguarding/DSL structures.	Action 5.1: Formalise the review of the employer's safeguarding statement/policy during the initial vetting process. The ESF DSL must retain the designated contact details for the employer's DSL/Prevent lead for all new placements.

National Geographic Spread	Failure to understand and react proportionately to localised threats or regional Counter-Terrorism Local Profiles (CTLPs) due to operating across the whole UK.	3	3	9 (Medium)	Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) maintains awareness of national threat levels.	Action 6.1: Establish a process for the DSL to liaise with DfE Regional Prevent Coordinators and/or utilise local police/authority Prevent resources to gain a broader regional intelligence picture annually.
----------------------------	---	---	---	---------------	---	--

**Completed by:** Dan Roe (Senior Operations Manager & DSL)

**Date:** September 2025

**Review Due:** Sep 2026

## Rating Key

Likelihood (How likely the hazard is to occur)

Rating	Score	Description
Very High	5	Expected to occur in most circumstances or is currently happening.
High	4	Likely to occur at some time or has been a factor in past incidents.
Medium	3	Could occur, but unlikely to be frequent or immediate.
Low	2	Not expected to occur under normal circumstances, but possible.
Very Low	1	Remote possibility, only in exceptional circumstances.

## Impact (Severity of the consequence if the hazard occurs)

Rating	Score	Description
Catastrophic	5	Severe harm to a learner, immediate police/Channel referral, major reputational damage, or loss of funding contract.
Major	4	Serious harm to a learner, statutory safeguarding breach, formal investigation by Ofsted/ESFA, or significant media attention.
Moderate	3	Minor harm to a learner, internal safeguarding referral, or necessary disciplinary action.
Minor	2	Low-level concern, requires increased monitoring and guidance only.
Negligible	1	Very limited impact, easily resolved by a line manager or tutor.

## Final Risk Rating (Likelihood x Impact)

Score Range	Risk Rating	Action Required
16 – 25	High	Immediate Action Required. Action plan must be implemented as a matter of urgency. Requires Senior Leadership Team oversight.
8 – 15	Medium	Planned Action Required. Action plan must have clear ownership and be monitored as part of the annual cycle.
1 – 7	Low	Monitor. Existing controls are considered sufficient, but must be maintained and regularly audited.