

LSE PREVENT GROUP

17 March 2016

2:00 – 3:30pm, 1KW.3.01f

Meeting minutes

Attending: Robin Hoggard (Chair), Michael Blackwell, Veronique Mizgailo, Paul Thornbury, Rachel Ward, Nona Buckley-Irvine, Alan Revel, Fiona Metcalfe, Jethro Perkins, Isabella Chan, Marta Gajewska (Secretary)

Apologies: Rachael Elliott, Jim Walters, Hannah Bannister, Sunil Kumar

1. Minutes of previous meeting on 7 January 2016;

1.1. Confirmed.

2. Matters arising;

2.1. None.

3. Next HEFCE submission: overview (inc. HEFCE concerns)

3.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/1.

3.2. MB pointed out that:-

3.2.1. on HEFCE's expectation that institutions would share disparate bits of information on students internally in order to spot any patterns in the whole, LSE would need to be clear where the legal authority to do this came from;

3.2.2. the Data Protection Act and EU law might be relevant;

3.2.3. the Information Commissioner might need to be assured that the School's practices were legal.

3.3. RH reported that he was keeping the COO briefed; and that some concern remained that HEFCE might have a tendency to require action beyond that required by the law;

3.4. RH to follow-up on MB concerns;

3.5. PT raised similar concerns about external disclosure through PREVENT ;

3.6. MB pointed out that other internal data sources included the student and staff counselling services and that advice needed to be given to those services;

3.6.1. RH agreed that staff in these areas needed to be made aware of what the PREVENT duty was and – importantly – what it wasn't;

3.7. MB asked whether the Group could obtain further legal advice on the matter;

3.7.1. RH responded that there was no further legal advice yet but that he had attended a useful Russell Group conference in Birmingham that week, at which other Russell Group members had displayed similar concerns;

3.8. VM enquired whether the Group could go back to HEFCE for clarification

3.8.1. RH responded that it would probably be better to seek clarification as a group of institutions;

- 3.9. RH briefed the Group in his meeting with the HEFCE PREVENT contact for London HEIs and the follow up discussion that the COO had with her manager, Steve Hall;

4. Next HEFCE submission: risk assessment

- 4.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/2.
4.2. NBI asked for the risk related to campus relations to be clearer that the primary concern related to students’;
4.2.1.Group agreed the amendment - RH to follow up.

5. Next HEFCE submission plan: action plan

- 5.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/3.
5.2. RH suggested that a ‘risk’ column should be added, referring to the relevant risk(s) on the risk assessment.
5.3. NBI asked whether unconscious bias training had been incorporated into the plan;
5.3.1.IC confirmed that the training was compulsory for staff in Departments;
5.3.2.NBI enquired whether it was therefore more staff-to-staff related and not student-to-student;
5.3.3. IC confirmed that ‘line management’ also covered ‘managing classrooms’.
5.3.4.RH to add NBI suggestion into Item 10 of the Plan.

6. Next HEFCE submission plan: events and speakers

- 6.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/4.
6.2. RH reported that the document was one of HEFCE’s requirements;

Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech

- 6.3. RH reported to the Group that the updated Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech which is included in the submission to HEFCE would be presented to Council for approval on 26 April and did not specifically mention the PREVENT duty.
6.4. RH said it would be necessary to bring the Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech to the attention of event organisers across the School.
6.5. RH informed the Group that HEFCE was allowed under its monitoring framework to enquire about any specific event at the School;
6.5.1.HEFCE had called RH to enquire about the FOSIS/LSESU Islamic Society conference on 5 March following up on a complaint from Jonathan Hoffman that an “extremist” was due to speak at the event; RH was asked to provide a written report on the event.

Room Booking Policy

- 6.6. PT reported that the guidance in the Room Booking Policy referring to risk analysis being assigned to every event was not being actioned due to lack of resources;
6.6.1.RW confirmed that the Room Booking Policy needed updating and she would work with PT on this;
6.6.2.IC suggested that the Equality Assessment was considered when updating the Policy;
6.7. RW and PT confirmed that if audited, the School would not be able to provide evidence that the Policy was being followed in practice;

6.8. The Group agreed that pages 9 to 19 of the PG4/4 document would be removed before submission to HEFCE.

6.8.1.RH to follow up.

LSE-branded events off campus

6.9. MB pointed out that the guidance in PG4/4 related to campus-based events and that PREVENT focused on all LSE-branded events; MB proposed adding a note that the School was committed to applying the same principles to all LSE-branded events;

6.9.1.The Group agreed to MB's suggestion – RH to follow up.

6.10. RH pointed out that events that were not monitored included Faith Centre events, events in the residences, Department-led events and off-campus events; RH proposed that all of the staff who organised those needed to attend the PREVENT Briefing;

6.11. VM pointed out that there were LSE-branded events organised in multiple countries abroad and enquired whether the School was expected to apply PREVENT guidance there too;

6.12. MB enquired whether LSE Enterprise was included into the guidance and whether the Group was liaising with them.

6.12.1. RH confirmed that any events organised by LSE staff or a contractor were included in the PREVENT duty;

6.12.2. RH to add LSE Enterprise and LSE Advancement into the HEFCE submission.

7. Next HEFCE submission: report on other areas

7.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/5.

PREVENT Briefings attendance

7.2. RH agreed to add LSE Advancement, LSE Enterprise and Heads of Departments into the list of staff to be trained;

7.2.1.RH confirmed that PhD Academy was covered in that list;

7.2.2.AR asked that any other staff in academic departments should be added who had specific responsibility for organising events;

7.2.3.RH to update the document.

Website filtering

7.3. JP updated the Group that ISAB was no yet considering website filtering;

7.4. Following the Russell Group meeting, RH reported that no other institution was doing that at the moment;

7.5. JP queried whether ISAB was the right forum for the topic;

7.6. RH reported that JISC was aiming to compose a list of dangerous websites;

7.7. MB pointed out that blocking websites could result in driving that traffic to mobile phones and away from where it could be monitored; also that the School could not necessarily control all the networks it was responsible for, including WiFi in residences;

7.8. JP confirmed that:

7.8.1.some categories of website, such as pornography, were blocked by default; for some others, a warning was issued before the site was made available;

- 7.8.2.the School did not monitor who accessed blocked or warning pages or tried to do so;
- 7.8.3.blocks could be lifted on request if for legitimate research or study;
- 7.8.4.there was no filtering on Cloud or third party WiFi providers;
- 7.8.5.Tor was accessible from the School servers and was an important safety tool for some researchers;
- 7.8.6.The government did not have a clear definition of a dangerous website.
- 7.9. RH to expand section of PG4/5 to reflect the Group's discussion.

8. PREVENT Training / briefing

- 8.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/6.
- 8.2. RH summarised that it had been agreed to expand categories of staff who would be offered briefing;
- 8.3. RH reported that there had been a suggestion from HEFCE that the School's training was too narrow and legalistic;
- 8.4. RH confirmed there would be more sessions available;
 - 8.4.1.RH noted that some off-the-shelf training material was available but it was unsophisticated and would not be useful for the School's staff or students.

9. Pastoral care and chaplaincy support

- 9.1. Given apologies from Hannah Bannister and Jim Walters, RH to speak to them separately to discuss paper PG4/7.

10. Engaging and consulting students

- 10.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/8.
- 10.2. RH reported that five students had attended the PREVENT briefings and that RH would continue to make the sessions available to students;
- 10.3. RH reported that the students who had attended seemed to have been pleasantly surprised with the School's approach to PREVENT.
- 10.4. RH reminded the Group that all documents from the Group meetings are available online.
- 10.5. RH to continue promoting the PREVENT briefings in Student News.
- 10.6. The Group agreed that the all-students email channel was best, as it covered the whole student community.

11. Legitimate access to sensitive material

- 11.1. The Group was invited to comment on paper PG4/9.
- 11.2. RH reported that he was taking forward Task 2.
- 11.3. JP reported that he had met with students researching extremism and was building them a specific server to use and search from safely. This was to protect the researchers.

12. Date of next meeting

- 12.1. The Group agreed that the next meeting would be in late autumn, in preparation for the next HEFCE submission date on 1 December 2016, unless there was a specific case to be discussed in the meantime.