

Prevent monitoring: accountability and data return 2026

Reporting on the 2025-26 academic year

Reference OfS 2026.45

Enquiries to prevent@officeforstudents.org.uk

Publication date 15 September 2026

Contents

Introduction	2
Who is required to submit a return?	2
How we use the data	2
Changes to the 2026 data return	3
Welfare dataset.....	3
Training dataset.....	4
Requirements for the 2026 return	5
Accountability declarations	5
Data return	5
Welfare	5
Events and external speakers	8
Training.....	10
How the ADR will be assessed	11
Outcomes and follow-up	11
Submission deadline.....	12

Introduction

1. This guidance is designed to help higher education providers complete the Prevent accountability and data return (ADR) for the 2025-26 academic year. The Office for Students (OfS) requires all established providers subject to Prevent monitoring during the 2025-26 academic year to submit an accountability and data return by **Tuesday 1 December 2026**.

Who is required to submit a return?

- All established providers that are currently monitored and have been subject to Prevent monitoring in the 2025-26 academic year **are** required to submit a return.¹ This means any provider that has previously submitted an ADR, or any provider that is a new entrant and has received its Prevent review meeting outcome by 1 August 2026.
- Providers that are new entrants to Prevent monitoring but have not received a detailed assessment outcome and Prevent review meeting outcome are **not** required to submit a return.²
- Further education and sixth form colleges registered with the OfS are **not** required to submit a return as we do not act as Prevent monitor for these providers. This is Ofsted's responsibility.
- Providers that have received a letter confirming their exit from Prevent monitoring during or since the last academic year **are** required to report for the period until we have confirmed their exit from our monitoring regime. We will contact these providers separately.

2. The Prevent template documents will be available in the OfS portal by the end of October 2026.

How we use the data

3. The data collected through the ADR informs the OfS's Prevent monitoring activity. It includes contextual information which allows us to understand a provider's approach to implementing the duty. The information we collect informs our risk-based approach to targeting engagement with providers that we consider to be at increased risk of not complying with the Prevent duty.
4. Information collected through the ADR may be used in the performance of any of the OfS's functions. For example, we may use it as part of our general monitoring activities, including in relation to a provider's approach to upholding the public interest governance principle relating to freedom of speech.

¹ Established providers are those that are subject to the duty, have been through an initial test of their compliance and go through the cycle of accountability and data returns.

² New entrant providers are those that are newly subject to the duty and are undergoing an initial test of their compliance before they are required to go through the cycle of accountability and data return.

5. As set out in our Prevent monitoring framework,³ we expect to publish relevant information and data from the ADR. This may include aggregate sector-level information on compliance and official statistics drawn from the data collected through the ADR.
6. The OfS will report to the Department for Education (DfE) on a periodic basis about providers' compliance with the duty. We may also share relevant information and data on an individual provider's implementation of the duty with government and other Prevent partners, including where we have reached a view that a provider is not demonstrating due regard to the duty.

Changes to the 2026 data return

- We have increased the number of radicalisation categories from four to six.
- We have added a text box to the training dataset which is optional to use.

Welfare dataset

7. As outlined following webinars in 2025, and in our letter to providers in July 2025,⁴ we have increased the number of radicalisation categories for Prevent-related cases in the welfare dataset from four to six. This is so that:
 - a. Providers may better understand their risks and threats of radicalisation and put effective mitigations in place, if they can consider a more detailed breakdown of ideological risks in the higher education sector.
 - b. A more detailed breakdown of categories could enable Prevent partners to better target their attention to support providers where the risk of radicalisation is at its greatest, or where new threats are emerging both nationally and locally.
 - c. A more consistent approach to categorisation with the Home Office's report data will allow better understanding of how higher education compares with other sectors.⁵
8. The previous 'Mixed, unstable and unclear' (MUU) categories are now disaggregated into three potential radicalisation concerns: 'InCel', 'Fascination with extreme violence' and 'Multiple or no ideology'.⁶ The remaining categories remain unchanged: 'Extreme right-wing', 'Islamist extremism' and 'Other'.

³ See OfS, [Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England 2018-19 onwards](#).

⁴ See OfS, [Changes to the data categories in the 2025-26 Prevent ADR](#).

⁵ The Home Office report data is extracted from the Prevent Case Management Tracker (PCMT) and has more types of concern categories. We have used the categories with the largest number of Prevent referrals: see GOV.UK, [User guide to: Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, England and Wales](#) and GOV.UK, [Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, October 2024 to September 2025](#).

⁶ We have amended the category names of 'school massacre' and 'conflicted' that we previously announced to better align with the updated naming from the PCMT system used in the Home Office reports. Our category naming is intended to broadly capture these changes.

Training dataset

9. There is an optional accompanying text box for the training dataset. Providers can use this to inform us of any substantive changes to their training approach that impacts the key staff numbers reported, if they wish to do so.
 - a. We will contact providers if we need further contextual information about the staff training numbers reported but this will allow those wanting to note any substantive changes and pre-empt our potential queries.
 - b. Providers will not be penalised if they choose not to use this optional text box.

Requirements for the 2026 return

10. These requirements relate to the period from 1 August 2025 to 31 July 2026. For the purposes of this return, we refer to this as the academic year 2025-26.

Accountability declarations

11. We require a signed declaration from the provider's governing body (or proprietor where there is no governing body). Any individual who has received delegated authority may also sign the declaration. This declaration is that the provider:
- a. Has had due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism (the Prevent duty).
 - b. Has provided to the OfS all required information about its implementation of the Prevent duty.
 - c. Has reported to the OfS in a timely way all serious issues related to the Prevent duty, or now attaches any reports that should have been made, with an explanation of why they were not previously submitted.
 - d. Has reviewed, and where necessary updated, its Prevent risk assessment and action plan.

Data return

12. The data return covers these areas of the Prevent duty:
- a. Welfare.
 - b. External speakers and events.
 - c. Staff training.
13. In each section below we have set out what information a provider must submit for each dataset as part of the ADR and definitions to explain the requirements.

Welfare

14. A provider is required to submit the information contained in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Prevent cases

Question	Islamist extremism	Extreme right-wing	InCel	Fascination with extreme violence	Multiple or No ideology	Other radicalisation	Total
a. Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Number of Prevent-related cases which led to informal external advice being sought from Prevent partners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Number of formal external Prevent referrals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
For each Prevent-related case, please add information about how the case originated (e.g. concerns identified from behaviour online, or through accessing material online, through external speakers or as a result of a welfare issue).							

15. Table 1 shows the full welfare dataset that must be submitted for the ADR, including the categories of radicalisation concern into which a provider should breakdown this data to show the underpinning ideology (if any) behind each individual's case.
16. The previous 'Mixed, unstable and unclear' (MUU) categories are now disaggregated into three potential radicalisation concerns: 'InCel', 'Fascination with extreme violence' and 'Multiple or no ideology'. The remaining categories remain unchanged. There are therefore now six categories:
 - a. Islamist extremism
 - b. Extreme right-wing
 - c. InCel (new)

- d. Fascination with extreme violence (new)⁷
 - e. Multiple or no ideology (new)⁸
 - f. Other radicalisation.
17. The definitions of these are collated (and in some cases amalgamated) from the latest Home Office report on Prevent referrals:⁹
- a. **Islamist extremism** – This refers to the political ideology that seeks the imposition of Sharia Law and the establishment of ‘khilafah’ or an Islamic caliphate.
 - b. **Extreme right-wing (ERW)** – This refers to a spectrum of thought revolving around the three main ERW ideological positions: Cultural Nationalism (‘Western culture’ is superior and under threat); White Supremacism; and Nationalism (belief in the superiority of the ‘white race’ and/or advocating for an ‘all white’ homeland).
 - c. **InCel** – This refers to an individual who is associated with the ‘Involuntary Celibate’ movement. Potentially extremist InCel concerns would involve aggressive hatred towards women and calls for extreme violence, or other serious offences, against those whom InCels regard as their ‘enemies’ or the cause of their insecurities.
 - d. **Fascination with extreme violence** – This mirrors the Home Office category ‘Fascination with extreme violence or mass casualty attacks (where no other ideology)’ and is shortened for ease. This category reflects where an individual does not appear to have an ideology, but seems to have an interest in committing extreme or mass violence, which makes them a concern for Prevent. This could include those interested in school massacres but also where violence is targeted at other settings or individuals and is not based on a specific ideological motivation.
 - e. **Multiple or no ideology** – This reflects where an individual is displaying a genuine mixture of different ideologies, without any clear dominant ideology, such as ERW and Islamist extremism or ERW and left-wing extremism. It also reflects individuals where there appears to be no evidence of an ideology, or those with no ideology who have other susceptibilities that are still a concern for Prevent.
 - f. **Other radicalisation** – Other ideology not already listed, for example left-wing extremism, Northern Ireland-related extremism, environmental extremism, other religious extremism.
18. Most of the cases that providers report in the welfare dataset are early stage and so we are not expecting a definitive categorisation. A provider’s own category assignments based on

⁷ We had previously announced this as a ‘school massacre’ category but this term now better reflects the broader context and aligns with the revised Home Office category.

⁸ The term ‘conflicted’ is no longer used, so we have changed this to better align with the Home Office category this largely reflects.

⁹ See User guide to: Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, England and Wales - GOV.UK.

the available information to them, together with further information in the accompanying text box, will provide valuable insights into the types of concerns they are dealing with.

19. While a definitive view of the ideology may only be obtained through a subsequent external referral, a provider should be able to identify the type of concern underpinning the case.
20. A provider should also give a brief description in the text box shown in Table 1 to provide further contextual information relating to where potential or actual radicalisation cases originated from: for example, concerns identified from behaviour online, or through accessing material online, through external speakers or as a result of a welfare issue.
21. The cases reported may be entered in more than one data question response. For example, if a case was escalated to the Prevent lead and informal external advice was sought in relation to this case, the case data count should appear in both boxes for question a. and b.
22. Table 2 below provides a definition for each question in the welfare dataset to explain what is required.

Table 2: Definitions for Prevent cases

Dataset	Definition
a. Number of Prevent-related cases escalated to the point at which the Prevent lead has become involved	This refers to cases reported to a provider's Prevent lead (or appropriate group or committee).
b. Number of Prevent-related cases which led to informal external advice being sought from Prevent partners	This refers to cases where a provider has sought advice and information from a multi-agency partner for a Prevent-related case, e.g. DfE Prevent co-ordinator.
c. Number of formal external Prevent referrals	This refers to where a provider has made a formal referral externally regarding a radicalisation case.

Events and external speakers

23. A provider is required to submit the information contained in Tables 3 and 4 below.

Table 3: Events and external speakers managed through the external speakers process

Dataset
a. Total number of events or speakers approved through the external speakers process
b. Total number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions
c. Number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions due to Prevent-related risks

24. An event or speaker count may be entered into all three questions if applicable. For example, if an event were approved, but with a mitigation and that mitigation was due to Prevent-related risks, the data count should be entered into questions a., b. and c. responses.

Table 4: Events and speakers rejected through the external speakers process

Dataset	Health and safety	Procedural matters	Reasons related to Prevent risk	Other matters	Total
d. Total number of events or speakers rejected	0	0	0	0	0
For each case, please add information about the reasons for rejection.					

25. As shown in Table 4, a provider will need to provide a breakdown of question d. to show the reason that each event or speaker was rejected, using the following categories: procedural matters, health and safety, reasons related to Prevent risks, or other matters.
- 'Procedural matters' relates to the need for the provider to adhere to its policy and procedure. For example, where the timescales for submission of a request as specified in a policy were not met so there was insufficient time to make a decision about a case and it was therefore not approved on that basis.
 - 'Health and safety' relates to a risk of accident or injury. For example, where the nature of the event itself is deemed to present a risk to safety or a venue offering sufficient capacity for an event to go ahead is unavailable.
 - Reasons related to Prevent risk relates to the risk of radicalisation. For example, where the speaker has previously been found to have promoted a proscribed terrorist organisation.
 - Rejections because of 'Other matters' relates to any other reason.
26. We recognise that there may be several reasons for an event or speaker to be rejected; however, for the purpose of this data we are asking for one primary reason to be identified. Providers can give further information in the narrative box.
27. With the exception of question a., where an estimate can be made to the nearest 10, providers must submit accurate figures.
28. Table 5 provides a definition of each question in the events and external speakers dataset to explain what is required.

Table 5: Definitions for event and speaker cases

Dataset	Definition
a. Total number of events or speakers approved through the external speakers process	This refers to the total number of events or speakers approved through a provider's external speakers and events process, i.e. not related to

Dataset	Definition
	the delivery of the academic curriculum. This figure can be an estimate to the nearest 10.
b. Total number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions	This refers to the total number of events or speakers that have been approved (through the external speakers and events process) subject to some form of mitigation in order to proceed, or where approval is subject to conditions being met by the organiser.
c. Number of events or speakers approved subject to any mitigations or conditions due to Prevent-related risks	This refers to the number of events or speakers that have been approved (through the external speakers and events process), subject to some form of mitigation in order to proceed or where approval is subject to conditions being met by the organiser because during the risk assessment process the provider has identified a Prevent-related risk, i.e. where it is considered there is a risk of people being drawn into terrorism.
d. Total number of events or speakers rejected	This refers to the number of events or speakers that have been rejected after consideration through the provider's external speakers and events process, including where an individual speaker has been rejected but the event itself has still gone ahead.

Training

29. A provider is required to submit the information in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Training

Dataset	Definition
a. Number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty	This refers to the number of staff a provider has identified as key in relation to Prevent implementation.
b. Number of key staff receiving induction Prevent training	This refers to the number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty who have received training related to their Prevent role or responsibility.
c. Number of key staff receiving refresher Prevent training	This refers to the number of staff identified as key in relation to the Prevent duty who have received refresher training related to their Prevent role or responsibility.

30. There is now an accompanying text box for this training dataset. Completion of the text box is optional but provides an opportunity for providers to explain any substantive changes in their training approach since the last ADR. Providers will not be penalised for choosing not to use this text box.
31. There is no change to key staff reporting. It is for providers to determine who they define as key for reporting purposes. Some providers, particularly smaller providers, may report all relevant staff as key to Prevent implementation. Others, who have tiered their training, may only report the top tier training numbers. Should we have any concerns or need a clarification, we will contact the provider directly to seek further information. We already hold information about how providers identify and train staff from our previous assessments of detailed policies and processes and Prevent review meetings.

How the ADR will be assessed

32. The information submitted in the ADR by each provider will be reviewed in early 2027, alongside other information we hold, including:
 - a. Previous Prevent compliance judgements.
 - b. Information from other Prevent assessments, e.g. change of circumstance or serious incidents.
 - c. Information from our regulation of registered providers more generally.
 - d. Intelligence from Prevent partners, including the Charity Commission, and DfE CONTEST co-ordinators.
 - e. Data from sources such as the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) to help provide further contextualisation.
33. We will use this information to inform our view of the risk of non-compliance with the Prevent duty. This risk assessment will allow us to identify any provider that we consider needs further engagement or targeted Prevent monitoring.
34. We may query information submitted by a provider in its ADR: for example, where we consider the data to be inaccurate or incorrect, or to confirm that the appropriate individual has signed off the accountability declaration. We will set a clear timescale for submission of any amended or additional information.

Outcomes and follow-up

35. As with previous ADRs, we do not intend to issue a compliance judgement for each provider following our assessment.
36. We will continue to target our engagement on those providers where there is cause for concern, to seek further information and evidence that a provider is demonstrating due regard to the Prevent duty. In these instances, when we have completed that engagement with an individual provider, we will issue a compliance judgement setting out whether the provider:

- a. Demonstrates, or does not demonstrate, due regard to the Prevent duty.
 - b. Should take further action(s).
37. Where we consider that a provider is not complying with the Prevent duty, i.e. it does not demonstrate due regard, this is likely to result in a referral to DfE. Further information about how we respond to non-compliance with the Prevent duty can be found in 'Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England'.¹⁰

Submission deadline

38. The data return is **mandatory**, and the deadline for submitting both the declaration sheet and the data survey is **Tuesday 1 December 2026**.

¹⁰ Available at OfS, [Prevent duty: Framework for monitoring in higher education in England 2018-19 onwards](#).



© The Office for Students copyright 2026

This publication is available under the Open Government Licence 3.0 except where it indicates that the copyright for images or text is owned elsewhere.

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/