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Executive Summary

In May 2008 BMG Research was commissioned by Communities and Local Government to conduct a mapping exercise of the Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund (PVEPF). The PVEPF was launched in October 2006 in order to support priority local authorities in developing programmes of activity to tackle violent extremism at a local level. Seventy local authorities across England were identified as priority areas in the pathfinder year. Some of these local authorities formed consortia, pooling resources and running projects collectively, which resulted in 56 local authorities or local partnerships responsible for distributing PVE Pathfinder Funding.

This mapping exercise involved collating descriptive data on all of the pathfinder projects funded in 2007/2008. A database developed by Communities and Local Government and subsequently expanded by the research team was distributed to all local authorities for completion. The database contains information about the range of projects funded, project partners, project beneficiaries and the contribution that the projects are making to the PVEPF priorities and the wider PREVENT strategy to counter-terrorism. This report contains an overview of the database information provided by 53 of the 56 local authorities or local authority partnerships who had returned their data by the reporting deadline, covering 261 projects.

Project activities

- Projects adopted a range of activities including training and education, debating and discussion forums, leadership and management activities, sports and recreation and arts and cultural activities.
- Authorities were mostly using their PVEPF funded projects to encourage communities to deliberate violent extremism via debates, discussions and forums (54 per cent of projects included these activities), and for general education purposes (33%). Recipients of these types of projects, and most other projects regardless of their main activities (omitting sports and recreation), catered to both men and women of all ages (as opposed to focusing on a single sex or age group).

---

1 A full list of the 70 priority local authorities can be found in Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund 2007/08: Case studies, Department for Communities and Local Government (April 2007). Full report is downloadable at: www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/324967.pdf

2 The remaining information was collated separately and added to the project database by Communities and Local Government after the reporting deadline.
Delivery modes

- More than half of activities were delivered through community-based work (56%), although large proportions also used outreach work (34%) and educational establishments (27%). Less than a fifth (19%) included mosque-based delivery or included printed/electronic material (16%). Home-based delivery methods were used the least, with only six out of the 261 total projects including this delivery mode for activities for parents and families in Muslim communities.

- There were some regional variations in the types of delivery modes used for projects. For example, although Yorkshire and Humber had relatively small numbers of projects delivered in the region (18), almost all of them included community-based work (94%), whereas a quarter of projects in the East Midlands (24%) included community-based activities. Yorkshire and Humber, the North West and North East regions were more likely to include mosque-based delivery (respectively, 33 per cent, 32 per cent and two of the six projects in the North East) than the other regions, including London.

Project timings

- Projects ranged from one-off, one-day events, to initiatives running for 12 months or more.

- Almost half of PVEPF funded projects (48%) had not yet ended at the time of data collection. In total, over three quarters of projects (77%) lasted or will last more than six months in duration, whilst fewer than one in ten (8%) ran or will run for one month or less, typically being one-off/one-day events including debates, discussion and forums.

Project beneficiaries

- Local authorities were asked to indicate which groups that projects directly engaged with (‘primary beneficiaries’) and which groups the project also aimed to impact (‘secondary beneficiaries’).

- There has been a concerted effort to directly focus projects towards Muslim communities – with 61 per cent of projects returned including this group of people as primary project beneficiaries. More than a quarter (29%) included the general population as primary beneficiaries and around a fifth of projects (20%) engaged with individuals ‘at risk’.

- Over half of all projects (57%) included both males and females as primary project beneficiaries as opposed to focusing on a single sex; a further 7 per cent focused just on males and 9 per cent aimed solely at females.

- A third of projects (33%) cited community workers or local service providers (32%) as primary project beneficiaries, and a quarter of projects (26%) included parents and families.
• Those ‘at risk’ and individuals/groups glorifying or justifying violent extremism were more likely to be identified as secondary beneficiaries than primary beneficiaries. This perhaps indicates that the information learnt by the primary beneficiaries is intended to be disseminated to local communities to reach those at risk or those glorifying or justifying violent extremism.

• More than two out of five projects (44%) included beneficiaries of mixed ages. However, out of the age-specific projects, people under the age of 16 (23%) and 16 – 25 year olds (28%) received the most focus. This compares to 35 projects (13%) that focused on those aged over 26.

• In terms of the numbers of project beneficiaries, a manual count of the information provided (by 177 projects) estimates this at around 44,000, equating to an average of around 245 people per project – using the 177 as a base (although this does not take into account ‘double counting’ where individuals may have benefited from more than one project, and is based on some projects providing ranges rather than absolute numbers).

• The diverse nature of the projects can be illustrated somewhat by the participant numbers. Smaller-scale projects tended to consist of small group-based exercises, for example, discussion groups and DVD producing. Larger-scale projects included media campaigns and workshop-based activities.

### Partnership working

• Local authorities in receipt of PVEPF funding were required to involve local partners in developing their programme of PVE work.

• From the data provided by local authorities, it was evident that partnership working was widespread, with projects demonstrating their involvement with a wide range of local stakeholders, particularly in the public and community sectors.

• Projects clearly had embraced partnership working both inside and outside of their local authority, with engagement across a number of different sectors, notably voluntary and community groups, the police and faith organisations. Rather less mention was made of educational establishments and of leisure, sports and arts providers.

Further research is required to identify how partnerships are forged on the ground, and what mechanisms are in place internally to ensure that links are made across, for example, schools and education, community cohesion, equalities and leisure and arts departments to ensure that the PVE work achieves maximum coverage and subsequently, impact. Additional ‘case study’ or focused approaches – such as those used in the recent Learning and Development Exercise undertaken by the Audit Commission and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary – would help to identify what facilitates and hinders successful partnership working in this context, and to identify evidence of good practice to inform future project development³.

Funding

- All of the projects included in the mapping exercise received PVEPF funding in the financial year 2007-2008, the total amount of which was approximately £6 million. The amount that local authorities received varied, from around £15,000 to cover two or three discrete PVE activities, to more than £500,000 for large multi-authority activities.

- For 35 of the 261 projects returned by local authorities (13%), additional (non-PVEPF) funding had been received for the PVE activities, for example from the local police. A number of projects also received additional resource support from elsewhere (for example project management assistance).

Contribution of projects to PVEPF themes

- The PVEPF required projects to identify with one or more themes: promoting shared values; supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership; increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions; and capacity and skills development.

- Of the four main PVEPF themes, all were covered to a greater or lesser extent by the 261 projects. However, projects were more likely to be identified with Theme 1 (promoting shared values, 64%) and Theme 2 (supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership, 61%) and less likely to be identified with Theme 3 (increasing resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early Interventions, 23%) and Theme 4 (capacity and skills, 31%).

- There may be merit in promoting activities that specifically focus key institutions on encouraging learning and development programmes, and on facilitating training for local frontline staff and managers in local service providing organisations to ensure that organisational and individual capacity is raised. This may help to enable preventative and early intervention work to develop.
Contribution of projects to PREVENT strategy objectives

- The PREVENT strategy is one of the four components of the Government’s counter-terrorism strategy (CONTEST) with the aim of stopping people becoming or supporting violent extremism. The strategy objectives were officially introduced in May 2008\(^4\) to provide a strategic framework for PREVENT activities going forward, building on the action plan set out in the April 2007 report *Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds*\(^5\). Authorities were asked to categorise their projects against one or more of the PREVENT objectives to provide a picture of how PVEPF projects map to the PREVENT strategy objectives.

- Of the 261 projects included in this analysis, 85 (33\%) adhered to just one PREVENT objective, with most addressing two to three different PREVENT objectives.

- The most common PREVENT objective was *increasing the resilience of communities to violent extremism* (Objective 4, 57\%). A large number of these projects were in London, the West Midlands and the North West, although the North East had the highest proportion of all projects in each region (5 out of 6 projects) meeting this objective.

- It is apparent that there is some variation in the interpretation and allocation of projects against PREVENT strategy objectives. For example, some local authorities have allocated a project that encourages discussion to Objective 5 (addressing grievances), whereas others have categorised similar projects to Objective 4 (increasing resilience).

Project monitoring and evaluation

- In addition to any national PVEPF evaluation activities, local authorities were required to carry out both monitoring and evaluation activities.

- Relatively few authorities were able to provide evaluation reports for their PVEPF projects in the first year.

- BMG undertook an extensive telephone exercise to obtain copies of evaluation material where it was indicated that it was available. As a result, 33 evaluation documents were obtained, representing 18 local authorities (or local authority consortia), 25 of which were of sufficient detail to include in a rapid review.

- These have ranged from very small satisfaction studies (for example, self-completion satisfaction scores or verbatim feedback from participants) to larger regional or authority-wide evaluation work carried out by external consultants.

---


The main theme of the evaluation reports has been focused on the organisation, delivery and achievements of the projects, in particular, against set objectives. From the reports reviewed, there appears to be limited reflective evaluation of the projects, in terms of a project's strengths, weaknesses, good practice and areas for improvement except in the larger evaluation studies.

Based on the review of the project evaluations to date, it is clear that authorities would benefit from further guidance as to how to gather and present evaluation evidence. For example, this may be in the form of a standard template to ensure that, as far as possible, evaluation evidence is collected in a systematic and comparable manner.

Authorities may also be encouraged to facilitate evaluation activities throughout the life of a project, rather than just at the end. An example of this may be collecting information on attitudes of participants to violent extremism before and after an intervention.

Recommendations

The mapping exercise has provided a comprehensive picture of projects that received PVE Pathfinder funding for 2007/2008. However, some local authorities have found it difficult to provide the required information. The following recommendations are suggested:

- For future mapping activities, further advance notice of the data required from local authorities
- Provision by local authorities and projects of a lead named contact with responsibility for monitoring and evaluation
- Clear guidance to projects on what constitutes evaluation, and guidance or a template on how to conduct a local evaluation of activities
- Further clarification to authorities about the PVE and PREVENT priorities
- A review of the project delivery modes, and whether there is scope for increasing some delivery methods (for example, written/electronic material, mosque-based delivery)
- Sharing of good practice and ‘lessons learnt’ among projects and local authorities
- Greater understanding of partnership working, and what makes this effective.
Section 1

Introduction and context

BMG Research was commissioned by Communities and Local Government to conduct a mapping exercise for projects delivered via the Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund (PVEPF). The PVEPF was launched in October 2006 for one year in order to support priority local authorities in developing programmes of activity to tackle violent extremism at a local level. The mapping exercise was intended to collate descriptive data on all of the pathfinder projects funded in 2007/2008. This report contains the results of this exercise.

1.1 Policy context – Preventing Violent Extremism

Preventing terrorism and violent extremism is a major long-term challenge, and one that the Government has recognised needs to be tackled at both a local and national level (as well as internationally). The PREVENT strategy is one of the four components of the government’s counter-terrorism strategy (which is known as CONTEST) and its approach is to stop people becoming or supporting violent extremists. The 2006 Local Government White Paper *Strong and Prosperous Communities*\(^6\) emphasised the need for local authorities to engage with the PREVENT agenda. In October 2007 the Communities Secretary announced £45 million for local partners building resilience to violent extremism. PREVENT cuts across a wide range of government departments, primarily Communities and Local Government and the Home Office, as well as the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS), amongst others. In particular, Communities and Local Government is working with others to enable communities to work at a local level in tackling violent extremism through the building of strong, resilient communities. Communities and Local Government has taken forward this work through four key approaches:

- Promoting shared values
- Supporting local solutions
- Building civic capacity and leadership, and
- Strengthening the role of faith institutions and leaders.

---

\(^6\) The full document can be found at www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/strongprosperous
The PVEPF was a key part of the PREVENT element of the Government’s counter-terrorism strategy and of the wider national framework as set out in *Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds*. It recognises that a centrally-driven approach to counter-terrorism will not be effective on its own: there is also a need to work in partnership with local communities, and local authorities and their partners are best placed to do this.

The PREVENT strategy, set out in May 2008 in *Preventing Violent Extremism: a strategy for delivery*, has the following five objectives which will provide the strategic framework for projects going forward:

- Challenge the violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices
- Disrupt those who promote violent extremism and support the institutions where they are active
- Support individuals who are being targeted and recruited to the cause of violent extremism
- Increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism
- Address the grievances which ideologues are exploiting.

In addition, there are two cross-cutting themes:

- Develop understanding, analysis and evaluation
- Strategic communications.

### 1.2 Background – the Pathfinder Fund

In the 2007/2008 financial year, funding was made available to 70 priority local authorities to take forward a programme of activities to tackle violent extremism at a local level. Some of these local authorities formed consortia, pooling resources and running projects collectively, which resulted in 56 local authorities or local partnerships responsible for distributing PVE Pathfinder Funding.

The PVEPF aimed to build on the work that local authorities were already doing, in terms of engaging with their communities, forging partnerships with police, community and faith groups and working with mosques and institutions of education.

---

7 The full document can be found at www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/preventingviolentextremism
8 The full document can be found at the following location: www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/preventstrategy
The strategic objectives of the programme were to develop a community in which Muslims:

- Identify themselves as a welcome part of a wider British society and are accepted as such by the wider community
- Reject violent extremist activity, and support and co-operate with the police and security services
- Develop their own capacity to deal with problems where they arise and support diversionary activity for those at risk.  

The range of activities that local authorities planned was very broad, but typically each authority ran between three and five different projects. In total, funding of £6 million was available in the pathfinder year which helped to fund more than 275 projects (of which 261 are included in this analysis).

The projects covered one or more of the following priorities:

- Promoting shared values
- Supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership
- Increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions
- Capacity and skills development.

A further £45 million will be provided to local authorities by government between 2008 and 2011, which will build on the lessons learned during this pathfinder year.

1.3 Research aim and objectives

The overall aim of the research was to conduct a detailed mapping of all projects receiving funding in the 2007/2008 financial year. Specific objectives were:

- To provide a comprehensive picture of all projects that received the funding
- To confirm the total number, and characteristics, of project beneficiaries
- To establish the main direction of funding in 2007/2008 – including which dimensions, themes or priorities of the PVE work were covered well, and which were not
- To identify any patterns in provision.

Participating authorities were also expected to carry out their own evaluations of projects, and a further aim of BMG’s work was to conduct a brief review of a selection of local evaluation reports (reported in Section 8).

1.4 Methodology

The methodology was designed in conjunction with Communities and Local Government to build on and update existing information about the different pathfinder projects. In summary, the approach was as follows:

**Preparation**
- agree additional information to be sought
- letter to Chief Executive/contacts
- contacts provided by local authorities/Government Offices

**Database**
- database to BMG from Communities and Local Government (updated with contact details – email, telephone number, address)
- additional variables agreed with Communities and Local Government
- new variables added to database with explanatory notes/comments

**Contact**
- project details emailed to contacts by BMG, along with explanatory notes
- contact completes information and emails back to BMG
- BMG telephone when necessary to elicit additional information or for clarification

1.5 Preparation of database

An Excel database had been previously developed by Communities and Local Government, which contained the following information:

- Government Office
- Local authority name
- Overall PVEPF funding for each pathfinder area
- Title and brief description of each project,
- Partnerships for each project.
Following discussions with Communities and Local Government, the database was expanded to contain additional information which would be sought from the participating authorities. The additional fields covered information about the type of project, project partners, project beneficiaries, PVEPF theme codes adhered to and contribution to PREVENT strategies (see Appendix B for full variable list).

1.6 Identifying contacts

Advance notification of the mapping exercise was sent by the Preventing Extremism Division at Communities and Local Government to the Chief Executive of each of the 56 local authorities or local authority partnerships participating in the PVE Pathfinder year. A letter from the Preventing Extremism Division was also emailed to all Government Office PVE leads asking them to forward to Communities and Local Government the contact details for the PVEPF projects at a local level. These contacts were then forwarded to BMG to enable them to make initial email contact and to send the tailored database.

1.7 Database distribution and return

Once the final list of contacts had been provided by Communities and Local Government, emails were sent out by BMG to all contacts, with a tailored version of the database which included known details of each project funded by the PVEPF in that local authority (or group of local authorities), along with explanatory guidance notes to aid completion of the database.

Local authorities were asked to verify these details and to add further information via a mixture of primary pre-coded responses, which minimised the amount of written responses required, and open-ended responses to allow for the diversity of projects to be captured. Respondents were also provided with a named contact at BMG Research should they need any assistance in completion of the database. Some authorities did experience difficulties in completing and returning the database which delayed some returns (see Appendix C).

However, by the reporting deadline, 53 of the 56 local authorities or local partnerships had provided a usable dataset, bringing the total number of projects to 261. The final three local authorities or local authority partnerships were not able to provide a completed database within the specified timetable, although they have subsequently returned their data directly to Communities and Local Government (the information provided, covering 17 projects, was subsequently added to the database but was not included in the analysis presented in this report).
1.8 Changes to existing data

Local authority project representatives were asked to check the project data that was already held by CLG, and to update it where necessary.

The main changes that were made were related to project name alterations and changes in project partners.

1.9 Data analysis

Once the individual datasets were returned by the local authorities, the data were collated in an Excel database which enabled an exploration of patterns of provision across the different regions and authorities. In most cases, the data are broken down by the number of projects. In some places, percentages have also been provided, to enable a comparison of patterns of provision between different regions. However, it should be noted that in many cases percentages represent a relatively small number of projects. A full breakdown of project activity and delivery mode data by region (in the form of tables) are provided at Appendix D.

It is important to note that the analysis has been conducted on self-coded responses – in other words the local authority representatives completed the database following instructions from BMG. Responses have been checked by BMG researchers for validity, which involved ensuring as far as possible that the information provided in the database by the local authority makes logical sense (for example, if a project was described as for women only, checks were made to ensure that project recipients were coded as females).

1.10 Report structure

Following on from this introductory section.

Section 2 describes the PVEPF projects, looking at the types of activities undertaken across the different regions, the delivery modes and project timescales.

An overview of the project beneficiaries is provided in Section 3, looking at both primary and secondary beneficiaries.

Section 4 examines the nature and extent of partnership working in the pathfinder projects, and Section 5 provides an overview of the use of project funding.

Section 6 assesses the contribution of the projects to the different PVEPF priority themes, and Section 7 looks at their contribution to the overall PREVENT strategy objectives.

Section 8 presents an overview of projects’ own monitoring and evaluation activities.

The penultimate Section 9 provides an overview of the regional picture of PVEPF activities, and any apparent gaps in coverage or provision. Finally, an overview of the national picture and recommendations are provided in Section 10.
Section 2

Project Activities

2.1 Section summary

According to the information provided, local authorities were mostly using their funding to encourage communities to consider violent extremism via debates, discussions and forums, and for general education purposes. Recipients of these types of projects, and most other projects regardless of their activities (omitting sports and recreation), were for both men and women of all ages (as opposed to female or male only activities).

Most projects – over half of the total (56%) – were delivered through community-based work, with just over a third of projects delivered via outreach (34%) and more than a quarter through educational establishments (27%). Less than a fifth of projects (19%) included mosque-based delivery or were delivered via written/electronic/web means (16%). Home-based delivery methods were used the least with only six out of the 261 total projects (2%) using this method for a variety of activities for parents and families in Muslim communities.

There were some regional variations in the types of delivery modes used for projects. For example, although Yorkshire and Humber had relatively small numbers of projects delivered in the region (18), almost all of them (94%) included community-based work, whereas a quarter of East Midlands projects (24%) included community-based activities. Yorkshire and Humber, the North West and North East regions were more likely to include mosque-based delivery than the other regions (respectively, 33%, 32% and two of the six projects in the North East), than other regions, including London (17%).

Almost half PVEPF-funded projects (48%) had not yet ended at the time of reporting, mainly due to them being over six months in duration. In total, almost three-quarters of projects lasted more than six months in duration (77%), whilst fewer than one in ten (8%) ran for one month or less, typically being one-off/one-day events utilising debates, discussion and forums.

2.2 Introduction

A primary aim of the mapping exercise was to clarify the type of projects being funded, and the kinds of activities they had undertaken during 2007/2008.
Overall, 261 different projects were analysed in this report, split across the nine government regions as follows:

### Table 1: Project returns by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Region</th>
<th>Number of PVEPF project returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Region</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Region</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Region</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Region</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Region</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Project activities

Projects could be allocated in the database to one or more of the following activity types:

- Training (including activities that both led to a certificate or qualification [accredited] and those that did not [non-accredited])
- Education
- Debate/discussion forum
- Leadership and management activities
- Sports and/or recreation
- Arts/cultural; or
- ‘Other’.
On average, each project recorded two different types of activities. The most common activities delivered amongst all local authorities in each region were those that encouraged males and females of all ages to deliberate violent extremism via debates, discussions and forums – 141 of the 261 projects included these activities (54%). The next most common activities involved general education activities (85 projects, representing 33% of all projects), leadership activities (70 projects, representing 27% all projects) and non-accredited training (68 projects, representing 26% of all projects). Accredited training and sports were the least common, representing less than one-fifth of activities (11% and 13% respectively). Of the 261 project details returned, 35 did not state what their project activities were. Examples of projects’ activities are provided in the sections below. However, as noted earlier, most projects included an average of two activities.

### 2.3.1 Debate, discussion and forums

Examples of projects that contained debates, discussions and forums include the development of local forums facilitated by an external consultant, and the bringing together of Muslim and non-Muslim youth to express and discover mutual aspirations.

- A high proportion of projects in almost all regions included delivering debates, discussions and forums (see Table 1 in Appendix D). Fifty-four per cent, or 141 projects (out of 261) in England incorporated these activities.
• These projects were mostly delivered via community-based work (39%), whereby local communities were given the means to carry out their own projects and activities encouraging debate and discussion

• As proportions of all projects, 78 per cent of projects in the Yorkshire and Humber region, 74 per cent in the North West and 52 per cent in the West Midlands were undertaking debate, discussion and forum activities. In terms of absolute project numbers, the London and North West regions undertook the most (42 and 35 respectively) – reflecting the higher number of projects in total in these areas

• Although the South West and North East regions had the fewest number of projects delivering this activity (two and three projects respectively), the proportion of all projects in those areas was relatively high

• Lower proportions of projects in the South East (38%) and East of England (38%) regions involved debates, discussions and forums

• The sole activity of 24 projects (12 of which were in London) was to generate or facilitate discussion and debate.

2.3.2 General education

Examples of projects that delivered general educational activities (as opposed to activities related to training) included a programme of 10 one-hour presentations to schools about Islamic beliefs and culture, the tackling of under-achievement of Pakistani boys by means of a Pakistani Achievement Forum/Study Centre, and production of informative materials to address perceptions about Islam and Muslim communities.

• A third of all projects (33%) included elements delivering general educational activities (see Table 2 in Appendix D)

• Of the 85 projects in England which stated that their activities included general educational activities, the majority (in absolute terms) were in London and the North West (26 and 24 projects respectively), reflecting the higher number of projects overall in these regions

• Two of the three projects in the South West, three of the six in the North East and 24 of the 47 projects in the North West (51%), increased awareness by introducing general educational activities about violent extremism

• The East of England had the lowest proportion of projects delivered in this area, with only three of the 21 projects (14%) incorporating general educational activities

• Two-thirds of projects (66%) that included general education activities were aimed at both males and females, as opposed to projects focusing on a single sex

• Educational activities were the sole focus of ten projects spread across England

• Almost a third of all education projects (30%) were delivered via community-based delivery methods.
2.3.3 Leadership and management
Examples of projects that delivered leadership and management activities included the establishment of a management committee engaging representatives from local mosques, relevant voluntary and community groups, the council and other faith bodies, and the provision of professional media training to key contacts, mainly from Muslim communities, on how to deal with media interest around terrorism issues.

- Of the 261 projects returned, there were 70 projects (27%) whose activities included leadership and management (see Table 3 in Appendix D)
- These activities were the sole focus of 11 projects spread across the South East, North West, West Midlands and London
- Eight of the 18 projects (44%) in Yorkshire and Humber delivered leadership and management activities – the largest proportion of any region
- There were no projects in the South West that reported leadership and management activities.

2.3.4 Training (non-accredited)
Non-accredited training refers to training that does not result in a recognised award or qualification from an external source (typically through City and Guilds or Open College Network).

Examples of projects that delivered non-accredited training included the development of a local platform for local Muslim women to learn how to access local services and develop skills for active citizenship through forum sessions and training delivered by women’s voluntary organisations; and the training of imams in English language, ICT and British society by qualified tutors.

- More than a quarter of the 261 projects returned (26%) included non-accredited training activities. Of the 68 non-accredited training projects in England, the North West (20) and London (19) regions had the largest number (see Table 4 in Appendix D)
- Eleven of the 18 projects in Yorkshire and Humber (61%) incorporated non-accredited training, whilst 20 of the 47 projects in the North West (43%) included these activities
- The East Midlands had the smallest proportion of non-accredited training activities, with just two of its 25 projects (8%) including this activity. There was a similar proportion of non-accredited training projects in the East of England (two out of 21 projects, 10%)
- Almost two-thirds (63%) of these non-accredited training activities included both males and females, as opposed to focusing on a single sex
- There were eight projects where non-accredited training was the only activity being undertaken (five in London) – the rest of the projects also included other activities.
2.3.5 Arts and cultural activities
Examples of projects that delivered arts and cultural activities included a local theatre production which raised issues of extremism in communities and media-based capacity building projects.

- There were 49 projects (19%) with activities including the arts and/or culture (see Table 5 in Appendix D)
- Seven projects carried out in Yorkshire and Humber delivered arts or cultural activities (representing 39 per cent of all projects returned for that region – the largest proportion of any region)
- There were three projects in the East of England with projects including arts or cultural activities (14%), the lowest proportion of any region.

2.3.6 Sports and recreation
An example of a project that delivered sports and recreation is a boxing club which aimed to provide diversion activities for local young people:

- Approximately one-tenth of projects (13%) included sports and recreation activities (34 out of 261 projects returned – see Table 6 in Appendix D), delivered by 28 local authorities
- Of the 34 projects that delivered sports or recreation activities, the majority were delivered in the London and North West regions (13 and 9 respectively), reflecting the larger number of projects generally in these two regions
- On the whole, projects with sports and recreation activities were delivered to mixed gender audiences aged 16 – 25 years
- There were no sports and recreation activities delivered in the South West.

2.3.7 Training (accredited)
Accredited training refers to training that is accredited through a recognised accreditation standard, such as City and Guilds or Open College Network. This means that the training undertaken is working towards an externally verified quality standard (typically through submission of a portfolio of work and/or visits by external verifiers).

An example of a project that delivered accredited training is a project providing accredited courses to allow imams to engage better with their community. The courses included English for Speakers of Foreign Languages (ESOL) classes for imams and mosque management committees, delivered via the local college and local community centres.
• The Yorkshire and Humber region was the most likely to offer accredited training in its projects, with 33 per cent of projects offering this kind of activity (see Table 7 in Appendix D)

• Of the 30 accredited training orientated projects in England, 12 were in London, six were in Yorkshire and Humber and five were in North West

• There were no accredited training orientated projects delivered in the South West or North East

• Almost two-thirds of the 30 accredited training schemes (60%) included both males and females as opposed to training focused on a single sex

• Accredited training was the sole activity of only four projects, two based in the London region and one in both the South East and East of England.

2.3.8 ‘Other’ Project Activities
Examples of projects that delivered ‘other’ activities that were not defined in BMG’s analysis grid included using local young people to develop research skills by finding out about the values and opinions of Muslim communities; cities working together to share learning and best practice, and the general gathering of baseline information.

• Thirty-four projects around England (13%) stated that their projects involved activities that did not fall under previously listed categories. These were mainly carried out in London, covering 13 projects (see Table 8 in Appendix D)

• Of the 34 ‘other’ activities, 32 per cent (11 projects in total) were research/survey related whilst the remaining others involved volunteering, advice and mediation

• Almost two-thirds of the projects that fell under this category were delivered via outreach or peripatetic activities (62%) which is a slightly higher proportion than those delivered via community-based delivery methods (56%).

There were no ‘other’ home-based delivered projects.

2.4 Delivery mode

The delivery mode(s) for each project was recorded in the database, using the following categories:

• Outreach or peripatetic
• Community-based
• Home-based
• Educational establishment
• Mosque-based
• Web/electronic/printed material; or
• ‘Other’.

Projects were able to record more than one delivery mode for each activity.

**Figure 2: Delivery mode of projects (multiple response)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational establishment</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque-based</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/electronic/printed material</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All projects returned (261)*

• Projects typically included a range of different delivery mechanisms, with most projects including between one and two modes of delivery
• Most projects included a community-based element (for example, operating from a community centre or other local facility). A total of 56 per cent of all projects used this approach (145 projects)
• Thirty-four per cent of projects utilised outreach approaches (90 projects), with a further 27 per cent including delivery via educational establishments (70 projects)
• Fifty projects (19%) included mosque-based delivery, and 42 projects (16%) included the production of web/electronic or printed materials
• Home-based projects were the least common delivery mode, occurring in only six projects out of 261 (2%)
• Of the 261 projects undertaken across in England using PVE pathfinder funding, 32 did not state what the main delivery mode was. These were mainly based in the South East region.

Examples of projects with different delivery modes are provided in the sections below. However, as noted earlier, most projects included two activities.
2.4.1 Community-based projects
An example of one project that utilised community-based delivery mechanisms is a project which was set up within the local community to develop and train volunteers to work with young people, deliver workshops, develop promotional materials and translated materials, coordinate outreach activities in the community and to recruit mentors to engage young people.

- Fifty-six per cent of projects across England (145) included community-based approaches with the largest number of projects in London (47) and the North West regions (28) (see Table 9 in Appendix D)
- However, Yorkshire and Humber and the East of England have the largest proportion of projects with a community-based approach to delivery (respectively, 94% and 67% of projects in each region), whereas the East Midlands region has the lowest proportion (24%).

2.4.2 Outreach/peripatetic activities
An example of a project that made use of outreach delivery modes is the establishment of a community engagement post to encourage and support community-led development and representation within the Muslim community. Another project developed a programme of activities, events, workshops and focus groups within the community and then held a stakeholder event to discuss how to embed the findings from these events into meaningful changes in day-to-day activity.

- There were 90 projects that included outreach/peripatetic delivery methods, delivered by 45 local authorities in England. This represents 34 per cent of all projects (see Table 10 in Appendix D)
- Of these 90 projects, two out of five (40%) were delivered in London
- Over two-thirds of all projects in Yorkshire and Humber (67%) included outreach/ peripatetic delivery modes, which is the largest proportion in any region. This is followed by the East of England where nearly half (48%) included outreach or peripatetic delivery mechanisms
- Relatively few projects in the South East (20%) used outreach approaches.
2.4.3 Educational establishment
An example of a project that included delivery via an educational establishment is a programme of one-hour presentations to 10 classes in local schools about Islamic beliefs and culture, intended to improve understanding of commonalities and dispelling myths. In another project, a university held a series of public lectures including both Muslim and non-Muslim students to debate Islamic principles that reject extremist interpretations of sacred text.

- Seventy projects included activities delivered via educational establishments, representing 27 per cent of all projects
- Nearly three-quarters of these projects (73%) were carried out in the London, North West, Yorkshire and Humber and South East regions (see Table 11 in Appendix D)
- Eleven of the 18 Yorkshire and Humber projects (61%) and three of the six North East projects included activities delivered at educational establishment, making these the largest proportions of all the regions. The West Midlands had the lowest proportion of projects delivered via educational establishments (17%)
- The North West and London regions had the greatest numbers of projects delivered using this method. However, the proportions of all their projects that were specifically using these activities were relatively low. For example, of the 78 London projects, only 16 were delivered via educational establishments (representing 21 per cent of London projects). Similarly, 14 projects in the North West included activities delivered via educational establishments, which represents 30 per cent of projects in that region.

2.4.4 Mosque-based
Examples of projects that utilised mosque-based delivery modes include support for three local mosques to have a united voice in challenging radical ideas and extremism and the establishment of a mosque forum.

- There were 50 projects (out of 261) that included mosque-based delivery (19% of projects overall). The largest number of these projects were based in the North West (15) and London regions (13) (see Table 12 in Appendix D)
- Around a third of the projects in Yorkshire and Humber, the North West and North East regions included delivery of project activities via a mosque (respectively 33 per cent, 32 per cent and two of the six North East projects)
- The East Midlands had the lowest proportion of projects delivered via mosques (4%) of all the regions, apart from the South West, where there were no projects that included mosque-based activities.
2.4.5 Web/electronic/printed material
Examples of projects that utilised web, electronic and/or printed material include the production of a documentary DVD highlighting the positive contribution made by Muslims to the local community, the development of an online training package and the production of general information booklets and other resources.

- Forty-two projects (16%) of all projects returned included elements delivered via web, electronic and/or printed materials
- Of these 42 projects, half were based in the Yorkshire and Humber and London regions (11 projects in Yorkshire and Humber and 10 projects in London). See Table 13 in Appendix D for a full breakdown by region
- Yorkshire and Humber had the highest proportion of their projects that included this delivery mode, with 11 of the 18 projects (61%) doing so. This is followed by around a third of projects in the East Midlands (36%) and one of the three projects in the South West using web, electronic and/or printed material
- The South West and North East regions had the fewest number of projects delivered this way (one project in each region).

2.4.6 Home-based
An example of a project that included home-based delivery is a Women and Families worker, who provided home-based support to improve women’s confidence and parenting skills.

- Of the 261 projects returned, just six included home-based work, carried out by four local authorities in the North West, East of England and South East regions (see Table 14 in Appendix D).

2.4.7 Other delivery modes
A small number of projects (25) were delivered in other ways which included one-off workshops and seminars. These were delivered across all regions.

2.5 Project timings
2.5.1 Duration of projects
The duration of projects ranged from one-off day events to 12 months or more (some of which had not yet completed by the time of the mapping exercise).

- Less than a quarter of all projects were less than six months in duration (23%)
- The highest proportion of projects were between six and eleven months in duration (41%)
• One-fifth of all projects took longer than 12 months (19%). These projects were mainly delivered in London and the North West
• A total of 44 projects did not state their duration (17%).

2.5.2 Finished projects
Of the 261 projects analysed in this report, 119 had ended (46%), 126 had not yet ended (48%) and the remainder did not specify (6%).
Section 3

Project Beneficiaries

3.1 Section summary

Project representatives were asked to indicate which groups the project directly engaged with (‘primary beneficiaries’) and which groups the project also aimed to impact (‘secondary beneficiaries’).

Although a large proportion of projects engaged with local Muslim communities – around three out of five of all projects (61%) – more than a quarter (29%) included the general population as primary beneficiaries and a fifth (20%) engaged with individuals ‘at risk’. Very few projects engaged with individuals or groups glorifying or justifying violent extremism.

That said, those at risk and individuals/groups glorifying or justifying violent extremism had a greater level of representation as secondary beneficiaries. This perhaps indicates that the information learnt by the primary beneficiaries is intended to be disseminated to local communities thus reaching those ‘at risk’ or glorifying/justifying violent extremism. It also may suggest the difficulty in directly accessing such groups through the PVEPF activities.

More than two out of five projects included mixed age groups as primary project beneficiaries (44%). For projects that targeted particular age groups as their primary beneficiaries, around half tended to focus on people under the age of 26 (51%).

The diverse nature of the projects can be illustrated somewhat by the participant numbers. Smaller-scale projects tend to consist of small group-based exercises, for example, discussion groups and DVD producing, whereas larger-scale projects included activities such as media campaigns and workshop-based activities.

3.2 Introduction

Communities and Local Government specified to local authorities that PVEPF activities or actions needed to be focused on at least one of the following audiences:

- At the general population of Muslim communities, helping them to build their resilience to violent extremist messages and to voice their condemnation of violent extremism

• At those most ‘at risk’ of being ‘groomed’ into violent extremist ideologies, developing specific interventions to help individuals counter such messages

• At those justifying and/or glorifying violent extremist ideologies and terrorism to prevent efforts to indoctrinate vulnerable members of society.

Accordingly, projects were required to identify who the projects directly engaged with (primary beneficiaries), as well as any other groups that the project aimed at having an impact on (secondary beneficiaries).

3.3 Primary beneficiaries

The local authority contacts were asked to identify the intended primary beneficiaries for each PVE project in their authority. The respondents were presented with five options: the general population; the Muslim community; ‘at risk’ individuals; individuals or groups justifying/glorifying violent extremism; and, ‘other’ groups of people. Local authorities were able to identify one or more of these options.

• Out of the 261 projects returned, 159 (61%) included Muslim communities as primary beneficiaries

• Seventy-five projects (29%) focused on the general population as their primary beneficiaries

• Other projects engaged in work with:
  – ‘at risk’ individuals (53 projects, 20%)
  – ‘other’ individuals (39 projects, 15%) – examples given included ‘others aspiring to be leaders’, ‘service providers’ and ‘front-line staff’
  – those justifying/glorifying violent extremism (a primary beneficiary group in seven projects (3%) – six of which were London based).

It is worth noting that some local authorities listed more than one primary beneficiary group or were not able to provide details of their beneficiaries (for example in terms of gender, ethnicity etc) because of promises of anonymity and confidentiality to participants.

3.3.1 Beneficiary Type

In terms of gender, more than half (57%) of projects included both male and female beneficiaries as opposed to focusing solely on a single sex. For others:

• 18 projects specifically focused on males (7%)

• 23 projects were aimed at females exclusively (9%)

• 68 projects were focused on parents and families (26%)

• 83 projects engaged with local service providers (32%)

• 87 projects engaged with community workers (33%).
3.3.2 Age of beneficiaries
The local authority contacts were asked to record the age groups at which each project was primarily focused towards. Projects may have focused on more than one age group.

- More than two out of five projects (116, 44%) included mixed age groups as primary beneficiaries
- 59 projects included the under-16 age range (23%)
- 73 projects were engaged with the 16-25 age group (28%)
- 35 projects included people aged 26 and over (13%).

3.3.3 Ethnicity of primary beneficiaries
A quarter (25%) of the 261 projects included all ethnic groups as primary beneficiaries. Thirty projects (12%) reported that they included those from ‘a Muslim background’, choosing to engage with people from this religious affiliation rather than with a particular ethnic group.

3.3.4 Number of participants
Respondents were asked to provide an indication of the numbers of participants in the PVEPF projects. For 84 (out of 261) projects, the number of participants was not provided; in some cases the information was ‘not available’ and in other cases, due to the nature of the activity (for example, development of a ‘myth busting booklet’), it was not possible to quantify the exact number of beneficiaries. Furthermore, some authorities gave an indicative range (for example, between 300 and 400 people).

Nevertheless, a manual count of the figures (taking mid-points where necessary) in the database gives an estimated figure of over 44,000 participants or ‘beneficiaries’ in some form or another (for the 177 projects that provided information). This equates to an average of around 249 people in each of the 177 projects that provided information. This figure does not, however, take into account that some people may have been involved in more than one project (ie, double-counting), or the 84 projects that did not provide an estimate of the number of participants.

The number of participants for the projects range from very small groups (for example, 13 young people who developed a DVD talking about their faiths) to very large groups (for example, 1,000 young people involved in dialogue sessions).

Projects aiming at wide audiences include:

- A media campaign to promote the PVE agenda and good relations between Muslims and the rest of the community
- Over 3,500 children and young people who participated in drama presentations and workshops.
Examples of smaller-scale projects include:

- 55 young people from three schools and one college who completed a peer leadership/conflict resolution training programme
- 12 imams who received ESOL and IT training.

Some projects engaged with a small number of people, with the intention that these people would pass on their experiences to other people in the wider community. For example:

- In one project, 17 Muslims featured in a photography project, including an exhibition which 600 visitors attended. There was also extensive media coverage on the BBC, Russia Today TV, SKY TV and other news outlets to a combined worldwide audience of 12.5 million people
- One women’s discussion forum group had 12 members, but events they were involved in, including a families’ day and theatre work, attracted over 100 women and children.

The ways in which the projects have engaged the participants can be divided into four core categories:

- Dissemination: for example, one project involved the design and production of a logo to illustrate the unity of an entire community to be used in communication materials disseminated to local mosques
- Training: for example, 34 imams obtained accredited qualifications in English and 12 training sessions were provided to a total of 180 people from service providers and local communities
- Discussion groups: for example, 300 students and 20 frontline staff engaged through Question Time events and theatre events. A similar project involved 200 participants in dialogue and debate activities
- Workshops: for example, over 100 women engaged in discussion workshops and meetings.
3.4 Secondary beneficiaries

The local authorities were also asked to record information on any ‘secondary’ beneficiaries. This referred to any individuals that the project aimed to reach or have an impact upon indirectly, for example, through work with primary project beneficiaries.

- Out of the total 261 projects, 84 (32%) included the general population as secondary beneficiaries.
- A slightly smaller number of 81 projects (31%) were intended to reach Muslim populations as a secondary group.
- In terms of ‘at risk’ individuals, 51 projects (20%) were said to have this group as a secondary beneficiary.
- Individuals/groups justifying or glorifying violent extremism were said to be secondary beneficiaries of 32 projects (12%). By contrast, only four projects (2%) had this group as one of their primary beneficiary groups.
Section 4

Partnership Working

4.1 Section summary

Overall, partnership working was widespread, with projects demonstrating their involvement with a wide range of local stakeholders, particularly in the public and community sectors.

Projects clearly had embraced partnership working both inside and outside of their local authority, with engagement across a number of different sectors, notably voluntary and community groups, the police and faith organisations. Rather less mention was made of educational establishments or leisure, sports and arts providers.

Further research is required to identify how partnerships are forged on the ground, and what mechanisms are in place internally to ensure that links are made across, for example, schools and education, community cohesion, equalities and leisure and arts departments to ensure that the PVE work achieves maximum coverage and, subsequently, impact. Additional ‘case study’ approaches would help to identify what facilitates and hinders successful partnership working in this context, and to identify evidence of good practice to inform future PVEPF project development. The Learning and Development Exercise conducted by the Audit Commission/Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) which included consultations with local authority and police representatives to get a better understanding of how PREVENT was being delivered, may help to inform this.

4.2 Introduction

Local authorities in receipt of PVE Pathfinder funding have been required to involve local partners, particularly the police and local communities, in developing their programme of PVE work.

This chapter examines the nature and extent of partnership working for PVEPF projects. The PVEPF aims to build on existing activities and encourage schools, mosques, police, community and faith groups to work together. Local forums and partnership structures were encouraged, in recognition of the benefits of joined-up community working, and of bringing together key local players including local authorities, police, education and the community and voluntary sector. Furthermore, the emergence and development of locally

---

defined and agreed approaches for tackling social issues (for example through Local Area Agreements and Local Strategic Partnerships, Sustainable Community Strategies, special development strategies and local regeneration partnerships) mean that local communities are being given both a greater role and a greater responsibility for tackling today’s social and economic issues together.

Overall, virtually all projects specified partners that they were working with. The exceptions were those projects that were carrying out research.

4.3 Internal project partners

Most local authorities provided details of a range of internal project partners within the local authority that contributed to the PVEPF projects. By far the most commonly mentioned were (in order of frequency of mention, with the most frequent first):

- children and young people’s services – specified in around a fifth of projects. Reference was mostly made to Youth Services and Youth Offending Teams
- community safety and neighbourhood management teams – again specified in around a fifth of projects
- community engagement, community cohesion, social inclusion and regeneration teams (including Safer and Stronger Communities), cited in around a quarter of projects.

Other internal partners mentioned less frequently included:

- economic development, performance, corporate policy and planning departments
- education, schools (including ESOL co-ordinator)
- marketing, communications, media and information departments
- adult social services
- equality and diversity units
- leisure, arts and sports departments
- housing departments
- libraries.

Approximately 100 projects did not specify any internal partners. In some of these cases, internal partners were already classified elsewhere as ‘project partners’ and in other cases, projects were working solely with external partners. For example, one project worked with a local further education college (specified as an ‘external public sector partner’) to bring together Muslim and non-Muslim students to debate issues affecting them as UK citizens.
Other projects included research and information gathering exercises (for example, local mapping studies or surveys) so appeared to have been run as stand-alone projects.

In a few cases, local authorities did not specify internal partners for any of their projects. In part, however, it was clearly because they allocated all of their partners under the heading ‘public sector partners’ or ‘project partners’ rather than ‘internal’ partners (see Section 4.4 below).

### 4.4 Public sector partners

From the information provided by respondents it was clear that almost all projects were working with a wide range of partners in the public sector, sometimes in addition to the local authority. Often the types of partners worked with reflected the nature of the project. For example, a project that utilised sport (football) to develop young people’s potential, and to engage young people in ‘positive activities’ (as part of the Every Child Matters agenda), worked with a local football club, the police and local housing providers as well as community safety teams.

Public sector partners which were common across many projects included:

- colleges and training providers (including higher education institutions in some cases)
- the police
- crime prevention groups
- housing associations
- primary care trusts
- Local Strategic Partnerships
- race equality councils
- Business Link and other local business or economic organisations.

Other partnerships mentioned included:

- A wide range of voluntary and community sector organisations, including:
  - community youth groups
  - sports groups (for example, local football clubs).
- faith organisations, including organisations representing:
  - Muslims (such as the British Muslim Forum, Islamic Cultural Society, local women’s Muslim groups)
  - other local multi-faith groups such as the Active Faith Communities Programme.
The small minority of projects that were not working with a range of partners were generally those that were primarily involved in data collection or research activities, bespoke training activities (provided by a specialist training organisation or group) or very small discrete projects working with a specific remit (for example, a small project working to engage Muslim women).
Section 5

Funding

At the time of the PVEPF launch, the government stated that £5 million would be available for priority local authorities in the financial year 2007/2008. Subsequently, this figure was raised to £6 million. Local authorities in all nine English regions received funding, based on the proportion of the Muslim population in that region. The amount that local authorities received varied, from around £15,000 covering two or three small discrete PVE projects to £525,000 for PVE activities in Birmingham covering a wide number and range of projects.

Table 2 below summarises the PVE pathfinder funding by region.

Table 2: Regional breakdown of PVE pathfinder funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Local Authorities</th>
<th>Total regional PVE Funding (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>£2,080,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£1,205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Project funding

The amount spent on individual projects varied widely. The smallest amount spent on a project was £204 which paid for the delivery of Arabic lessons from a local scholar intended in part to help support and nurture civic and theological leadership (PVEPF theme 2). One of the largest amounts spent on an individual project was £74,334 which helped to fund a large-scale project including cultural awareness and training events, community events, training, development of written material, a conference and a small grants programme.

A range of both smaller and larger projects were funded at a local level. Examples of projects up to £500 included:
The engagement of Muslim women to develop an action plan to combat extremism

Developing charters between different faith and/or neighborhood groups to enable them to work together to challenge perceptions and address community issues.

Examples of larger projects that received funding of up to £20,000 include:

- A youth engagement and media-based capacity-building project involving approximately 60 young people
- Forty-eight children involved in a scheme to work with mosques in delivering a programme of citizenship education for young people.

Examples of some of the largest projects (£20,000 and upward) included:

- An education programme promoting good citizenship and tackling violent extremism, tailored for students at risk of radicalization
- A “bringing communities together” and project comprising a range of community-based activities including cultural sharing and awareness events, cultural training workshops, dialogue events, community Iftar events, accredited training, production of a DVD which outlined the achievements of young people involved in the project, a poster campaign developed by young Muslims, a conference on extremism and Islamophobia and three community mediation workshops
- The development of a coordinated service delivery strategy aimed at delivering youth work to divert young people from the influence of extremist organisations and agendas
- Outreach work within communities to better understand key issues and provide a safe environment for views to be shared.

5.2 Additional non-PVEPF funding

Project contacts were asked to specify whether any additional, non-PVEPF funding had been used for the projects. In total, 35 of the 261 projects (13%) benefited from additional non-PVEPF funding. The sources of the additional funding are highly diverse in both amount (ranging from £150 to £40,000) and provider. However, from information provided by local authorities, common sources of additional funding included police authorities, local authority funding streams and third sector bodies.

Several local authorities also referred to additional personnel resource as a source of additional non-PVEPF funding. In these cases, reference was made to resources such as the staff time of a worker from a local authority or the cost of project management from the local police force.
Section 6

Contribution to PVEPF themes

6.1 Section summary

Of the four main PVEPF themes, all were covered to a greater or lesser extent by the 261 projects included in this report. However, projects were more likely to be identified with Theme 1 (promoting shared values) and Theme 2 (supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership) and less likely to be identified with Theme 3 (increasing resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions) and Theme 4 (capacity and skills). However, it is important to note that many projects identified with more than one theme.

The findings suggest that there may be merit in promoting activities that specifically focus on increasing the resilience of key institutions (Theme 3), encouraging learning and development programmes, and that facilitate training for local front-line staff and managers in local service providing organisations (Theme 4). This will help to ensure that organisational and individual capacity is raised to enable preventative and early intervention work to develop.

6.2 Introduction

The PVEPF requires projects to identify with one or more themes:

1. Promoting shared values
2. Supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership
3. Increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions, and
4. Capacity and skills development.

Each theme is broken down into sub-themes; a fuller description of these themes is provided below.
Table 3: PVEPF Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promoting shared values</td>
<td>1.1 Providing effective local campaigns to confront extremist ideologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Promoting local role models able to counter negative imagery and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Promoting understanding of the benefits that Muslims have brought to local areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Promoting understanding and acceptance of key shared values, and promoting dialogue and engagement between communities in support of those values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership</td>
<td>2.1 Supporting local community leaders, role models, local mosques, imams and madrassahs to tackle violent extremism and equip them with the skills necessary for these roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Promoting democratic participation, engagement and civic involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Enabling members of communities to debate and question political and social issues in safe environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Providing support networks for at risk and vulnerable groups within local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Promoting volunteering opportunities for local members of communities, particularly on work relevant to tackling extremism but also to foster greater engagement in community voluntary activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Promoting Islamic awareness amongst Muslim communities and local communities more widely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions</td>
<td>3.1 Improving the gathering and sharing of intelligence at a local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Developing mechanisms to identify vulnerable communities and individuals in local areas, and develop strategies to address those at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Developing targeted programmes of counter- and de-radicalisation work in local areas, particularly in key institutions – such as universities, colleges and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity and skills development</td>
<td>4.1 Supporting local forums on extremism and Islamophobia, in line with the Local Government White Paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Learning and development programmes relating to violent extremism for local leaders and members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Providing guidance and awareness training for front-line staff and managers in organisations providing services or community support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Conducting research and attitudinal surveys of local Muslim and other communities – using shared methodologies to which local partners will have contributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About two-thirds (64%) of projects identified with Theme 1 ‘promoting shared values’

A slightly smaller proportion (61%) identified with Theme 2 ‘supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership’

Around a quarter of projects (23%) identified with Theme 3 ‘increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions’

Almost a third of projects (31%) identified with Theme 4 ‘capacity and skills’

Seven projects (3%) identified with ‘other’ themes – for example, a project that helped promote inclusion and cohesion between communities by working with youths from across the area

For 35 projects, a PVEPF theme was not stated.

Figure 3: Number of projects addressing PVEPF themes (multiple response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting shared values</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/theological leadership</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational resilience</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and capacity development</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All projects returned (261)

There were some slight regional variations in the theme coverage (as illustrated in Figure 4 below), although all regions had greater coverage of Theme 1 ‘promoting shared values’ and on Theme 2 ‘supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership’ compared with Themes 3 and 4.
Figure 4: Number of projects addressing PVEPC themes by region (multiple response)

Base: All projects returned (261), total projects in each region in parentheses
Section 7

Contribution to the PREVENT strategy objectives

7.1 Section summary

All PREVENT objectives had been covered by PVEPF projects in 2007/2008, albeit the number addressing the different objectives varied. More than half of all projects (57%) sought to increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism (Objective 4); a somewhat smaller proportion (48%) sought to challenge violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices (Objective 1), largely via debates, discussions and forums.

However, it is observable that comparatively fewer projects adhered to those PREVENT objectives that focused on tackling the ‘sharper end’ of preventing violent extremism work, namely disrupting those who promote violent extremism and support the institutions where they are active (Objective 2, 16%) and supporting individuals who are being targeted and recruited to the cause of violent extremism (Objective 3, 26%). This pattern is supported by the evidence from the previous chapter examining the extent to which projects were aligned with the different PVEPF themes – fewer projects were identified with increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions, supporting early interventions, identifying vulnerable communities and individuals and developing targeted programmes of counter and de-radicalisation work (PVEPF theme 3) than other themes.

What was apparent from the analysis of the 261 projects was that more than two-thirds of projects (67%) adhered to more than one PREVENT objective and in fact averaged between two and three each. This no doubt reflects the diverse nature of the PVEPF-funded projects as well as some overlapping priorities between the different objectives.
7.2 Introduction

The PREVENT strategy launched in May 2008 has five key strands and two strategic enablers. Going forward these objectives will provide a strategic framework for PREVENT projects. The key strands are to:

- Challenge the violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices (Objective 1)
- Disrupt those who promote violent extremism and those who support the institutions where they are active (Objective 2)
- Support individuals who are being targeted and recruited to the cause of violent extremism (Objective 3)
- Increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism (Objective 4), and
- Address the grievances which ideologues are exploiting (Objective 5).

These are supported by two cross-cutting work streams which are key enabling functions in delivering the strategy:

- Develop understanding, analysis and evaluation (Objective 6), and
- Strategic communications (Objective 7).

Local authority contacts categorised each PVEPF project according to which of the PREVENT objectives the project addressed.

![Figure 5: Number of projects addressing PREVENT objectives (multiple response)](image)

*Base: All projects returned (261)*
Of the 261 projects, 85 (33%) adhered to only one PREVENT objective.

On average, each project was categorised in accordance with two to three different PREVENT objectives.

The most common PREVENT objective that projects across England addressed, accounting for over half of all projects (57%), was increasing the resilience of communities to violent extremism (Objective 4). Further analysis shows that:

- A large number of these projects were in London (41) and the North West (33)
- The North East had the highest proportion of projects (five of six projects) meeting this objective
- Seven out of 23 projects in the West Midlands (30%) focused on this PREVENT objective.

Over two-fifths of all projects across England sought to challenge the violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices (Objective 1) and develop understanding, analysis and evaluation (Objective 6, 48% and 44% respectively). Again, these were mostly delivered in the London (17) and North West (16) regions. In addition:

- All projects in the South West (three out of three) were categorised as helping to develop understanding, analysis and evaluation (Objective 6)
- Approximately a quarter or less of all projects adhered to PREVENT Objectives 2, 3, 5 and/or 7
- The smallest proportion of projects sought to disrupt those who promote violent extremism and support the institutions where they are active (Objective 2, 16%). Of these, most were projects carried out in London or in the West Midlands.

As noted earlier, the categorisation of projects against PREVENT objectives was provided by the local authority contact rather than by Communities and Local Government or BMG researchers (although a guidance document was provided by BMG). It is apparent from the analysis that there is some variation in how projects have been categorised at the local authority level – although projects often were identified with more than one objective. For example, some local authorities have allocated a project that encourages discussion to Objective 5 (addressing grievances), whereas others have categorised such projects to Objective 4 (increasing resilience).
Section 8

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Areas in receipt of PVEPF funding were required to carry out their own monitoring and evaluation activities. This section presents an overview of the monitoring activities underway, and the evaluation activities carried out. Due to the diverse nature of the projects funded through the PVEPF, the evaluation activities in particular varied considerably both in their scope and the methodological approach.

8.1 Section summary

This makes an assessment of the projects difficult, in terms of how they are being delivered and what possible impact the project is having on the participants or the wider community.

Evaluations have ranged from short satisfaction studies (for example, self-completion satisfaction scores or verbatim feedback from project participants) to larger regional or authority-wide evaluation work. Some evaluation reports have been conducted by the project staff themselves, while others (particularly larger-scale evaluation work), have been commissioned to external agencies, including small consultancies and universities. Evaluations have also either been project specific, or have covered a range of PVE activities across an authority. In the latter cases, evaluations tend to be externally commissioned and generally more thorough and robust.

The main theme of the evaluation reports has been focused on the organisation, delivery and achievements of the projects, in particular, against set objectives. From the reports reviewed, there appears to be limited reflective evaluation of the projects so far, in terms of a project's strengths, weaknesses, good practice and areas for improvement except in the larger evaluation studies.

Some of the more comprehensive evaluations used a variety of evaluation methods including interviews, observation and documentary analysis which provided a richer picture of the project's impact and delivery. The remainder used relatively narrow approaches. However, it is important to bear in mind that the type and depth of evaluations is in all likelihood related to the size of the project itself – for example, a small one-off event for £4,000 will have a relatively limited amount of resources available for evaluation activities compared to a project with a much larger budget.

There is a tendency within the shorter evaluations to provide participants' comments on satisfaction as a means of evaluation. Whilst of some use in terms of assessing general views on the delivery of activities, such data are generally insufficient to provide any measure of impact or effectiveness of activities.
Based on the rapid review of the project evaluations to date, it is clear that authorities would benefit from further guidance as to how to gather and present evaluation evidence. This may be in the form of a standard template, for example, to ensure that as far as possible evaluation evidence is collected in a systematic and comparable manner. Additional resources may also be required, either in the form of research support, or earmarking an element of the project budget for evaluation activities to ensure that it is an integral part of the activities.

Authorities may also be encouraged to facilitate evaluation activities throughout the life of a project, rather than just at the end. An example of this may be collecting information on attitudes of participants to violent extremism before and after an intervention.

Evaluations of subsequent PVE activities need to place a greater emphasis on the collection and analysis of data that will capture change as a result of the intervention and thus provide more robust evidence on the impact and longer-term outcomes of the PVE work. Guidance on how to do this will help authorities and their partners in taking their evaluation work.

8.2 Project monitoring

- Around three-quarters of projects (72%, or 188 projects) reported having regular monitoring arrangements (see Figure 6 below)
- Of these projects, monitoring tended to be done via reports that had been received by the local authority, with the frequency varying from weekly updates to annual reviews. For other projects, monitoring was not generally done via the submission of reports, but at project meetings and the frequency of these was not given
- The most common review period was quarterly, carried out by just over half (105) of projects which undertook monitoring. Forty-six projects (25%) were monitored monthly
- The most common mentions of ‘other’ monitoring periods were weekly and bi-monthly
- In only a very small number of cases (1%) the local authorities were unable to state the frequency of their monitoring arrangements – mainly because the project was still in its inception stage, had yet to be delivered (for a one-off event) or was completed.
In addition to any national evaluation activities, all pathfinder areas were expected to carry out their own evaluations of their projects. As part of the mapping exercise, a review of existing project evaluations was also carried out by BMG, to add insight to information from the mapping exercise as well as to highlight any other relevant information to inform the development of the PVE work going forward (for example, possible case studies, methodological approaches to the evaluation of these kinds of projects etc). Each local authority contact was asked to provide details of whether project evaluations were underway or completed, and to provide appropriate contact details to enable the research team at BMG to obtain copies of any completed evaluation reports.

Of the 261 total project returns, 107 stated that there was no evaluation (or no evaluation as yet), a further 70 stated that evaluation activities had been undertaken (in some cases one evaluation covered a number of projects) and 54 stated that it was ‘in progress’. For 30 projects, this field in the project database was left blank (in some cases this was related to the type of project activity, for example, a contextual mapping exercise or research).

Of the 119 projects that were recorded as having ended, just over two-fifths (52) stated that the projects had been evaluated and that the evaluations were complete, with a further 28 stating that the evaluation was in progress. Twenty-nine stated that there was no evaluation, and 10 provided no response to this question.
Table 4 (below) shows the number of completed projects that had carried out an evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations reported as ‘complete’</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations reported as ‘in progress’</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evaluation available</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total completed projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having identified, therefore, that there were 52 projects for which evaluation activities had been completed, BMG was able to obtain 33 evaluation outputs from the contact details provided by the local authorities. These represented 18 local authorities in seven of the nine regions, and covered in excess of 38 different projects.

In terms of coverage, in some cases, the evaluations were authority wide (or wider), and included a review of general PVE activities rather than specific evaluations of interventions, or examined the range of activities underway (and, in some cases, the number of different activities that had been evaluated was not always clear). Two examples of this are a report to identify the general learning points and lessons for further PVE activity, based on in-depth interviews with eight key strategic stakeholders in the area, and a report looking at PVE activities across three cities in a region (both reports externally commissioned).

A total of 25 outputs were included in the evidence review (eight were not included as they were summary versions of fuller reports included in the review, or because they were information leaflets rather than research or evaluation reports).

The overall findings from the review are presented in two discrete sections: findings in relation to approaches to local research and evaluation work, and findings from the evaluations themselves (that is, findings from the PVE activities).

**8.3.1 Approaches to local research and evaluation work**

**WHAT HAS BEEN EVALUATED?**

In the main, the evaluations undertaken have focused on the set-up and delivery of PVE activities including establishing networks and partnerships, identifying potential participants and planning and running activities. In these instances, the outputs are best described as a progress report (a primarily descriptive record of what has been achieved or delivered) rather than an impact evaluation (that is, what worked and why, what has been the impact of the activity).
In general, evaluations were less likely to focus on any assessment of the outcomes and subsequent impacts of activities in relation to the PVE themes. In part this is a reflection of where the activities were in their development, in terms of still being in their infancy in addressing some of the wider PVE priorities, and thus having a focus primarily on initial engagement and awareness-raising activities. In other cases, the evaluations have looked at the achievement of targets (for example, numbers engaged in a project or numbers trained).

In a small number of cases, evaluations focused on the wider outcomes, including strengthening community capacity, engaging vulnerable groups and/or individuals, developing quality baseline information and managing a coordinated response to preventing violent extremism.

**WHO HAS UNDERTAKEN THE RESEARCH OR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES?**

Some reports have been produced by externally commissioned organisations. These are more likely to be fuller evaluation reports and include those originating from:

- University-based researchers
- Private sector consultancies
- Community organisations.

In other cases, the evaluation report originated from the lead project worker or group with oversight of project delivery. These more commonly relate to monitoring and progress reports, or reports of satisfaction or feedback activities for which event participants have provided satisfaction scores and verbatim feedback. In at least one case, the evaluation report was produced by the organisation that also ran the activity.

**WHAT RESEARCH OR EVALUATION METHODS HAVE BEEN UTILISED?**

In some cases, the evaluation report is based on monitoring data (for example, number of participants in an event). In such cases, a template has been used which appears to have been provided by the local authority.

Where empirical data have been collected, a variety of methods has been utilised, including:

- Self-completion questionnaires (generally distributed either before an activity as a way of gathering baseline data, or at the end of an activity or programme as a way of gathering feedback, but rarely both)
- Focus groups (with beneficiaries and/or staff)
- In-depth interviews (with staff/key stakeholders)
• Observation (for example, of training sessions)
• Documentary review and analysis (for example, review of original bids, project minutes, curriculum plans)
• Contextual or literature review (for example, mapping local activities).

It is of note that very few reports made specific reference to the research methods used, and even fewer included examples. An example of this is reference to feedback being received from participants, but no details in the report as to how the feedback was gathered.

**WHAT RESEARCH QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED?**

As noted earlier, the research activities have focused around a range of delivery or process-type questions, and, to a lesser extent, some reflective or evaluative questions around the outcomes and impacts.

Process related areas of exploration included:

• Feedback (for example, from staff or project beneficiaries) on delivery
• What has been learnt from an activity or event
• Effectiveness of the learning style
• Needs and gaps in service provision
• Recommendations for development of PVE activities
• Engagement (success of, types of beneficiaries engaged).

Outcome related questions included:

• A qualitative assessment of the impact of projects against key objectives (including capacity building, rejection of violent extremism etc)
• An assessment of whether the project achieved its full potential.

**WHAT EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN LOCAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES ARE THERE?**

Areas of good practice in local evaluation activities include:

• The provision of standard template for completion. This may include explicit reference to the kinds of data and reflection required (for example, achievement of outcomes, assessment of impact, reflection on what would be done differently in the future). This approach appears to have worked well by ensuring that consistent information is collected across an authority or region. This may be particularly useful where the project is small, and/or there is insufficient budget to commission any external evaluation activity.
• The use of case studies. Because of the disparity in projects, the inclusion of case study material provides a useful overview of a project, how it has been delivered, what outcomes there have been and what lessons have been learnt.

• Independent evaluations. Evaluation activities and reporting undertaken by independent external organisations appear to be generally more robust, with the reports including more interpretation and reflection on impact than was evident in other reports.

• Evaluations of a range of activities. In cases where evaluations have been commissioned for a range of PVE activities (for example, across an authority or wider area), these are able to provide a better and wider overview of activities and how they fit in to other local or regional developments.

WHAT ARE THE MAIN WEAKNESSES OF THE DOCUMENTS REVIEWED, IF ANY?

Of the documents reviewed, a number of weaknesses are evident (some of which were raised in the documents themselves, others of which have been identified by the BMG research team), including:

• Lack of information about the research or evaluation methods employed

• Lack of clarity about the research aim and objectives, or key research questions

• Lack of evidence to substantiate some of the findings (for example, shifts noted in attitudes of beneficiaries towards violent extremism or in greater self-confidence of participants)

• Insufficient time to implement a rigorous evaluation, or evaluation activities only being undertaken towards the end of an activity or programme, rather than from the start; this can make it difficult to track change in behaviour or attitudes of project beneficiaries or delivery staff

• Difficulties in accessing key respondents (because of sensitivities or issues of confidentiality)

• Lack of data provided in the reports in terms of numbers of participants (for example, numbers of attendees at workshops);

• Insufficient project monitoring data to be able to establish a profile of beneficiaries (for example, demographics of participants) – though this in part may be related to issues of confidentiality as noted above

• Lack of interpretation of qualitative findings, other than providing a list of verbatim comments

• Small sample sizes (notably for quantitative activities, but in some cases for qualitative work) making findings unreliable.
It is possible that some of this information is available through directly contacting the organisation or project involved. However, the review focused solely on the publications or reports provided by authorities (or their representatives) to BMG.

8.3.2 Key findings from the local evaluations
There were some overarching issues emerging from the evaluations, including:

- the use of the PVE language, which was noted as contentious by some, with a dislike of the term ‘Preventing Violent Extremism’. Some reports noted that there were negative associations with the term, and as a consequence avoided using the term in their project activities
- a concern among some that the receipt of PVE funding could be perceived as negative, and could create a backlash against Muslims, which may in turn run counter to building community cohesion. Although the Government has been clear that PVE funding should be used to complement other activities, and is necessary to protect against violent extremism, there was some concern that PVE activities related to, overlapped with, or was in conflict with, other priorities including community cohesion
- a perceived lack of clarity between the priorities of the pathfinder year and PREVENT priorities
- tensions and local politics between local partners and stakeholders (for example, council, police and community groups) which could have an impact on the set-up and delivery of PVE activities.

FINDINGS RELATED TO PROCESS, IMPLEMENTATION, DELIVERY ETC
The findings that have emerged from the review of evaluations relating to the delivery of PVE activities include:

- There appeared to be a wide range of activities underway around community cohesion, citizenship, understanding different faiths etc, but relatively few projects tackling the more sensitive issues of extremism and terrorism. Likewise, some of the more potentially ‘at risk’ or vulnerable groups did not appear to be specifically targeted (although this may be related to the stage of activities and one might expect to see a ‘step-change’ in focus in the next round of PVE funding)
- Local organisations responsible for project delivery often needed support to get things off the ground as well as to manage and deliver projects. Suggestions of PVE project boards were muted, to provide guidance and momentum – particularly perhaps to smaller projects
- Projects also noted other resourcing issues, including lack of ongoing funding to sustain activities in the longer term
- It was noted that there was an insufficient focus on further education and higher education, despite awareness that educational institutions could be a potential source of recruitment for extremist activities
A number of activities were affected by low turnout; this warrants further exploration (for example, whether it is related to the timing or location of events, promotional activity, lack of engagement or nature of activity, association with PVE activities etc)

Difficulties in engaging with some mosques was noted (although others demonstrated successful engagement)

Some difficulties were noted with engaging with different partners, due to limited availability, timings of events and so forth

There was a view from staff that they could be in a potentially vulnerable situation with regard to the monitoring of tensions, for example, with regard to confidentiality and anonymity.

**FINDINGS RELATED TO IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES**

Generally, few evaluation reports to date have provided evidence of impacts and outcomes. This is largely a reflection of the stage of the projects themselves but may also be associated with a general difficulty in capturing and measuring impacts of interventions of this nature – particularly in the short term.

- From the reports reviewed, the general impact of the PVE projects related to a greater awareness of the issues, of the different ‘sides’ of the issues and of the importance of working across a range of stakeholders
- Courses and training activities appeared in the main to achieve specified targets in terms of beneficiaries engaged and successful outcomes (for example, young people trained in conflict resolution or leadership skills, follow-on to other ‘positive activities’)
- Feedback from participants consistently identified lack of time to complete activities, and more discussion time needed. This suggests that many found the discussions and debates very worthwhile – some noted that there had been no previous ‘safe’ and ‘non-judgemental’ environment for doing this
- Role play activities (for example, around a fictitious terrorist incident, involving a range of public sector partners and community members) appeared to be a particularly effective way of engaging with a wide range of stakeholders, debating and discussing difficult issues, and putting a range of perspectives across and resulting in participants being more ‘informed’
- Some front-line staff felt that greater communication and understanding of the agendas at a management level would support them in implementing projects on the ground and in understanding the difficulties of achieving and demonstrating outcomes.
Section 9

Overview of the regional picture

9.1 Chapter summary

Although all PREVENT objectives had been addressed by PVE pathfinder projects in 2007/2008, they were more likely to be around increasing the resilience of communities to violent extremism and challenging violent extremist ideology, and supporting mainstream voices. Fewer projects adhered to those PREVENT objectives that focused on disrupting those who promote violent extremism. Similarly, fewer projects targeted those who support the institutions where they are active and supporting of individuals who are being targeted and recruited to the cause of violent extremism.

There was little variation between regions with regards to types of project activities, delivery methods and primary beneficiaries. Most followed the overall pattern of mostly including debates, discussions and forums and general education delivered via community-based methods and, on the whole, aimed to engage with Muslim communities and the general population. The most notable exception was the Yorkshire and Humber region where large proportions of projects undertook a more generic approach to their work by utilising a range of approaches and covering a range of activities.

9.2 Introduction

This chapter of the report brings together the evidence presented so far, from a regional perspective. Each of the nine regions is examined in turn to identify patterns in project types, beneficiaries and contribution to the PVEPF themes.

9.3 The Regional Picture

It should be recalled that each region has a different amount of funding, and consequently a different number of PVEPF projects – London, the North West and the South East have the greatest number of projects whereas the North East and South West have relatively few projects. This means that in some areas the breadth and variety of projects is greater simply because there are more projects. This should be borne in mind when interpreting any regional differences. A breakdown of project activities and delivery modes by region can be found in Appendix D.
9.3.1 London Region

London received £2,080,377 in PVEPF funding. In total, the London authorities returned information about 78 PVEPF projects. These were mostly concentrated around debate and discussion (42 projects) and general education (26 projects), although all project activities were covered. Accredited training courses were activities least likely to be included (12 projects). The projects were mostly delivered via community-based work (47 projects) and outreach/peripatetic work (31 projects). None were delivered via home-based work.

The primary beneficiaries of London-based projects were mostly from Muslim communities (54 projects) and the general population (25 projects). In addition, six of the seven projects that sought to engage in preventative work with those justifying or glorifying violent extremism across the whole country were based in the London region.

In terms of projects identifying with one or more of the four main PVEPF themes (see Section 6 for a full description of the themes), projects in the London region were mostly linked to ‘promoting shared values’ (47 projects) and ‘supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership’ (39 projects) with just around a quarter of project activities adhering to ‘increasing resilience of key organisations’ and ‘capacity and skill development’.

9.3.2 The North West

The North West region received £1,205,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the North West authorities returned information about 47 PVEPF projects. The activities were mostly around debate and discussion (35 projects) and general education (24 projects). Accredited training was the least frequent activity (5 projects). These projects were mostly delivered via community-based work (28 projects). The North West also had the highest proportion of their projects delivered via home-based work than any other region and the lowest proportion of projects using web/electronic/printed material compared with other regions.

Projects based in the North West region mostly stated that Muslim communities were their primary beneficiaries (32 projects). This region undertook a greater number of projects whose primary beneficiaries were ‘at risk’ individuals than any other region (15 projects compared to the overall average of 6 projects per region).

The North West projects were most likely to adhere to the PVEPF themes of leadership and shared values (around three-quarters of their projects). Around a third of project activities were aligned with increasing resilience and capacity and skills development.
9.3.3 Yorkshire and Humber
The Yorkshire and Humber region received £550,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the Yorkshire and Humber authorities returned information about 18 PVEPF projects, mostly including debates and discussions (14) and non-accredited training (11). Sports and recreation activities were used only once. Although the region did not have the highest numbers of projects delivered using community-based delivery methods compared to other regions, they had the highest proportion of their projects using these (eg only 17 projects utilised community-based work, but this accounted for 94% of projects in the region).

Primary beneficiaries of projects in Yorkshire and Humber were mostly Muslim communities (15 projects), those ‘at risk’ (11) and the general population (10).

Most of Yorkshire and Humber’s project activities included the PVEPF priorities of supporting civic and theological leadership and promoting shared values, but almost half of them also included skills development.

9.3.4 The South East
The South East region received £450,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the South East authorities returned information about 40 PVEPF projects, mostly including debates and discussions (15) and leadership and management (13). Accredited training was the least frequent activity (3). These projects mostly used community-based delivery methods (16 projects) and educational establishment-based work (10).

Twenty-three projects stated that the Muslim population was their primary beneficiaries and 10 projects primarily benefited the general population. A small number of projects engaged in work with other groups.

Around two-thirds of the South East projects adhered to the PVEPF objectives of shared values and leadership, with around a third also adhering to skills and capacity development.

9.3.5 The West Midlands
The West Midlands region received £800,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the West Midlands authorities returned information about 23 PVEPF projects. Debates and discussions (12) and general education (8) used the most common activity types. Five projects involved arts/cultural activities and 4 projects involved non-accredited training. Again, these projects mostly used community-based delivery methods (13 projects).

West Midland’s PVEPF projects tended to benefit Muslim communities and identify with the themes of leadership and shared values.
9.3.6 The East Midlands
The East Midlands region received £300,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the East Midlands authorities returned information about 25 PVEPF projects. These mostly included debates and discussions (10 projects), whilst low numbers made use of non-accredited training (2 projects) and accredited training (1). The projects in the region used web/electronic/printed material delivery methods the most (9 projects) and community-based, outreach/peripatetic and educational establishment work slightly less often.

Projects in the East Midlands mostly had Muslim communities as their primary beneficiaries (11 projects), whilst eight projects did not state a primary beneficiary promoting group at all.

Almost half of the PVEPF projects in the East Midlands identified with the PVEPF priorities of promoting shared values (12 projects) and supporting civic and theological leadership (11 projects), with around a quarter identifying with community resilience and skills development.

9.3.7 The East of England
The East of England received £380,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the East of England authorities returned information about 21 PVEPF projects. These projects mostly used debate and discussions activities (10 projects), but used accredited training the least (1 project). The projects in this region used community-based delivery modes the most (14 projects) and home-based work the least.

The East of England’s projects covered all of the primary beneficiary groups, including those justifying/glorifying violent extremism, and all of the PVEPF priorities, but with relatively few addressing increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions.

9.3.8 The North East
The North East region received £125,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the North East authorities returned information about six PVEPF projects. General education and debates and discussions were the most frequent activities in this region, whilst none made use of accredited training. Half of these projects undertook community- and educational establishment-based work.

The six North East projects covered the range of PVEPF priority themes, and five of those had ‘other’ groups as their primary beneficiaries.

9.3.9 The South West
The South West region received £80,000 of PVEPF funding. In total, the South West authorities returned information about three PVEPF projects. Only three activities were delivered in this region – general education (2 projects), debates and discussions (2 projects) and non-accredited training (1 project). No projects used mosque-based or home based-work.

The three South West projects had the general population and Muslim communities as their primary beneficiaries and covered all of the four PVEPF themes.
Section 10

Overview of the national picture and recommendations

This mapping exercise has been conducted to gather and collate descriptive data on all the PVEPF funded in 2007/08. The exercise has provided a comprehensive picture of all projects (for local authorities that responded) that received PVEPF funding.

The mapping exercise had the following research aims:

- To provide a comprehensive picture of all projects that received PVEPF funding in 2007/2008
- To establish the total number, and characteristics, of project beneficiaries
- To establish the main direction of funding in 2007/2008 – eg which dimensions of PVE work were covered well and which dimensions were not
- The production of some basic descriptive data (eg the total number of projects funded, the total number of participants/beneficiaries, the total number of projects that have been evaluated), as well as an indication of the overall direction of funding and any regional patterns.

The first part of this section provides an overview of the national picture. The remainder then provides some recommendations, relating to evaluation activities for the PVEPF Pathfinder Fund, as well as to the ‘direction of travel’ for PVE activities.

10.1 The National Picture of PVEPF projects

This section looks at types of projects overall, in terms of what activities are involved, how projects are being delivered nationally, who the main beneficiary groups are and what PVEPF and PREVENT themes are being covered.
10.1.1 Project activities
Overall, over half of all projects featured elements of debate and discussions, with all nine regions having projects that included these activities as part of the PVEPF. Projects that involve leadership and management activities were part of around a quarter of all projects – slightly more so in the Yorkshire and Humber, North East and North West and South East regions. One region – the South West – did not report any leadership and management activities.

Non-accredited training featured in just over a quarter of all project activities, with accredited training featuring in over one-tenth of projects. Yorkshire and Humber region appeared to offer the most non-accredited training activities, with over three-fifths including this activity.

Given that one of the priority groups for PVE work is young people, and in particular young adults, there may be merit in encouraging PVE activities through routes such as sports and arts – for 2007/2008 there were relatively few projects with these foci.

From the project descriptions and additional details provided by the local authorities, it is evident that many of the projects include a range of activities, the full details of which are not readily apparent through this type of data gathering exercise.

10.1.2 Project delivery
Project delivery mode was recorded in the database by local authorities (see Section 2.4) as outreach, community-based, home-based, educational establishment-based, mosque-based or electronic/printed material (along with ‘other’). Each project could have a range of delivery modes and nationally a wide range of project delivery mechanisms were identified by the local authorities. Over half of the 261 projects included community-based approaches, with a third including outreach activities and a quarter including delivery via local educational establishments (mostly schools). A fifth of projects included mosque-based activities. The preparation of written or electronic material (for example, awareness-raising DVD, myth-busting booklet, information website) was undertaken in 42 projects (out of 261). There may be scope to encourage projects to include more written outputs of their activities, as a way of dissemination and raising awareness.

10.1.3 Project beneficiaries
Overall, a wide range of individuals and groups were identified (where they were able to do so) by authorities as project beneficiaries. In terms of the sections of the population that the projects directly engaged with, although the majority of projects were engaging with the Muslim population (159 out of 261), over a quarter engaged with the general population. A fifth of projects sought to engage with those ‘at risk’ of being ‘groomed’ into violent extremism, with very few (7 projects) directly engaging with those justifying or glorifying violent extremist ideologies and terrorism. Some regions, notably the East Midlands and the North West had a greater project engagement with those ‘at risk’ than others.
Both males and females were included as project beneficiaries in most projects, rather than focus on one gender only. Eighteen projects focused solely on males, and 23 projects worked solely with females; 68 projects included parents and families, representing around a quarter of project activities. Projects that take a family-orientated approach to preventing violent extremism may be of particular interest as a delivery mechanism, given parental roles and influences.

Some authorities also had projects that engaged with community workers and local service providers (around a third of projects engaged with each of these groups), in efforts to increase the knowledge and awareness of PVE activities among those who come into direct contact with local community members.

10.1.4 Contribution to PVEPF themes and the PREVENT agenda

Of the four main PVEPF themes (described in full in Chapter 6), there was a far greater coverage of ‘promoting shared values’ (166 projects) and ‘supporting and nurturing civic and theological leadership’ (160 projects) than there was for ‘increasing the resilience of key organisations and institutions and supporting early interventions’ (61 projects) or for ‘capacity and skills development’ (80 projects).

This suggests that it may be desirable for future project activities to place a greater emphasis on working with key organisations (for example, educational establishments, mosques or community centres) which may be in a strong position to identify those ‘at risk’ from extremist activities and to develop early intervention activities. Developing, for example, learning programmes for individuals as well as front-line staff in organisations operating at a community or local level may also be an area of activity that could be encouraged to ensure that this strand of the PVEPF priorities is met. Developing local capacity and skills also fits with wider government objectives to develop capacity within the third sector (for example, through the ChangeUp initiative13) as well as to develop individual skills (for example, through the Leitch agenda14). To this end, there may be merit in facilitating more accredited learning opportunities in PVEPF project activities – this may include revisiting those projects who already have learning or training activities that are not accredited, as well as encouraging other projects to develop accreditation opportunities.

10.2 Recommendations

Based on the evidence available from the mapping exercise and from the review of local evaluation evidence, a number of recommendations can be made.

13 For further information visit: www.capacitybuilders.org.uk/detail/Capacitybuilders__delivering_the_ChangeUp_Programme_the_future_of_national_support_services/34/49.aspx

14 For further information visit: www.dcsf.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryId=21&ContentID=37
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10.2.1 Future mapping activities
As previously noted, three local authorities or local partnerships were not able to provide project information by the reporting deadline. It was evident that some authorities had capacity issues at the time of data collection, and some others were not able to access the required data within the specified time period. Embedding at the start the need to collect administrative and monitoring data throughout the life of projects of this nature would help to facilitate any future mapping activities.

10.2.2 Provision of a lead authority and project contact
During the mapping exercise, some difficulties were experienced in identifying an appropriate contact within the local authority who could provide the project information needed for the database, and in some cases the responsibility appeared to sit with a number of people. Future evaluation activities would benefit from having one named evaluation contact for projects.

10.2.3 Local evaluations
The evaluations obtained to date from local authorities vary considerably in both scope and quality. Whilst in part this may be influenced by the size of the project (and the associated scope for, and resources for, evaluation activities), local authorities will benefit from clear guidance in advance about what monitoring and evaluation activities they are expected to undertake, and how to carry them out. Provision of an evaluation template or further guidance may facilitate this and work is already being undertaken by Communities and Local Government to look at possible evaluation approaches. Local authorities may also welcome opportunities to share good practice through local research and evaluation networks.

10.2.4 PVEPF and PREVENT priorities
It also appears as though there may be some ambiguities in how the PVEPF and PREVENT priorities are understood and/or interpreted (for example, apparently similar projects were sometimes allocated to different themes). New government guidance may help to address this issue.

Furthermore, it appears as though projects are more likely to be aligned with those relating to fostering shared values, nurturing leadership and increasing community resilience than with those that address individual or organisational resilience. Since the Pathfinder Fund was introduced, PREVENT strategy objectives have been developed to provide a strategic framework for PREVENT projects going forward. When local authorities mapped their PVEPF projects against the PREVENT objectives, it was apparent that more work has been undertaken to increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism and challenge the violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices than, to disrupt those who promote violent extremism and those who support the institutions where they are active.

10.2.5 Review of PVEPF activities
Recognising that regions and authorities are different, each area had different types of projects, engaging with a range of beneficiaries and communities. However, the variation between regions in terms of the types of communities and beneficiaries projects were working with could be reviewed, to ensure that it is in line with current intelligence about violent extremism in those areas. For example, if it is known that in some areas educational establishments have a high profile among Muslim communities, then further work with these institutions may be needed. Other areas with a large proportion of young adults for example, may benefit from a greater push towards sports-related activities as a route in to PVE activities.

10.2.6 Focus on delivery
Projects are already using a range of delivery mechanisms. Although it is as yet unclear as to the effectiveness of these different approaches, it is notable that there are fewer projects delivered via mosques or via written or electronic material. The reasons for this warrant further consideration (to identify, for example, views on effectiveness and practicalities of different methods of delivery).

10.2.7 Sharing good practice
The information collected in the database has revealed that there are a number of projects that are following a similar model, or running similar activities. There may be merit in facilitating mechanisms for sharing good practice for the development of these activities, perhaps though local network meetings or activity updates circulated to key contacts.

10.2.8 Engaging with different groups and individuals
Projects have demonstrated a greater level of engagement with Muslim communities and the wider communities than they have with individuals at risk or those ‘glorifying’ violent extremism. The latter groups are clearly more difficult to identify and focus on, but over the longer term, strategies need to be developed to ensure that preventative action filters through to these groups. However, it is important to note that this initial engagement of the wider Muslim population and the increased understanding of key issues facing different communities such work seeks to achieve, will help local authorities to ensure that future activities and engagement methods for individuals ‘at risk’ or those ‘glorifying’ violent extremism are built on an existing evidence base.

10.2.9 Strengthening partnerships
Further research is required to identify how partnerships are forged on the ground, and what mechanisms are in place internally to ensure that links are made across, for example, schools and education, community cohesion, equalities and leisure and arts departments to ensure that the PVE work achieves maximum coverage and, subsequently, impact. Additional case study approaches would help to identify what facilitates and hinders successful partnership working in this context, and to identify evidence of good practice to inform future PVEPF project development. This would also help to ensure that relevant links are made to other PREVENT activities underway.
### Appendix A

#### List of PVEPF Local Authorities or Local Authority Partnerships (2007/2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South West Region</td>
<td>Bristol City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Crawley Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Oxford City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Reading Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Woking Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>Wycombe District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Camden Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Greenwich Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney&lt;sup&gt;15*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Haringey Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Islington Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Lewisham Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Redbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Southwark Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>Wandsworth Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>15</sup> Project information for local authorities marked with an asterisk were received after the reporting deadline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Council or Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>City of Westminster City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Region</td>
<td>West London Alliance&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Region</td>
<td>Bedford Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Region</td>
<td>Luton Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Region</td>
<td>Peterborough City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Region</td>
<td>Watford Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Region</td>
<td>Derby City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Region</td>
<td>Nottingham City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Region</td>
<td>Leicester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Region</td>
<td>Birmingham City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Region</td>
<td>Black Country Partnership&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt; (Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Region</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Based Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>Bradford Metropolitan District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>Calderdale Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>Kirklees Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>Wakefield City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Region</td>
<td>Leeds City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Partnership&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Lancashire Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Pendle Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Burnley Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Preston City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Hyndburn Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Ribble Valley Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Region</td>
<td>Rossendale Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Region</td>
<td>Newcastle City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Region</td>
<td>Middlesbrough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>16</sup> West London Alliance includes: Brent Council, Ealing Council, Hammersmith and Fulham Council, Harrow Council, London Borough of Hillingdon, Hounslow Council

<sup>17</sup> Black Country Partnership includes: Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council, Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council, Walsall Council

<sup>18</sup> Greater Manchester Partnership includes: Bolton Council, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council, Manchester City Council, Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council, Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, Salford City Council, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Trafford Council, Wigan Council
Appendix B

Full database variable information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region, LA, Chief Executive, Total project funding, project name, project description, project partners</td>
<td>Original, to be checked by authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of authority, NI35 scores(^{19})</td>
<td>New data, voluntary completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project partners (public, non-public and internal)</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project recipient characteristics (gender, age, ethnicity etc)</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVEPF project funding (inc additional sources)</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration/timescales of project</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation details</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENT strategy themes</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVEPF themes</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary recipient details</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main project activities</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) NI35 Local Government PVE Indicator score. These scores are given for the local authority and are not project-specific. The NI35 indicator assesses the effectiveness of PREVENT-related work programmes on a 1-5 scale against four criteria. This field was optional and based on a preliminary assessment by some local authorities.
Appendix C

Challenges faced in completing and returning the database

A number of issues emerged with regard to completion and return of the database by the local authorities which delayed their return. These were:

- Contacts not being able to provide all the necessary information without consulting with other colleagues in other departments
- Contacts having problems getting authorisation from other members of staff to release the data
- Problems with timings due to contacts already helping other agencies with work on very similar projects
- Key staff being away or absent (for example, because of sickness, holidays or generally spending significant time out of the office)
- Other work pressures within the local authority meaning that completion of the database was not given sufficient priority.
- Difficulties in being able to use Excel, and
- Difficulty in clarification on interpreting and allocating projects to the PREVENT and PVEPF priority themes.
## Appendix D

### Data tables

#### Table 1: Number of projects per region including debates, discussions and forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Number of projects per region including general education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Sample base</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Number of projects per region including sports or recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Number of projects per region including accredited training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Number of projects per region included ‘other’ activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Number of projects delivered via community-based work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Number of projects delivered via outreach/peripatetic work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11: Number of projects delivered via educational establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: Number of projects delivered via mosque-based work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13: Number of projects delivered via web/electronic/printed material based work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14: Number of projects delivered via home-based work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample base</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>