

N.I. 35 – BUILDING COMMUNITIES RESILIENT TO VIOLENT EXTREMISM**ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK*****Understanding of, and engagement with, Muslim communities.***

| Score | Description |
|--------------|---|
| 1 | Community engaged on an ad hoc basis and through wider faith/minority groups. Mechanisms and engagement is/are not self sustaining or productive. Understanding of the make-up of the local Muslim community is limited and superficial. |
| 2 | Regular mechanisms for consulting and working with Muslim community, but attendance and reach not wide. Tendency to engage with individuals and interest groups rather than communities. Basic knowledge of structure of local Muslim community in terms of ethnicity and geographical extent. |
| 3 | Regular and reliable mechanisms for frequent contact with whole communities, as well as individuals within communities. Strong knowledge of the make-up of the Muslim communities, including different ethnic groups, denominations, social and economic status, elected representatives and community leaders, knowledge of location and denomination of mosques, awareness of community groups. Knowledge of partner agencies appropriately utilised. |
| 4 | Regular and reliable mechanisms which include all communities and under-represented groups such as women and youth in an ongoing dialogue. That dialogue influences and informs policy. Sophisticated and segmented understanding of Muslim communities, the structures within them, and the cultures which make them up. |
| 5 | A self sustaining, dynamic and community driven engagement which takes place on a number of different levels and in a number of different ways, with innovative approaches to communication and engagement of all groups. Sophisticated understanding of local Muslim communities is used to drive policy development and engagement. |
| | <p><u>Self-assessed score for Criterion 1:</u></p> <p>End of January 2009: 2</p> |

Knowledge and understanding of the drivers and causes of violent extremism and the Prevent objectives

| Score | Description |
|--------------|--|
| 1 | Awareness of the issues, but no thinking about what it means for the locality or how to engage fully with the agenda. Poor understanding of causes of violent extremism and the Government's Prevent strategy objectives. |
| 2 | Basic understanding of what is required from local partners, and familiarity with key documents and guidance material. Attempts to draw together an evidence base and to analyse the underlying causes of violent extremism. |
| 3 | Good understanding of the Prevent objectives and drivers of violent extremism among partners. Established evidence base draws on a number of sources, including evidence from a number of local partners about violent extremism within the local area. Awareness of appropriate research. Attempt to take into account specific local circumstances and build evidence of strength of drivers locally, including sharing of information between partners. |
| 4 | Strong understanding of the Prevent objectives and the drivers of violent extremism, as well as of the interfaces with related policy areas. Full use of local, national and international research, guidance and expertise on the agenda, including good information sharing between partners. Good understanding of local circumstances and drivers. |
| 5 | Sophisticated understanding of the Prevent objectives and the drivers of violent extremism. Full use of local, national and international research, guidance and expertise on the agenda to build a wide-ranging and sophisticated evidence base. Clearly strong information interchanges between local partners across delivery organisations and strands of activity. Strong understanding of local circumstances and drivers. |
| | <p><u>Self-assessed score for Criterion 2:</u></p> <p>End of January 2009: 2</p> |

Development of a risk-based preventing violent extremism action plan, in support of delivery of the Prevent objectives

| Score | Description |
|-------|--|
| 1 | Basic, narrowly focused action plan in place. |
| 2 | Action plan with clear resource allocations and timeframes attached to actions. Some linkages to Government's 'Prevent' strategy objectives and to the drivers of violent extremism. Some links to feedback from community engagement. |
| 3 | Risk-based comprehensive and clear action plan which makes clear links to the 'Prevent' strategy. Links to community engagement and knowledge and understanding of the drivers of violent extremism. Range of activity covering different strands of the 'Prevent' strategy. |
| 4 | Risk based and strategically focused action plan with clear links to the knowledge and understanding of the drivers of violent extremism, the 'Prevent' strategy and to extensive consultation with communities. Clear buy-in from senior officers and strategic partners. Necessary actions, capabilities, policies and projects clearly identified. Strong focus on multi-agency partnership working, including synergies with CDRPs and other bodies. Broad range of activity delivering all strands of the 'Prevent' strategy, including through a range of mainstream services. |
| 5 | Risk based and strategically focused action plan with strong links to the knowledge and understanding of the drivers of violent extremism, the 'Prevent' strategy and to extensive consultation with communities and local partner agencies. Agenda effectively 'mainstreamed' through consideration of existing service delivery and policies, alongside the development of specific actions, projects and capabilities. Awareness of agenda throughout partner organisations. Full range of activities across all strands of the 'Prevent' strategy. Innovative actions, projects and capabilities clearly identified. Strong evidence of multi-agency approach to deliver across a broad range of partners and agencies, including synergies with CDRPs and other bodies. |
| | <p><u>Self-assessed score for Criterion 3:</u></p> <p>End of January 2009: 1</p> |

Effective oversight, delivery and evaluation of projects and actions.

| Score | Description |
|--------------|--|
| 1 | Loose and informal monitoring of projects, leading to haphazard delivery and frequent overruns and changes of scope. Evaluation is informal and haphazard. Audit arrangements in place. |
| 2 | Clear plans for delivery and oversight. Some level of formal evaluation, but no clear mechanism for follow-up. Audit arrangements and risk management in place. |
| 3 | Monitoring mechanisms in place with regular reviews to ensure delivery. Oversight group in place. Formal evaluation but which has no real effect on developing future projects and actions. Strong audit arrangements and risk management in place. |
| 4 | Proven monitoring mechanisms in place which help ensure regular delivery of projects within timescale, to the required standard and budget constraints. Oversight group with range of skills and representing appropriate range of interests. Formal evaluation using appropriate methodology which has some impact on the development of future projects. Strong audit arrangements and risk management in place. |
| 5 | Strong tried and tested monitoring mechanisms which allow highlighting and resolution of issues, track progress and ensure consistent delivery of projects and actions within timescale, to the required standard and budget constraints. Oversight group with appropriate skills and seniority in place and actively involved in monitoring. Professional and extensive evaluation of project against agreed objectives, which has real impact on development of future projects. Strong audit arrangements and sophisticated risk management in place. |
| | <u>Self-assessed score for Criterion 4:</u> End of January 2009: 2 |