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Abstract: The article considers the risks that pose a danger to educational institutions in the aspect of the requirements of international programs to improve the sustainability of cities. Risk-generating factors that threaten the sustainability of educational institutions can be both external and internal, associated with the social interaction of the participants of this organization. The authors believe that one of the most significant factors in the sustainability of an educational institution is the state of anti-terrorism security. The main principles for ensuring anti-terrorist security are: elimination of the source of danger from the system; exclusion of conditions for the commission of terrorist acts. The article describes the criteria for anti-terrorism protection, a small number of which, when attesting the anti-terrorism security of an educational institution on its own, is determined by the capabilities of the educational institution itself. Recommendations are given on creating a plan to reduce the vulnerability of an educational institution.

1. Introduction
Issues of development of the Russian education system and the state security in their relationship have become particularly acute only in the last decade. However, scientific research on security in education is still fragmentary and episodic. At the same time, the current situation requires a fundamentally new approach to the problems of ensuring Russia's national security, analysis of the content and evolution of all its aspects. The lack of a unified approach to the problems of educational security makes it extremely relevant to study the issues of ensuring the safety of the educational space in the context of modern domestic and world educational policy, placing it among the most important modern problems.

The determination of the risk factors of staff and students in the field of education is due to new approaches to studying the relationship of a person with the social environment and the changes that are occurring at the present time. These processes forced us to take a different look at the problem of correlating the learning outcomes and the interaction of students, teachers, parents, and think about the harmony of the personality in the "Man-Society-Nature-Technique" system, especially during the period of intensive changes in the field of education. Conflicts that arise in the system may be the risk factors.

Risk factors and causes can be combined into four groups: objective, organizational and managerial, socio-psychological, and personal. Despite the certain subjectivity of this classification,
these groups adequately determine the grounds for the protection of the rights and interests of participants in a social conflict.

A study of the education sphere on the basis of social legal risk involves the identification and determination of its following characteristics [1].

First, it is the social orientation of the risk itself, i.e. the contradictions that have arisen in the sphere of certain social relations.

Second, it is the direction of the actual contradictions that make up the content of the conflict itself, in other words, whether they have a legal character.

Third, the nature of these contradictions, their belonging to certain social relations – property, educational, labor, etc.

Fourth, the regulation of legal norms of public relations that form the basis for the conflict.

Fifth, the presence of specific subjective rights, obligations of participants in a legal conflict.

Sixth, the structure of social conflict.

In the science of conflict management, the structure of conflict is understood as a set of stable connections of the conflict that ensure its integrity, identity to itself, and difference from other phenomena of social life [2]. The main components of a social conflict in the psychological aspect are its participants (subjects), subject and object, micro and macrospheres, psychological components - the aspirations (goals) of the parties to the conflict, the strategy and tactics of their behavior, the mental perception of each side of the conflict situation.

Taken together, these characteristics allow a legal analysis of possible social risk-related (conflict) situations, in particular in the field of education, with a view to their further consolidation in a regulatory form as the basis for the protection of subjective rights and interests of participants in subjects of education, development, ultimately, on this basis, means, legal protection.

The main prerequisite for the identification and characterization of such factors is the sphere of education itself and its regulatory and legislative regulation.

Consideration of the subject area of education in all its multidimensionality (as a process, social value, result, system) allows us to name the following main properties that affect both the legal regulation itself and the implementation of the directly protective function of law in the field of education.

1. The special social value of education, both for individuals, legal entities, and for society and the state as a whole.
2. The multidimensional presentation of education as a social value, system, process, result.
3. The combination of regulation, the criteria of the educational process with the freedom of behavior of its subjects (academic freedom, autonomy of educational organizations).
4. The multi-subjectivity of both public relations regulated by law in the field of education - legal relations, and actual, not regulated by law.
5. Presentation of the final result of social interaction in the field of education in the form of acquired knowledge, skills or competencies.
6. The multi-stage, multi-level nature of the educational process and the educational system; its conditionality by age factor.
7. The impact on the education sector of many factors of a political, economic, sociocultural and other nature.
8. The economic nature of education, its content, the presentation of education as a result of economic value, the need to take into account possible economic risks in the field of education.
9. The presence in the educational system of non-governmental, state, municipal educational organizations, endowed in accordance with civil law with various property independence and responsibility.
10. Satisfaction of private, including corporate, as well as state and public interests and needs in the field of education at the same time.
11. Legislative establishment of the non-commercial orientation of the sphere of education.
12. There is a risk of social conflict caused by integrative manifestations of other risks – economic, educational, legal.

13. Restorative orientation of measures to protect violated and disputed rights and interests of a certain group of subjects of education – students.

The fundamental provision for the protection of subjects of the sphere of education is the Constitution of the Russian Federation (article 43) enshrining the right to education, as well as other rights and freedoms exercised in the field of education: the right to choose the language of education, training, creativity (part 2 of article 26 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation); guaranteeing freedom of literary, artistic, scientific, technical, other types of creativity, teaching intellectual property (part 1 of article 44 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation), the right to freely seek, receive, transmit, produce and distribute information in any legal way, as well as a number of other rights and freedoms (part 4 of article 29 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation) [3].

According to M. V. Baglay, the right to education and a number of related rights in the field of education are natural rights given to a person from birth, and the constitutional act only strengthens them and gives them legitimacy [4]. The legislation on education establishes a number of academic freedoms in the field of education, establishes the rights and obligations of participants in educational activities, and provides requirements for the conditions of the educational process, including its regime, content, and provision. Special attention is paid to the requirements for education – process and education – result, which are formalized in the state educational standards.

In the field of education, internal risks include those that arise, as a rule, within an educational (educational) organization in connection with the social interaction of the participants of this organization — schools, universities, additional educational institutions, etc. Interaction (behavior) in an educational organization is carried out, first of all, in the form of educational legal relations, in connection with the provision, consumption of education, i.e., in other words, regarding the organization and implementation of relevant educational programs. Social interaction can arise on other grounds, in connection with the presence of other social relations - property, labor, regarding the protection of the employee, etc. Accordingly, specific social conflicts arise due to the participation of their subjects in these social relations, in other words, in social interaction. The structure of such conflicts is based on the following scheme of social interaction of its subjects.

I group.
1. A student - A student.
2. A student - a teacher (teacher).
3. A student is an educational organization.
4. A student is a leading employee of an educational organization.
5. A student is a class (group).

II group.
1. Parents (legal representatives) of the student - the teacher.
2. Parents (legal representatives) of the student - an educational organization.
3. Parents (legal representatives) of the student - the leading employee of the educational organization (body of the educational organization).
4. An educational organization – a teacher.
5. The head (Dean, head of the Department, other senior employee of an educational organization) - a teacher.
6. Educational organization (its body, head) - class (group), Department.
7. Educational organization (its body, head) – other structural division (Dean, head of Department, Department).

This scheme presents both subjects of the education sector recognized by the laws on education, and formally and really existing, but not endowed with a legal personality, in particular, a classroom, group, faculty, department, etc., but actually participating in educational activities [5].
An external social risk-generating factor (conflict) in the field of education arises in connection with the participation (social interaction) of subjects of the field of education in relations that go beyond the framework of the formally established organization of the educational process. For example, such conflicts include sharp contradictions between a graduate of an educational organization and an educational management body (state), an employer about the level and quality of education received, between an educational organization and a management body (supervision) about licensing, accreditation, etc.

The current Russian legislation on education practically does not contain relevant legal institutions that reflect the human rights orientation in the field of education [6].

In the context of the expansion of the autonomy of academic freedoms and the democratization of the activities of educational organizations, the protective activity of not only public authorities and their officials, but also the organizations themselves and their leaders, including persons endowed with certain authority within the educational organization - the head teacher of the school, the dean of the faculty, the head of the department, etc., as well as those created by self-governing organizations, public associations, including trade unions.

The measures used by such bodies to protect the rights, freedoms and legitimate interests, especially of students and teachers, are measures of operational impact, they should be implemented in a much shorter time and with greater effectiveness than the measures of jurisdictional protection, because these bodies are as close as possible to the students [7].

S.V. Barabanova justifies the need to create a special body to consider disputes in the field of education as an effective mechanism for protecting the rights and legitimate interests of students [8].

The Ministry of education of Russia in 2003 noted the importance of administrative and procedural forms of law enforcement in universities, the need to form effective structures to protect the rights and legitimate interests of young people, including students (instruction letter of the Ministry of education of Russia dated 24.04.2003 "On the development of youth parliamentarism in the subjects of the Russian Federation").

The creation of such special public bodies is possible within the framework of the self-government of educational organizations, including student, in high school educational institutions, which is still very underdeveloped.

The peculiarities of the sphere of education make it necessary to fix in the legislative form special actions of students and teachers, considered in the relevant legal relations as a weak side, as a self-defense of their rights [9]. In particular, such actions could include leaving the training sessions of the student in the case when the teacher allows humiliation of his dignity, insults him. Appeal to the administration of the teacher's actions should also be considered as self-defense.

The previously described structure of possible social conflicts between participants in social interaction, formalized by educational legal relations, allows us to formulate probable options for operational protection and self-defense.

In general, legal protection of rights and legitimate interests should be considered as one of the important functions of social management, in particular in the field of education [10].

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that each level of social management in the field of education - the level of management of a department, faculty, university or the management of a general educational institution, as well as the level of public administration of education, should be vested with protection powers and fulfill human rights functions within them and in accordance with social management goal.

2. Methods

As world experience shows, educational institutions, as crowded places, are “ideally” suitable for achieving the criminal goals of certain groups, religious or other extremists, as well as mentally ill people [11].

Consequently, the likelihood of a terrorist attack in educational institutions is consistently high.

The most likely terrorist threats in an educational institution include:
• causing harm to the health of students, employees and other persons in an educational institution using firearms or cold steel;
• causing harm to the health of students, employees and other persons in an educational institution using explosives (poisonous) substances;
• the exclusion of the source of danger (terrorist) from the system;
• the exclusion of the conditions for the commission of terrorist acts.

The implementation of the first principle is a radical means of eliminating terrorist threats and is the responsibility of law enforcement agencies.

The second principle does not eliminate the terrorist threat, but does not allow them to be realized.

The exclusion of the conditions for the commission of terrorist acts implies:
• the correct (in terms of anti-terrorism security) actions of people;
• the use of anti-terrorism protection.

The system of anti-terrorist protection of an educational institution is a complex of interconnected organizational, technical, coordination-informational, propaganda-pedagogical, legal and psychological measures and entities that implement them, the purpose of which is to comprehensively prevent threats of a terrorist nature.

One of the recommended measures to reduce vulnerability to manifestations of a terrorist nature, carried out by the forces of a general educational institution, is the certification of educational institutions for anti-terrorism protection [12].

The certification results will serve as a source of information on the level of protection of the educational institution from manifestations of a terrorist nature, and will also become the starting point for the development of measures to reduce vulnerability and justification for their additional financing.

The first document in the organization that determines the start of work on the certification of the anti-terrorist protection of an educational institution on its own is the order of the head of the educational institution, which appoints the chairman and members of the permanent certification committee and determines the timing of certification.

The certification committee carries out the following works:
• provides methodological guidance and control of certification at all stages;
• forms the necessary regulatory and reference base for certification;
• compiles a list of indicators (criteria) taken into account during the certification;
• identifies shortcomings (assesses the anti-terrorism security of the educational institution);
• develops proposals and draws up an action plan to increase the anti-terrorism security of the educational institution; makes proposals on the readiness of the educational institution for certification, carried out by an external special committee.

After drawing up a plan of activities for certification at a meeting of the certification committee, a schedule is drawn up to evaluate the institution according to the criteria of anti-terrorism protection [13-14].

To conduct certification by the educational institution, it is recommended to provide the survey according to the following criteria:

K1 - the presence and condition of physical protection of a general educational institution, the possibility of secretive penetration of an object with a means of destruction;
K2 - the presence and condition of anti-terrorism instructions for staff and students of a general educational institution;
K3 - the state of anti-terrorism training of staff and students of a general educational institution.

A small number of criteria during the certification of anti-terrorist protection of educational institutions on their own is due to the ability of the educational institution to influence their level. In addition, these criteria show the degree of readiness of the exact institution where the certification was carried out.

Based on the listed responsibilities and criteria for assessing anti-terrorism security (vulnerability), the certification committee develops a plan of activities for conducting certification.
When developing an action plan, it should include the main stages of work on the preparation and conduct of certification in the institution, indicating the timing of their implementation and responsible performers.

After drawing up a plan of measures for certification at a meeting of the committee, a schedule is drawn up for assessing the institution against the criteria of anti-terrorism protection.

Assessment of the terrorist vulnerability of educational institutions is based on the criteria-rating method developed by I.D. Motornyi. ("Modern terrorism and the assessment of sabotage and terrorist vulnerability of civilian objects": monograph).

At the first stage of certification, a choice is made: a model for calculating terrorist vulnerability from the most likely threats. The basic model assumes an adequate state of the object's defense means to the tools of attack. In "optimistic" - initially assumed superiority of protection over attack; in the "pessimistic" - the superiority of attack tools over accepted protection.

General recommendations for choosing a particular model for calculating terrorist vulnerability for typical situations are related to assessing the general state of anti-terrorism work in the country [15].

Based on the selected calculation models, a terrorist vulnerability of educational institutions is scored according to tables 1-3.

An example of calculating the terrorist vulnerability of an educational institution from the implementation of a terrorist threat: "Knowingly false report about an act of terrorism." The calculation is carried out according to the basic model [16-19].

For example, the scoring of the first criterion K1, which characterizes the presence and condition of physical protection of a general educational institution, the possibility of secretive penetration of an object with a means of destruction, will be equal to 4, provided that in the educational institution the watchmen, night watchmen, professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties, but when there are no territory fencing, video surveillance systems, "panic button", sound alarm, turnstile at the entrance to the building of the educational institution.

The second criterion is K2, which characterizes the presence and state of anti-terrorism instructions for staff and students of a general educational institution, in the absence of a package of targeted instructions for students and staff for typical cases and the presence of memos and general recommendations, access to which is limited (from 20% to 40 % of students and staff are not aware about their existence), will be evaluated by five points [20-21].

To score the third criterion K3, the knowledge of students and staff is checked in the form of a test. For example, 66-72% of staff and students passed the test (satisfactory condition of training). In this case, the third criterion is assigned 4 points.

The results are entered in table 4.

After the score, the terrorist vulnerability from the considerable threat is calculated in relative units (Y) (table 4).

The same scheme is used to calculate the terrorist vulnerability of an educational institution and other types of probable threats.

The final assessment of the vulnerability of an educational institution is a comprehensive indicator of vulnerability, determined according to the equation:

\[
Y = \sqrt[n]{\prod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i}
\]

where: \( n \) is the number of probable terrorist threats; \( Y_i \) - assessment of terrorist vulnerability in relative units from the \( i \)-th threat.

Accordingly, a comprehensive indicator of anti-terrorism security is determined by the equation: \( P_{\text{comp}} = 1 - Y_{\text{comp}} \).

Having determined a comprehensive indicator of anti-terrorism security, the committee gives a conclusion on the degree of protection of an educational institution from terrorist threats.
Table 1. The assessment of the presence and condition of physical protection of a general educational institution, the possibility of secretive penetration of an object with a means of destruction (K1).

| Factors determining the scoring of the criterion | Scoring of the criterion of terrorist vulnerability depending on the accepted calculation model |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                  | pessimistic | basic    | optimistic |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. There is a complete set of technical safety equipment: fencing of the at the educational institution territory, video surveillance systems, “panic button”, audible alarm, turnstile at the entrance to the building | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. One of the above tools is missing or faulty | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. Two of the above tools are missing or faulty | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. Three of the above tools are missing or faulty | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. Four of the above tools are missing or faulty | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Janitor, night watchmen, and professional security guards conscientiously fulfill their duties at the educational institution. There are no technical safety measures | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| Janitor, night watchmen faithfully perform their duties at the educational institution, professional security guards are absent duties at the educational institution or unfairly perform their functions | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Janitors faithfully perform their duties at the educational institution, night watchmen and professional security guards are absent or unfairly perform their functions | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| Janitors, night watchmen, and professional security guards are absent duties at the educational institution or unfairly perform their functions | 10 | 8 | 5 |

3. Results

Vulnerability is considered low if \( Y = (0 - 0.2) \), when \( Y = (0.2 - 0.4) \), the vulnerability is acceptable, but measures to increase anti-terrorism protection are required.

If the value of \( Y \) is more than 0.4, the vulnerability is unacceptable.

Similarly, the effectiveness of protection is evaluated:

- with \( P = (0.8 - 1.0) \), the security of the educational institution is high;
- with \( P = (0.6 - 0.8) \), the security of the educational institution is acceptable, but requires improvement;

- with \( P \) less than 0.6, the security of the educational institution is unacceptable.

According to the results of certification, if necessary, additional protective measures are determined.
### Table 2. The assessment of the presence and condition of anti-terrorism instructions for staff and students of a general educational institution (K2).

| Factors determining the scoring of the criterion | Scoring of the criterion of terrorist vulnerability depending on the accepted calculation model |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| There is a package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases | pessimistic | basic | optimistic |
| There is a package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, while less than 20% of students and staff are not familiar with them | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| There is a package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, while from 20% to 40% of students and staff are not familiar with them | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| There is a package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, with the absence of access to them by more than 40% of students and staff | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| There is no package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, there are memos and general recommendations, while less than 20% of students and staff are not familiar with them | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| There is no package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, there are memos and general recommendations, access to them is limited (from 20% to 40% of students and staff are not aware of their existence) | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| There is no package of targeted instructions for staff and students for typical cases, there are memos and general recommendations, access to them is limited (more than 40% of students and staff are not aware of their existence) | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| There is an incomplete set of memos and (or) recommendations | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| There is no documentation | 9 | 7 | 4 |

### 4. Conclusions

Based on the results of the security assessment, if necessary, additional protection measures are determined. The effectiveness of the work carried out to achieve this goal is a determining factor in countering the spread of radical, asocial and other destructive ideologies in educational institutions. Thus, the safety of educational organizations is a necessary link in the implementation of global initiatives and programs, both nationally and internationally.
Table 3. The assessment of the state of anti-terrorism training of staff and students of a general educational institution (K3).

| Factors determining the scoring of the criterion | Scoring of the criterion of terrorist vulnerability depending on the accepted calculation model |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 94-100% of staff and students passed the test (excellent state of preparation) | 2 pessimistic | 0 basic | 0 optimistic |
| 87-93% of staff and students passed the test (very good state of preparation) | 3 pessimistic | 1 basic | 0 optimistic |
| 80-86% of the staff and students passed the test (good state of preparation) | 4 pessimistic | 2 basic | 1 optimistic |
| 73-79% of staff and students passed the test (satisfactory state of preparation) | 5 pessimistic | 3 basic | 2 optimistic |
| 66-72% of staff and students passed the test (satisfactory state of preparation) | 6 pessimistic | 4 basic | 2 optimistic |
| 60-65% of staff and students passed the test (satisfactory state of preparation) | 7 pessimistic | 5 basic | 3 optimistic |
| 53-59% of staff and students passed the test (unsatisfactory state of preparation) | 8 pessimistic | 6 basic | 4 optimistic |
| 44-52% of staff and students passed the test (unsatisfactory state of preparation) | 9 pessimistic | 7 basic | 4 optimistic |
| Less than 44% of staff and students passed the test (unsatisfactory state of preparation) | 10 pessimistic | 8 basic | 5 optimistic |

Table 4. Scoring of the terrorist vulnerability of an educational institution.

| Forms of realization of a terrorist vulnerability | Assessment of the significance of the criterion (K) in points | \( \sum_{j=1}^{3} K_j \) | \( y = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{3} K_j}{3 \times 10} \) |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Knowingly false report about an act of terrorism | 4 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 0.43 |
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