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Academy Overview

• The Academy’s mission is to bring people together to share knowledge, skills and practice and to promote excellence in social justice commissioning

• The Academy was created in 2007 and now has over 4000 cross sector members

• Services are designed to support the development of social justice commissioning and include nationwide events, eLearning, commissioning themed learning groups and web pages offering commissioning information
Hate Crime & the issues of under-reporting

Rose Simkins – Chief Executive
rose@stophateuk.org
The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry

Recommendation 12

“A racist incident is any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person.”
The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry

Recommendation 16

“The ability to report at locations other than police stations”

“The ability to report 24 hours a day”
So why do we still have a problem?

- Perception is still argued about
- **Hate element often overlooked**
- Hate Crime is often complex
- **Hidden in reports of other types and often not identified**
- Many barriers to reporting (both physical and psychological)
- **Inconsistent approaches across the UK & competing priorities**
- Lack of national standards
- **Unsustainable approaches**
- Lots of examples of short lived projects and approaches with minimum investment
- **Inconsistencies across the strands**
- Few examples of services meeting all forms of identities & different standards of delivery between them
- Hate Incident or 3rd Party reporting centres

STOP HATE. START HERE

STOP HATE UK®
“whatever they call you

call us”
‘No Hate Speech’ Project

MALICIOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Cyber-stalking

HARASSMENT

BULLYING

Stirring up of Hatred

Incitement to commit violence

STOP HATE. START HERE STOP HATE UK
Online Hate...

STOP HATE. START HERE

STOPHATEUK
Hate Crime Strands

Criminal Legislation recognises 5 strands of identity:

- Disability
- Faith, Religion and Belief
- Gender Identity
- Race, Ethnicity and Nationality
- Sexual Orientation

Reports made to police will be recorded as Crimes or Non Crime Hate Incidents.

Stop Hate UK support people who are targeted because of any aspect of their identity – crimes and incidents
Other Recognised Strands

Police forces can choose to record other strands:

- Alternative sub-culture (Leicestershire, Nottingham & 9 other forces).
- Age (Barking & Dagenham – the Met)
- Misogyny (Nottingham, North Yorkshire)
- Street Workers (Merseyside)

‘Incidents against women that are motivated by an attitude of a man towards a woman and includes behaviour targeted towards a woman by men simply because they are a woman.’
How to report?

Victim Perceives Hate Crime

Option 1
Direct reporting to Police

Option 2
Local Third Party reporting arrangements

Option 3
Internet Reporting

Option 4
Telephone Service

STOP HATE. START HERE

STOP HATE UK
0800 138 1625
24 HOUR HELP LINE
Barriers to reporting

- Not realising the reason for being targeted
- Ashamed or embarrassed (believe they are to blame)
- Not wanting to share personal information
- Not serious enough
- Will not be believed/credible witness
- Believing nothing will change
- Abuse becomes normal

Communication /life skills
- Poor mental health
- Poor physical health
- Denial
- Fear of things getting worse
- Not knowing how/where to report
- Fear of involvement from professional agencies
- Mistrust and Negative past experiences

STOP HATE. START HERE
STOP HATE UK®
The Reality of Hate Crime
You’re not alone

Hate crime affects 3 out of 4 people with mental health problems

Don’t suffer harassment or intimidation alone

We can help

STOP HATE CRIME
0800 138 1625
24 HOUR HELPLINE
Text Relay 18001 0800 138 1625

STOP HATE UK
STOP HATE. START HERE

www.stophateuk.org  Reg Charity: 1062692  March 2018

STOP HATE. START HERE
0808 802 1155
Stop Learning Disability Hate Crime
Open 24 hours a day, every day of the year

Real friends don’t call you names

# xxx #

Mate Crime is wrong. We are here to support you

See it. Report it.

(Produced in 2014)
Where do we provide our 24 hour services?

Stop Hate Line (covers all aspects of identity)

- Derbyshire
- Devon and Cornwall / Isles of Scilly
- Essex
- Leeds
- Lincolnshire
- Royal Borough of Greenwich
- London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
- London Borough of Hackney
- London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
- London Borough of Harrow
- London Borough of Havering
- London Borough of Richmond
- London Borough of Sutton
- Merseyside
- Newcastle (City)
- Oldham
- Queen Mary University of London
- Sheffield
- Southway Housing (South Manchester)
- Surrey
- Wakefield

Reporting by App
- West Yorkshire
- Surrey

Stop Gypsy and Traveller Hate Crime
- West Yorkshire

Stop Roma Hate Crime
- Yorkshire and Humber

Stop LD Hate Crime
- All Stop Hate Line areas

Stop LGB & T Hate Crime
- Dudley
Key Messages:

1. We need more consistent and sustainable responses
2. Evolve and change services to meet changing demands of Hate Crime
3. I would like listeners to:
   • Recognise the complexity of Hate Crime
   • Understand that it is a specialist service where 1st response is critical
   • Look for consistent and sustainability
Rose Simkins
Telephone: 0113 293 5100
Email: rose@stophateuk.org
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Evaluating Third Party Reporting Efficacy in Practice

Kris Christmann, Kevin Wong, Michelle Rogerson
"What gets measured gets managed"

- The limited evidence base suggests that many TPRCs are not functioning as originally intended.

- So what do we do about it?
  - How do we drive performance improvements?
  - How do we identify the elements associated with efficacy?

- TPRC tool is our practical contribution to these questions.
Purpose: TPRC Assessment Tool

• Provide metrics to inform the assessment of TPRC capacity, productivity and efficacy, to be used by:
  • Individual centres
  • Commissioners (e.g. PCCs, local authorities, the police)

• Drive improvements in effectiveness of TPRCs

• Ultimately, increase reporting of hate crime, thereby:
  • Generate a more accurate picture of hate crime
  • Help devise and deploy more effective solutions
  • Pursuit of justice
Development of the tool

**Conceptual Development**
- Research Literature
- Identify key components to include in measurement effort

**Sense testing with stakeholders**
- TPRC Practitioners
- Local government
- Central government policy makers
- Coverage of items?
- Clarity of questions?

**Pilot with Area 1**
- Usability questionnaire
- Feedback from TPRC practitioners
- Analysis of results
- Revision of problem items

**Pilot with Area 2**
- Usability questionnaire
- Focus Groups
- Face validity
- Clarity
- Expanded response Options
- Analysis of results
- Revision of problem items
TPRC Tool: Key Dimensions

- Organisation – purpose, resourcing, capacity and capability
- Staffing – paid/unpaid, training received
- Services – reporting methods, operating hours
- Geographical coverage – neighbourhood, local authority, PCC area
- Links to agencies including police and local authority
- Level of activity – reports to the centre
Empirical testing of the Tool

- **Local Authority 1** in 2016: 21 (of 44) TPRCs
- Revisions following analysis and feedback
- **Local Authority 2** in 2017: 14 TPRCs
- Identified the key dimensions of
  - Capacity & capability
  - Activity
- **Scoring:** Developed RAG rating assessments
Capacity and capability

- Features of a high scoring, green flagged, centre:
  - core business
  - specific hate crime funding
  - paid staff, dedicated to hate crime reporting
  - up-to-date training
  - took reports 24 hours a day
  - responded to all types of hate crime
  - full range hate crime related services
  - full range of reporting methods
  - strong partnership links
## Capacity and Capability: Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA1 N (%)</th>
<th>LA2 N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hate crime reporting not core business</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
<td>12 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated funding for hate crime reporting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capacity and Capability: Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA1 Average</th>
<th>LA2 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff receiving training in hate crime reporting</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff receiving training in hate crime reporting - in the last 12 months</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capacity and Capability: Partnership Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Authority 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>12 (57)</td>
<td>12 (57)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | Local Authority 2 |              |              |              |              |
|                  | Limited |          |              |              |              |
|                  | 8 (57)  | 7 (50)   | 1 (7)        | 8 (57)       | 8 (57)       |
|                  | Good    |          |              |              |              |
|                  | 4 (29)  | 4 (29)   | 8 (57)       | 5 (36)       | 5 (36)       |
|                  | Very good |      |              |              |              |
|                  | 2 (14)  | 3 (21)   | 5 (36)       | 1 (7)        | 1 (7)        |
Capacity and capability

LOCAL AUTHORITY A (N=21)
- % of centres: 14

LOCAL AUTHORITY B (N =14)
- % of centres: 36

Percentage of centres
Activity

• Components of ‘activity’
  ▫ Level of reporting & proportion of conversions
  ▫ Compares ‘expected reports’ based on capacity and capability with actual reports
  ▫ Conversion rates

• The full potential of reports is unknown

• RED: no reports when they would be expected to OR a low proportion are converted.

• AMBER: fewer than expected OR not all reports are converted

• GREEN: expected level of reports (or higher) AND all reports are converted.
Activity

- Uptake of reporting services are low
- In the previous 12 months
  - LA1 around half of the 21 TPRCs received no victim contacts
  - LA2 only 5 of the 14 centres received victim reports*
- Conversion rates are good BUT
- Undermined by the low rates of reporting to the services
Activity

% of centres

LOCAL AUTHORITY A (N=21)

LOCAL AUTHORITY B (N =14)
Applying the Tool

• The tool is designed as a diagnostic instrument for
  ▫ Individual TPRCs
  ▫ Commissioners (PCCs, police, local authorities, community safety partnerships and criminal justice boards)

• Offers a ready means to collect data across
  ▫ Centres
  ▫ Areas
  ▫ Potential for benchmarking

• Does not provide definitive answers about efficacy

• Does enable specific questions around efficacy to be identified
Limitations of the Tool

- Small samples
- Based on self-assessment by TPRCs
- Tool balances detail of data collected with completion fatigue
- Dimensions are open to debate and revision
  - e.g. the number of monitored victim groups included - centres may want to concentrate upon a particular group
Conclusions

• Our practical contribution to addressing a long-standing problem and it is offered in that spirit

• Offers an opportunity to open up a dialogue about:
  ▫ what effectiveness looks like
  ▫ how it can be assessed

• Dislocates the silence around TPRCs
Top Tips

1. ‘Mum and Apple Pie’ Syndrome

2. Offers some insights concerning what components drive TPRCs to function effectively

3. So, there is a need to collect consistent data for all TPRCs and the TPRC Tool does this!
Evaluating Third Party Reporting Efficacy in Practice
Background

- The Third Party Reporting Scheme in Essex was originally launched in 2013, under the brand ‘Stop The Hate’
- Several agencies were trained to host third party reporting centres, with associated ‘Hate Crime Ambassadors’
Perception of the Scheme

• Prior to 2016, reporting levels were poor - of the 20 then-active HIRCs only 5 advised that they had engaged with clients
• Not all HIRCs were consistent in making a return to Essex Police - 5 made no returns at all,
• Accredited organisations also did not feel well supported:

I have concerns that due to the lack of reports, trained staff have not used the process to report a crime and have perhaps forgotten what is expected of them. Follow up training or refreshers would be useful.

The only other enquiry we had came from a deaf gentleman. We needed a sign language interpreter but the volunteer we use was away...

When there was the public launch of the HIRC’s and advertised in the press it was only X that was photographed and interviewed - all the others weren’t included.
Relaunching the Scheme

- The scheme was relaunched in 2016, following a high profile murder initially reported as a hate crime.
- Several new ‘Hate Incident Reporting Centres’ were trained, as well as many new Hate Crime Ambassadors.
Relaunching the Scheme

• Additional support for HIRCs were invested by Essex Police and partners, in particular:
  • All HIRCs were given a follow up visit
  • Locality meetings were held.
  • An email account for enquiries and returns was established.
  • A quarterly bulletin was issued, containing information about different awareness raising events, upcoming activities, details about new HIRCs, etc.

• Additionally, Stop Hate UK, commissioned by the OPFCC to run a helpline in Essex, were promoted as a support tool for HIRCs
Funding

• Despite these additions to the scheme, no extra funding was provided to the network outside of a small budget for marketing materials
  • The scheme is entirely voluntary and managed by Essex Police, with some support from Victim Support and other key agencies.
• In addition for 2016-2017, a hate crime ambassador scheme run by a transgender support group - ‘Transpire’ - was funded by the Office of the Police, Fire, and Crime Commissioner.
  • This funding went towards laptops and mobile phones for community hate crime ambassadors, as well as some budget for marketing materials
Measuring Success

- The pilot in Harlow saw a considerable increase of reports fielded by HIRCs.
- The network-wide average was 1.3 reports a month with the Harlow pilot exhibiting 8 reports a month.
- Across the wider network (covering the whole of Essex), this extended to 20 reports a month, a dramatic improvement from a few years before.
- This is likely to plateau and then stabilise over time. In the Harlow example, the average eventually steadied at 3 reports a month.
- Regardless, agencies reported sustained awareness raising and engagement with their service users about hate crime, regardless of fluctuating levels in reporting.
Utilising the Tool

• The tool was used in the early stages of the relaunch pilot to compare the success, or otherwise, of 14 of the HIRCs across the county

• This early version of the tool compared several performance measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Centre</th>
<th>Organisational Type and Mandate</th>
<th>Professional Capacity</th>
<th>Breadth of Service Provision</th>
<th>Partnership Working</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM20 1NU</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM20 1NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS15 1DL</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM9 5DL</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The tool not only ranked each centre, but identified areas of improvement around each performance measure
Response from HIRCs

• A workshop was held regarding the TPRC efficacy tool, with HIRCs expressing support for the tool being used to measure and develop their efficacy:

  *It will be a good boost to the hard working members of our organisation*

  *It gives some objective evidence to see what is going well or what needs improvement*

  *It makes it feel worthwhile*

  *We would know collectively we are achieving and raising awareness of hate crime*
Utility for Commissioners

- Discussions with commissioners and host organisations identified several ways the tool could be used to enhance the network:
  - Identifying high and low performing organisations
  - Identifying gaps in service provision - geographically or across the protected strands
  - Identifying the value of a funded service against a voluntary service

- The tool was also useful in assessing how well centres understood their responsibilities in the scheme: the chart overleaf shows how centres assessed the services they offered

- Although the first 5 answers should have each been a feature of all HIRCs, several centres did not, for example, identify raising awareness of hate crime as one of their key activities
Utility for Commissioners

What services does your agency provide in relation to Hate Crime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposting or referral to another service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising public awareness of Hate Crime reporting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking reports for passing on to other agencies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement action</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking reports for information only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target hardening (additional physical security, i.e. locks, bolts, CCTV)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

- TPR agencies benefit from being able to measure performance

- ‘Inspection’ does not have to be negative; it can help in agencies feeling valued and as part of a wider, supported network

- The tool benefits commissioners by allowing them to direct resources to the most productive and identify gaps in provision

- The tool benefits commissioners by also reinforcing agencies understanding of the scheme and ensuring a uniform approach