

Public Note of Meeting

Reducing Reoffending Board (RRB)

20th June 2024, 14:00-16:00

MS Teams

Chair: Director of Commissioning & Partnerships (MOPAC)

Theme: Establishing effective rehabilitative interventions for hate crime

Attendees:

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)
London Probation
Greater London Authority (GLA)
Right to Know (RTK)
HM Courts & Tribunals Service (HMCTS)
London Prisons Group (LPG)
LB Haringey
Clinks

Apologies:

Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

1. Welcome

MOPAC welcomed members and highlighted that it is the pre-election period for the general election. The next meeting will focus on the post-election update and national CJS priorities.

2. Update on RRB Forward Plan

MOPAC gave an overview of the development of the new PCP plan. The current steer from the Mayor and Deputy Mayor is that they continue to support the overall strategic direction

from last eight years and the priority areas will not change significantly. Collaboration, stakeholder and community engagement, will be critical. The focus of the next PCP will be on delivery, ensuring meaningful change for Londoners is delivered.

MOPAC explained that the RRB forward plan is in development but will need to be cognizant of key strategic documents including the PCP.

The Board agreed that the next meetings would be thematic sessions focusing on the following topics:

- Youth justice including child first and transitions for 18–25-year-olds.
- Accommodation/ homelessness prevention including CAS3 update.
- Revisit thematic session on supporting people on probation into work to update on progress as well as relevant priorities not covered in the previous discussions.

3. Workshop context setting

MOPAC gave an overview of the landscape in relation to hate crime in London. MOPAC also gave context for the rapid evidence review concerning hate crime perpetrator programmes which RTK (Right to Know) were commissioned to evaluate. RTK presented the findings of the Rapid Evidence Review.

Key findings included:

- There was no evidence robust enough to claim that programmes definitively worked to reduce hate crime reoffending.
- ‘One-size-fits-all’ approaches are unlikely to be effective. Differences across types of hate crime and hate crime perpetrators means a range of bespoke interventions is likely to be required to deal effectively with re-offending.
- Multi-agency approaches tailored to meet the needs of specific offender cohorts that take into account local community characteristics are likely to be most effective.

Matt Uberoi shared feedback from the VCS forum:

- The VCS felt it was reassuring that this issue was being addressed. Some organisations reflected that although they don’t ask what offence the person committed, anecdotally they feel they do support people who commit hate crime.
- The VCS is interested in understanding what more can be done in the pre-criminal space to address hate crime, as a preventative measure.

The Board discussed how can we encourage more reporting of hate crime as well as whether an intervention for a perpetrator of hate crime offences would only focus on preventing hate crime reoffending or all offending behaviour.

The Board also discussed the use of restorative justice (RJ) for hate crime offences.

4. Workshop

The workshop discussion focused on what levers the RRB has to impact this work. London Probation raised that they have carried out scoping in this area in the past including research with the voluntary sector and consultation with practitioners. It raised that some local authorities have a strategic focus on hate crime via local hate crime forums and some of the work on tackling ASB also involves hate crime offences.

It is necessary to understand the average prison length for hate crime offences to know what role prison services could have. Custody data can now record faith-based motivation for hate crime which gives fuller picture of the risk of offender – but this has only recently been possible. One option to explore is post-release provision including a VCS as part of the referral pathway.

MOPAC summarised the discussion:

- There is clearly a gap in working with perpetrators of hate crime offences. The practical reasons for gap are understood – financial constraints and the complexity of the issue. However, there are some available resources to work with and there is good partnership working at a London level through the RRB to help drive this forward.
- The first step is to better understand the scope across London. There is a need to understand what is in place to tackle hate crime, such as hate crime forums, strategies etc, to identify what role the RRB and its partners could play. This would support the Board to identify what an effective multi-agency approach would look like.
- There is some work to be done to improve understanding of RJ. RJ agencies want to engage with probation more, but a shared, multi-agency understanding of the RJ approach is needed in London to support this.
- More RJ work upstream is needed, in communities, to inform, educate and trouble shoot before issues escalate (local councils may be key to this).