

Developing a Hate Crime Reduction Strategy for London

Consultation on draft proposals

Hate Crime Reduction Strategy: Vision and Aim

The Mayor's vision is for London "to be the safest global city on earth". This includes helping communities to have the confidence to report hate crime and know that the police and partners will respond appropriately to their needs.

London is one of the most diverse cities in the world. This is cause for celebration. However, unfortunately, some people are targeted just because of who they are. Hate crime makes victims of whole communities with repercussions beyond those being targeted. Hate crime has a significant impact on the perception of crime, community cohesion and can lead to feelings of fear, stigmatisation and isolation among those who share characteristics with victims, even if they have not been victimised themselves. In addition, hate crime can impact upon those communities that already have lower levels of confidence in the police, compounding their lack of confidence to report hate crime and engage with the services that can offer help and support.

In his Police and Crime Plan, the Mayor recognised that levels of hate crime are too high and that there is significant under reporting. Reducing hate crime is a strategic priority for the Mayor, but this can only be achieved by working together with partners. A MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime) challenge on hate crime was held in February 2014. At this meeting, a range of statutory agencies (including the Crown Prosecution Service, Metropolitan Police Service and Ministry of Justice) as well as voluntary and community organisations, agreed to work together to develop a collective strategy to tackle hate crime across the capital.

About this document

The analysis and proposals in this document are based on quantitative and qualitative research conducted by MOPAC officials, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and other partners. This included:

Data and discussions from the MOPAC challenge in February 2014 (papers and a full transcript can be found at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/policing-crime/how-we-work/mopac-challenge/2014/13-february-2014-challenge-board-hate-crime>)

Engagement with key stakeholder forums

Meetings with wider voluntary and community organisations

A review of key literature relating to hate crime

As a result, this document sets out the London context and some of the challenges that need to be addressed to effectively tackle hate crime across the capital. A number of key objectives and potential strategies are proposed to prompt debate and discussion. We welcome your feedback in order to prioritise efforts and to develop a focused and effective approach.

Definition of hate crime

The Government's plan to tackle hate crime entitled 'Challenge it, Report it, Stop it' was published in March 2012. This sets out the following definition for hate crime:

"A hate crime is defined as any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a personal characteristic; specifically actual or perceived race, religion, sexual orientation, disability and transgender identity".

"A hate crime incident is defined as any non-crime incident which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a personal characteristic; specifically actual or perceived race, religion, sexual orientation, disability and transgender identity".

Hate crime comes in many forms and may include, amongst other types of behaviour, verbal abuse, physical assault, domestic abuse, harassment and damage to property. Our consultation to date has endorsed the need to adopt a sufficiently broad definition of hate crime for the purposes of this strategy.

Context: hate crime trends in London

Analysis of the hate crime data undertaken by MOPAC indicates that in the rolling year to May 2014, the **number of recorded offences** in each category has increased:

Disability hate crime by 13% (from 107 to 121)

Faith hate crime by 25% (from 673 to 843)

Homophobic hate crime by 7% (from 1106 to 1185)

Racist and religious hate crime by 8% (from 9187 to 9918)

Transgender hate crime up 65% (from 51 to 84)

An increase in the number of offences does not necessarily indicate an increase in the prevalence of hate crime. For example, data shows that compared to 2007-08 reports of homophobic crime have increased by 21 per cent. The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), however, shows that homophobic hate crime has reduced by 44 per cent since 2007-08. There is no reason to assume that the picture in London is any worse. This means that we can reasonably assume that the increase in reports is due to increased confidence to report – the gap between CSEW incidents and reports having narrowed – rather than an increase in incidents.

Context: hate crime reporting

Under reporting is a key challenge:

Hate crime is hugely under-reported. The Crime Survey for England and Wales indicates that 43% of personal hate crimes are not reported to the police. This may be for a number of reasons including a lack of confidence that the authorities will take them seriously and because sometimes people do not even recognise that a crime has been committed against them.

Racist and religious hate crimes are the most reported hate crimes. Transgender and disability hate crimes are least reported.

There are some communities where victims are even more unlikely to report crime and we need to ensure their specific needs are addressed. The evidence suggests that this is a significant issue among a range of groups including disabled victims, new migrant communities and transgender victims.

The Stonewall 'Gay British Crime Survey (2013) reported that more than three-quarters of gay, bisexual and lesbian victims of hate crime did not report it to the police.

There is a lack of clarity as to what constitutes certain types of hate crime. For example, a joint review by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and Probation Service in 2013 revealed that there is a lack of clarity and understanding as to what constitutes a disability hate crime. This causes difficulty in the identification and recording of disability hate crime and can also lead to challenges when seeking charging advice.

Context: hate crime victims

Repeat victimisation and victim satisfaction are key issues:

An increase in the number of victims was recorded in all categories of hate crime in the rolling year to May 2014.

Victims of hate crime are mostly male and aged 20-49.

The combined 2011/12 and 2012/13 Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) hate crime estimates show higher rates of repeat victimisation for hate crime compared with CSEW crime overall.

According to the 2011/12 and 2012/13 CSEW, victims of hate crime were more likely than victims of crime overall to say they were emotionally affected by the incident (94% and 82% respectively) and more likely to be 'very much' affected (34% and 14% respectively). This trend is similar over time.

In terms of victim satisfaction with the police in London, satisfaction of hate crime victims is static or falling.

There is a growing satisfaction gap between victims with a disability (73%) and those without (80%).

Context: detection, prosecution and conviction

Sanction detection* rates for all hate crime types are static or declining and attrition through the criminal justice system (CJS) is an issue that needs to be tackled to drive swifter, surer justice for victims

Of 11,075 hate crime offences recorded by the police (rolling year to May 2014), 38.2% had a sanction detection.

Sanction detection rates for hate crime are almost double that for other crimes, but the data indicates that sanction detection rates for all hate crime types have remained broadly static or have declined.

The number of defendants proceeded against at magistrates' courts, for racially or religiously aggravated offences (the most reported type of hate crime) in London, has increased in the last 10 years. The conviction rate has improved and was 65% in 2012.

The proportion of offenders who receive a custodial sentence for hate crime offences has reduced compared to the other outcomes. The average custodial sentence for hate crime has greatly reduced in the last 10 years. Most offenders convicted in London for hate crime offences are given a fine or community sentence.

*A sanctioned detection occurs when (1) a notifiable offence (crime) has been committed and recorded; (2) a suspect has been identified and is aware of the detection; (3) the Crown Prosecution Service evidential test is satisfied; (4) the victim has been informed that the offence has been detected, and; (5) the suspect has been charged, reported for summons, or cautioned, been issued with a penalty notice for disorder or the offence has been taken into consideration when an offender is sentenced.

Findings from consultation to date (1)

Our consultation with stakeholders to date has indicated there needs to be a multi-agency approach across London to:

1. Improve the confidence to report hate crime

2. Support victims of hate crime and reduce repeat victimisation
3. Ensure effective enforcement against perpetrators of hate crime.

To improve confidence to report hate crime stakeholders have said we need to:

Increase hate crime awareness in educational establishments.

Adopt a sufficiently broad definition of hate crime for the purposes of this strategy (e.g. ensure it includes gender and age).

Recognise under-reporting of hate crime as a whole and particular types of hate crime such as disability hate crime.

Increase awareness of reporting mechanisms and improve non-MPS reporting facilities across boroughs.

Develop a training package for Police Officers and other frontline officers to understand hate crime and how to respond to it.

Findings from consultation to date (2)

To support victims of hate crime and reduce repeat victimisation stakeholders have said we need to:

Recognise that online hate crime exists and is becoming more prevalent

Recognise the wide range of support needs that hate crime victims have and ensure that there are appropriate referral pathways and specialist services in place

To ensure effective enforcement against perpetrators of hate crime stakeholders have said we need to:

Improve the criminal justice response to hate crime, including training for prosecutors on different types of hate crime.

Highlight positive outcomes for victims in terms of prosecutions.

Explore the use of non-criminal justice solutions, such as restorative justice, for those hate crime victims who want it.

Key objectives

Partners and stakeholders have been instrumental in shaping 3 key objectives for the strategy:

Objective 1: Work with communities and partners to increase awareness and to boost confidence to report hate crime.

Objective 2: Work with partners to protect communities that are vulnerable to hate crime and reduce repeat victimisation.

Objective 3: Work with criminal justice partners to ensure swift and sure justice for hate crime victims.

Objective 1: Work with communities and partners to increase awareness and to boost confidence to report hate crime (1)

Objective: Increase awareness and boost confidence to report hate crime.

Potential Strategies:

Work with partners to develop joint hate crime information and awareness campaigns and to publicise successful outcomes.

Outcomes:

Communities more aware of the support available.
Increased confidence within communities about the police/partner response.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Work with voluntary and statutory partners, and through safer schools officers, to disseminate hate crime education resources for educational establishments, raising awareness of the impact of hate crime on individuals and the wider community.

OUTCOME:

Increased confidence amongst young people.
Increased reporting in schools.
Enhanced intelligence picture to target resources.
Reduced victimisation.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Work with partners to ensure appropriate third party reporting services are in place in line with the outcomes of the Home Office review of provision (commenced in June 2014)

OUTCOME:

Increased confidence amongst communities.
Increased reporting of hate crime.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Work with the Ministry of Justice to develop London-specific resources within the True Vision reporting and information site that are aligned to commissioned hate crime support services.

OUTCOME:

Increased confidence amongst communities.
Increased reporting of hate crime.
Reduced victimisation.

Objective 1: Work with communities and partners to increase awareness and to boost confidence to report hate crime (2)

Objective: Increase awareness and boost confidence to report hate crime.

Potential Strategies:

Ensure that the MPS incorporates online hate crime into a wider strategy and approach to tackling cyber-crime.

Outcomes:

Victims of online hate crime are offered equal protection from victimisation.
Increased reporting.
Better intelligence picture to target resources.
Reduced victimisation.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Ensure the MPS identifies and engages with communities vulnerable to hate crime as part of its overall community engagement approach and through the development of borough and neighbourhood plans.

OUTCOME:

Interventions are targeted at the communities most vulnerable to hate crime and resources directed effectively.
Increased confidence amongst communities.
Increased reporting of hate crime.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Work with partners to improve information sharing between agencies (e.g. registered social landlords, the police) to ensure more effective identification of hate crime victims, particularly where antisocial behaviour is present.

OUTCOME:

Better intelligence picture to target resources.

Interventions are targeted at the communities most vulnerable to hate crime and resources directed effectively.

Objective 2: Work with partners to protect communities that are vulnerable to hate crime and reduce repeat victimisation

Objective:

Protect communities that are vulnerable to hate crime and reduce repeat victimisation.

Potential Strategies:

Use analysis and intelligence to develop hate crime hotspot maps in order to better understand communities and to drive local plans to prevent hate crime from occurring.

Outcomes:

The risk of repeat victimisation of those vulnerable to hate crime is identified and effective risk management plans are put in place.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Drive innovative ways to reduce repeat victimisation, e.g. through hate crime multi-agency risk assessment conferences.

OUTCOME:

Interventions are targeted at the communities most vulnerable to hate crime and resources directed effectively.

Reduced repeat victimisation.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Ensure that the Victims' Code of Practice is effectively implemented for hate crime victims by all partners.

OUTCOME:

Victims are better supported, able to cope and recover, and are protected from re-victimisation.

Communities are more confident in the police/partner response.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Prioritise the provision of services to support hate crime victims within MOPAC's Victims' Commissioning Strategy.

OUTCOME:

Victims are effectively identified and offered support throughout their interaction with the criminal justice system.

Victims are effectively supported to cope and recover from victimisation.

Objective 3: Work with criminal justice partners to ensure swift and sure justice for hate crime victims (1)

Objective: Ensure swift and sure justice for hate crime victims.

Potential Strategies:

MPS and CPS to ensure consistent and effective use of hate crime legislation.

Outcomes:

Increased confidence of victims in police response.
More offenders brought to justice.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Improve the workforce capability across criminal justice partners to deal with hate crime in all communities, e.g. by developing a multi-agency training package for the MPS, CPS and Courts Services, and by developing Police Officers and prosecutors with specialist skills in dealing with hate crime.

OUTCOME:

Increased confidence of victims in police response.

More effective response to hate crime.

More offenders brought to justice.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Raise awareness of successes when punishing perpetrators of hate crime, using appropriate and targeted means of communication out to communities.

OUTCOME:

Increased confidence and reduced fear of crime amongst communities vulnerable to hate crime.

Objective 3: Work with criminal justice partners to ensure swift and sure justice for hate crime victims (2)

Objective:

Ensure swift and sure justice for hate crime victims.

Potential Strategies:

CJS partners to drive new approaches to reduce attrition rates and acquittals within the criminal justice system, e.g. by exploring the introduction of hate crime advocates.

Outcomes:

Improved outcomes for victims.
More effective prosecutions.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

As part of MOPAC's Victims' Commissioning Strategy ensure there is a consistent restorative justice offer for hate crime victims throughout the criminal justice process for those who want it.

OUTCOME:

Improved outcomes for victims.
Reduced victimisation.

POTENTIAL STRATEGY:

Work with CJS partners to improve the victim journey and ensure that victims of hate crime are effectively supported throughout the criminal justice process.

OUTCOME:

Improved outcomes for victims.
More effective prosecutions.

Measures of Success

The final strategy will identify a range of indicators to measure success including, but not limited to, those listed below:

An increase in the number of reported hate crimes;

A decrease in the number of repeat victims;

An increase in the number of positive outcomes for victims, including sanction detection rates;

An increase in hate crime victims' confidence in the police;

A reduction in the confidence gap between victims of hate crime and victims of other crime types;

An increase in the satisfaction rates for hate crime victims.

Questions for consultation

This document has set out our proposed framework for developing a hate crime reduction strategy for London. The proposed strategies identified above are intended to stimulate your thoughts and we welcome your feedback.

MOPAC now invites responses to this draft document with a specific focus on the following questions:

1. Are the right objectives identified on page 9? Do you have any further suggestions?
2. Are the right potential strategies identified on pages 10 to 14? Do you have any further suggestions?
3. What are the right measures of success for this strategy (see page 15)?
4. Is there any further evidence which MOPAC can use to develop this strategy?
5. Can you/your organisation contribute to tackling hate crime? If so, how?

Contact Details

You can complete the consultation questionnaire online at this address:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/policing-crime/consultations>

Alternatively consultation responses should be sent by email to Laura.duckworth@mopac.london.gov.uk, or by post to:

Laura Duckworth, Research Assistant
Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime
City Hall, The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

Should you require assistance in completing the survey, please call 020 7983 6532

The consultation will close on 5 September 2014

The final strategy will be published in Autumn 2014

M O P A C

MAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME