The route to ending hate crime in Greater Manchester

A research and consultation report

December 2015
Foreword

Hate crime is something that must not – and will not – be tolerated in Greater Manchester.

We are proud of our cities, towns and neighbourhoods. We celebrate our common heritage. We gain strength from the diversity of our people and stand up to those who try to divide us through intolerance, violence and hatred.

I believe that by working together we can make a difference, strengthen our communities and make hate crime a thing of the past.

The route to ending hate crime is not going to be easy, but through my conversations with victims and the people who support them, I’ve learnt of an unwavering will and determination on the part of Greater Manchester people. If we work together, we can put a stop to hate.

This report sets out real challenges for me, local authorities, police, voluntary organisations, faith groups and other partner agencies. It outlines the actions we need to take to move forward in our quest to end the harm caused by ignorance and bigotry. We have to make a commitment to victims that hate crime is taken seriously and we are listening to what they have to say – if it’s mentioned, it matters.

I look forward to working with you and hearing your views and ideas about how we can achieve our common goal – the goal of ending hate crime.

Tony Lloyd
Greater Manchester Mayor and Police and Crime Commissioner
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Executive summary and way forward

Hate crime has devastating consequences and causes significant harm and fear amongst victims, their family and friends. Greater Manchester Police (GMP) has recorded increases in hate crime and incidents every year for the last three years. This is likely to reflect a greater willingness for victims to report it. Increases in Islamophobia and anti-Semitic hate crime have also coincided with tensions in the Middle East and terrorist activity abroad.

Ending hate crime is a priority for the Police and Crime Commissioner, as encapsulated in his Police and Crime Plan. He has been listening to victims, and many organisations that support them, to ascertain what is needed to do this. This research and consultation report provides a number of challenges for Greater Manchester Police, Community Safety Partnerships and other partners, as well as commitments from the Police and Crime Commissioner, based firmly on these conversations with victims of hate crime and their advocates.

Challenges to prevent hate crime through education

It was widely agreed that an education awareness campaign about why hate crime is not acceptable, and what to do if you experience or witness it, is required, and that this should start early in life, particularly in schools, colleges and universities. We challenge Community Safety Partnerships to consider:

- Where is hate crime education already taking place within academic institutions and with the general public? How can the gaps be filled?
- How can a comprehensive education and awareness package be established to ensure consistency across Greater Manchester?
- Where are there opportunities for publicity materials developed for Hate Crime Awareness Week 2016 to be used throughout the year?

We challenge academic institutions to consider:

- To what extent does hate crime exist in your organisation?
- What more can be done to tackle the motivation behind the hatred, and how attitudes and behaviours can be challenged and changed?

Challenges to increase confidence to report hate crime

While proactive efforts to increase hate crime reporting have paid off, we know it is still hugely under-reported and in order to further increase reports we challenge GMP and Community Safety Partnerships to consider:

- Which reporting mechanisms are working most effectively, e.g. telephone, online or third-party reporting centres?

---
1 Community Safety Partnerships have been set up in each local authority area to make communities safer by focusing on the policing and community safety issues that matter most in each area. Membership of the partnerships vary by area, but generally include representatives from the police and crime commissioner’s office, police, fire and rescue, council, probation, youth offending, and housing providers.
How can good practice be applied to other places or communities?
Are other reporting mechanisms required in order to meet the needs of different victims in different circumstances?
Where are there gaps in geographies or communities of interest reporting hate crimes, and how can these be filled?

Challenges to providing an effective response

After victims have made a report, many need additional support to help them cope and recover. With this in mind, we challenge GMP to consider:

- How can the service further encourage reporting and engender confidence that hate crime is a priority?
- What more will be done to equip police officers and call operators with the knowledge, tools and tactics to effectively respond to victims of hate crime, including translating GMP’s Hate Crime Policy and Procedure into practice?
- How can a broader range of advocate groups and victims be involved in developing policies and procedures, and training for officers and call operators?
- How can officers manage expectations about whether they will investigate, or whether the information will be used to build a picture of hate crime in the area?
- What procedures can be implemented so victims are kept informed of their case?
- How is information and intelligence received from increased reporting being used by integrated neighbourhood police teams to identify hotspots and offenders?

Our challenge for Community Safety Partnerships is:

- How can you support the development of third-party reporting centres so they are providing an effective and consistent service?
- Are there opportunities for ‘safe places’ and ‘safe routes’ in your area?

Challenges for a successful resolution

Justice is a key facet of recovery, and currently nearly half of reported hate crimes do not have a positive outcome. We believe the following challenges for GMP will help redress this:

- What is the profile of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’?
- What can the police, Crown Prosecution Service and victims do to decrease the proportion of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’? What can the Police and Crime Commissioner and other partners do to support this?

And for Community Safety Partnerships:

- How can partners effectively use community resolutions, including restorative justice, so that there is a satisfying resolution for victims?
- Where are there opportunities to highlight and promote cases where victims of hate crime have gone through the criminal justice system and had a satisfying resolution?
In order to play our role in the partnership, the Police and Crime Commissioner is committed to:

- Supporting the development of additional education in schools, colleges and universities, as well as public awareness campaigns.
- Ascertaining the most effective reporting mechanisms across Greater Manchester and hosting events for partners to share good practice.
- Facilitating the development of an agreed set of minimum standards for third-party reporting and supporting centres across Greater Manchester.
- Checking the reality faced by victims by dip-sampling GMP records and mystery shopping third-party reporting centres.
- Working with private sector organisations to develop potential ‘safe places’ across Greater Manchester.
- Supporting organisations to build capacity and capability to deliver community resolutions through the restorative justice framework.

The Police and Crime Commissioner has committed to providing £10,000 to each of the 10 Community Safety Partnerships in Greater Manchester to support actions which will address these challenges and ensure that improvements are made to the reporting process, as well as supporting victims to cope and recover.
Chapter 1: Introduction and methodology

Hate crime has devastating consequences and causes significant harm and fear amongst victims, their family and friends. Ending hate crime is a priority for the Police and Crime Commissioner, and he has been working with victims, as well as organisations that support them, to ascertain what is needed to do this. Our research and consultation methods include:

- Research of good practice from around the UK
- Review of third-party hate crime reporting centres
- Survey of victims of hate crime (see Appendix 2 for topline results)
- Focus groups with communities of interest around the following personal characteristics:
  - Alternative sub-cultures
  - Disabilities
  - Jewish faith
  - Muslim faith
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Refugee status
  - Sexual orientation
- Secondary analysis of research with the transgender community conducted by Greater Manchester Police’s Neighbourhoods, Confidence and Equality Team
- A themed public forum on the 28th October 2015, held at the Maccabi Community and Sports Club in Bury (see Appendix 3 for the event’s agenda)

This report covers:

- Preventing hate crime through education
- Building confidence in reporting
- Supporting victims through investigations and criminal justice proceedings
- Helping victims cope with the aftermath and recover

Ending hate crime requires a partnership approach, and commitments from the Police and Crime Commissioner, as well as challenges for Greater Manchester Police, Community Safety Partnerships, and other partners are included at the end of each chapter. These challenges are summarised in Appendix 1.
Chapter 2: Hate crime in Greater Manchester

Definition of hate crime and hate incidents

A **hate crime** is any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice based on a personal characteristic(s) or perceived characteristic(s).

A **hate incident** is any non-crime incident which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice based on a personal characteristic(s) or perceived characteristic(s).

There are five centrally monitored personal characteristics, and every police service in England and Wales is required to record:

1. Disability
2. Race or ethnicity
3. Religion or beliefs
4. Sexual orientation
5. Transgender identity

Police services have the option to add additional characteristics, and in April 2013 Greater Manchester Police became the first police service in the country to also record alternative sub-culture related hate crime, also known as alterophobia.

As we shall see in chapter 3, these definitions are not well known or understood by victims or the general public. In this report, the term **hate crime** will be used to cover all hate events discussed.

Extent of recorded hate crime and incidents in Greater Manchester

Greater Manchester Police (GMP) has recorded increases in hate crime and incidents every year for the last three years. In the 12 months between September 2014 and August 2015, the police recorded 5,817 hate crimes and incidents, which is a 31% increase compared to the previous year. Increases have been recorded across all personal characteristics and most divisions. The trends are broadly in line with all victim-based crime, which has also seen a year-on-year increase for the last three years. The proportion of hate crime and incidents reported in Greater Manchester is comparable to reports across England and Wales.
Table 1: Hate crime and incidents by personal characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total hate crimes &amp; incidents</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>+31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>4,603 (79%)</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>670 (12%)</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>564 (10%)</td>
<td>+70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>273 (5%)</td>
<td>+62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>61 (1%)</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative sub-cultures</td>
<td>28 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional personal characteristic

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamophobia</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>+203%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitic</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>+31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker/ refugee</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy/ traveller</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greater Manchester Police

Greater Manchester’s Police and Crime Commissioner (GMPCC) conducted a survey of victims of hate crime in September and October 2015. One hundred and seventy-seven people responded, and while the survey isn’t representative of the Greater Manchester population, the results give a good indication of the type and extent of hate crime taking place across the conurbation.

Like GMP’s recorded crimes and incidents, the survey’s most frequently cited motivation was race or ethnicity (48%), followed by sexual orientation (36%), religion or belief (30%), and disability (22%). Sixteen percent of respondents reported being targeted because they dress differently, and six percent said it was because their gender is different to the one assigned at birth. It is important to remember that hate crime can be motivated by hostility or prejudice towards any personal characteristic, and other reasons people gave for being targeted included their size, gender, age, not being a local and having a different accent.

It’s often assumed that racial hate crimes are perpetrated by white offenders against victims from an ethnic minority. However, representatives from Manchester BME Network told us that inter-racial abuse is as much an issue as white-on-minority abuse.

The increase in reported hate crime is likely to reflect a greater willingness for victims to report it. Increases in Islamophobia and anti-Semitic hate crime have also coincided with tensions in the Middle East and terrorist activity abroad. It is widely recognised that hate

---

2 Data caveat: a hate crime or incident can be motivated by hostility or prejudice towards more than one personal characteristic, therefore numbers do not sum 5,817 or 52,528.

3 See Appendix 1 for topline results
crime is still significantly under-reported, and chapter 4 will explore the reasons for this in more detail.

**Common types of hate crime**

**Table 2: Hate crime by crime type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office Classification</th>
<th>Number (%) recorded Sept 2014 – Aug 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public order offences</td>
<td>2,733 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence without injury</td>
<td>894 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage and arson</td>
<td>363 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence with injury</td>
<td>318 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>56 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous crimes against society</td>
<td>46 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>27 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>15 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of weapon offences</td>
<td>11 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle offences</td>
<td>11 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>8 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape[other sexual offences]</td>
<td>1 [4] (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total hate crimes (excluding incidents)** 4,487

Source: Greater Manchester Police

Our survey reflects GMP’s recorded hate crimes as the majority of respondents have experiences which may be classified as public order offences. Sixty-one percent said perpetrators have “said nasty things to their face”, or “shouted nasty things across the street” (57%), a third said they are “picked on again and again”. While verbal abuse may not always be recorded as a hate crime, victims told us that the police and support agency staff need to refrain from describing it as ‘low level’, as it still has a significant impact on them.

A quarter of respondents have been physically assaulted. The most serious examples include being stabbed, having their hair set on fire and having a broken jaw requiring metal plates, as well as other violence, such as pushing or shoving. Again this is broadly in line with GMP’s recorded crimes which show there is violence either with or without injury associated with 27% of hate crimes.

Nearly one in five respondents have been the victim of burglary, theft or criminal damage (18%). Examples include having bacon thrown at their home windows, and having all their exterior locks superglued shut.

Some types of abuse are more prevalent amongst certain groups, for example ‘mate crime’ whereby the victim is manipulated or abused by someone they believe to be their friend, is more common amongst people with learning difficulties. Transgender people also reported ‘curiosity crime’, involving touching and ‘checking’ parts of the body for stubble and genitalia, which amounts to sexual assault.
The vast majority of hate crime takes place in public places: 79% of respondents have been abused in the street, 30% in parks and open space, and 27% on public transport. One in five people also reported being abused in school, college, university or their place of work.

**Perpetrators of hate crime**

According to our survey, most victims have been abused by strangers – either a group of strangers (59%) or one on their own (50%). One in five victims has been abused by someone they go to school, college or university with, or by a neighbour. Only a very small proportion of respondents report being abused by a professional, such as a doctor, teacher, key worker or carer.

**Frequency of hate crime**

A small proportion (four percent) of survey respondents report being abused on a daily basis. During the focus groups, many people from alternative sub-cultures told us they are verbally abused, or pushed, or have objects thrown at them almost every time they go out. Until now, they would only report very violent cases to the police. For others, the abuse is less frequent, although 11% say they are abused several times a week, and 10% say several times a month. Just over half say they are abused several times a year or have been once or twice in their lives.

**Impact of hate crime**

Hate crime can result in physical harm, as well as psychological damage, such as reduced confidence, anxiety, depression and feeling isolated. It has a devastating effect on victims, as not only do they have to deal with the crime itself, but also the knowledge that they were targeted simply because of who they are.

“I feel it contributed to the severe depression and self harm I suffered in my teens. I felt unable to talk to anyone and share my experiences through fear of being ridiculed. Others see dressing differently as a choice that I made, so therefore I should change that in order to not be attacked or harassed. Nobody should ever be afraid of being who they are.” (Survey respondent, victim of crime for being part of an alternative sub-culture)

The vast majority of survey respondents (84%) said they have changed something about their lives to try and prevent the abuse, including avoiding going to certain places (65%) and changing their usual routine (43%). A smaller proportion has even tried to alter the way they look to avoid being targeted (13%).

“I basically tried to completely reinvent myself so the person they attacked, me the victim, no longer existed.” (Survey respondent, victim of multiple motivations of hate crime)
“Behaviour change is also a big part of making sure you are not the target of hate crime – such as not holding hands in public with a same sex partner.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

These changes may also negatively impact the victim in other ways, such as having to spend more money on taxis to avoid public transport, and becoming isolated due to fears about going out.

“I stopped going out late, and use taxis rather than get the bus.” (LGBT Foundation)

“Avoid public transport at all costs as it is too dangerous.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

“The tenant in question hardly leaves the house, doesn’t let her children out and when she needs to go out she drives as she doesn’t feel safe on the estate.” (Hate crime themed public forum)
Chapter 3: Preventing hate crime through education

All facets of our research, including the review of third-party reporting centres, found that there is confusion as to what constitutes a hate crime and a hate incident. Common myths include:

- It only counts as a hate crime if it is motivated by hostility or prejudice towards one or more of the protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010, whereas it can be any personal characteristic or characteristics.
- It must be proved to be motivated by hostility or prejudice, whereas it only needs to be the perception that the motivation is hostility of prejudice towards a personal characteristic or characteristics.
- The perception of hostility or prejudice has to be the direct victim’s, whereas it could be the perception of another witness, not only the victim.

The victims and advocates we connected with felt that the general public do not know the extent to which hate crime exists in our society, nor the severe impact it has on victims. It was strongly felt that an education awareness campaign is required, aimed at the general public and victims to communicate:

- What hate crime is
- Why it is not acceptable in our society
- How to intervene in a safe way if you witness something that is unacceptable
- How to report hate crime
- The importance of reporting hate crime, and that not doing so is socially irresponsible
- That it is worth reporting hate crime because the police take it seriously

"The police will not stop hate crime. The wider community has to by not accepting this behaviour. We must stand up together to stop hate crime.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial hate crime)

It was also strongly felt that education and awareness raising should start early in life, particularly in academic institutions, to promote tolerance and prevent abuse in the longer term. This is crucial as our survey found that this is where a significant proportion of hate crime takes place:

- 19% said they have been harassed, abused or attacked in school, college or university
- 20% said they have been harassed, abused or attacked by someone they go to school, college or university with
- 4% said they have been harassed, abused or attacked by a teacher
- 9% said they have changed school, college or university to stop being harassed, abused or attacked

---

4 The Equality Act 2010 stipulates the protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation.
Many schools already hold classes about hate crime, but this is not happening in a consistent way across Greater Manchester. Some schools focus on one particular personal characteristic, while others cover a wider range.

**Educating good practice: People First Tameside’s Disability Awareness and Hate Crime Education Sessions**

People First Tameside have delivered training to all primary and secondary schools, and special support units, in Tameside about what it’s like to have a disability, so pupils can learn to empathise which should make them less likely to abuse someone with a disability.

A hate crime art project in primary schools involved pupils creating messages about hate crime on badges, posters, bags and T-shirts. These were displayed around Tameside to further raise awareness amongst the general public.

Metrolink is also working in schools to educate young people about the effects and consequences of antisocial behaviour, including hate crime, on the network. Over 50 schools entered a competition to create a series of TV and radio commercials showing the impact of antisocial behaviour, including hate crime, and fare evasion. Fourteen schools were shortlisted, and they ran an online campaign to deliver the message as widely as possible. During Hate Crime Awareness Week 2015, Transport for Greater Manchester ran a bespoke campaign throughout the transport network, which will be repeated in 2016. Metrolink agreed there were further opportunities for public transport providers to tackle hate crime and are keen to be involved.
Challenges for Community Safety Partnerships:

➢ Where is hate crime education already taking place within academic institutions and with the general public? How can the gaps be filled?
➢ How can a comprehensive education and awareness package be established to ensure consistency across Greater Manchester?
➢ Where are there opportunities for publicity materials developed for Hate Crime Awareness Week 2016 to be used throughout the year?

Challenges for schools, colleges and universities:

➢ To what extent does hate crime exist in your organisation?
➢ What more can be done to tackle the motivation behind the hatred, and how attitudes and behaviours can be challenged and changed?

Commitment from GMPCC:

➢ To support the development of additional education in schools, colleges and universities, as well as public awareness campaigns.
Chapter 4: Increasing confidence to report hate crime

GMP and local authorities have been successful with their proactive work to increase reports of hate crime, however, it is widely recognised that it is still hugely under-reported. Our survey asked whether victims tell the police when they have been harassed, abused or attacked. Nearly half said they do not report it to the police (44%), although almost one in six people said they report it every time (16%).

A variety of reasons were given for not reporting to the police, including:

- Previous experience of being laughed at, or not taken seriously, by the police.  
  “It feels like abuse again.” (LGBT Foundation)
  “When I reported the crime I was treated like a criminal, as if it was my fault for going out.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial and religious hate crime)

- Feeling let down because previous reports weren’t investigated.  
  “Nothing happens and it amounts to wasting your own time to report when nothing changes.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial and religious hate crime)

  “Being ignored when reporting abuse is almost as hurtful as the abuse itself.” (Refugee Action)

  “I know people who wouldn’t report a hate crime as the police haven’t got back to them after making a report.” (Survey respondent, advocate for a victim of disability hate crime)

- Perception that hate crime is not a police priority.  
  “Police are often not seen as interested in low level crime. Some police do not seem to care about what has happened.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial and religious hate crime)

  “The first time I reported homophobic crime, it was not taken seriously. The police reaction was one of ‘don’t tell tales’.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

- Awareness that the police have had their budgets dramatically cut and have fewer officers, so victims believe they don’t have the resources to deal with hate crime.  
  “Police have enough on their plate.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial hate crime)

- Abuse, particularly verbal, is often perpetrated by strangers and so victims don’t feel they have any useful evidence for the police to help them investigate, such as names or descriptions.  
  “They won’t be able to catch the perpetrator as I couldn’t give names, etc.” (Gothic Meet-up Manchester)
“Most of the time it’s strangers who you can’t identify so what’s the point in reporting it?” (Survey respondent, advocate for a victim of racial hate crime)

- Fear of reprisals, and believing that if they tell the police it will make things worse (particularly strongly asserted by Gothic Meet-up Manchester, Manchester BME Network and Refugee Action).
  “People are afraid to report things because of fear, especially when you are the only one on a housing estate that is ‘different’ from the rest, they know it’s us who has reported it. Therefore once the police leave the scene the abuse starts again. We have been hit, spat at, intimidated just because of our faith.” (Hate crime themed public forum)

- Believing some hate crimes aren’t serious enough to report.
  “I don’t report verbal abuse, only physical.” (Gothic Meet-up Manchester)

  “I wasn’t physically hurt so took the attitude of ‘it’s life’ and some people are just cruel.” (Survey respondent, victim of multiple motivations of hate crime)

  “Disability hate crime is a daily problem for me so unless I am physically assaulted I don't report it.” (Survey respondent, victim of disability hate crime)

  “I didn’t think it was a police matter as the attack wasn’t physical.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

- Believing hate crime is just something they have to put up with.
  “It’s a way of life.” (Roma Voices of Manchester)

  “It’s background noise.” (Transgender group)

**Different ways to report**

Collectively we need to increase confidence in the reporting system and convey that we want people to report hate crime, it is a priority, and they will be dealt with carefully and respectively. During the focus groups we had the opportunity to explain the importance of reporting all hate crime, every time it occurs, to the police.

Most people agreed it is important to pass information and intelligence on to the police to help them build a picture of where hate crime occurs in order to prevent it happening to them, or others, in the future.

People who said that they currently don’t report it because it happens so frequently, and is perpetrated by strangers and so they don’t feel they have solid evidence for the police to investigate, also said they would be willing to report to the police if it was quick and easy and didn’t take up too much of their time. They mentioned reporting via text, mobile app or website as suitable options, but they would not be keen on telephoning the police or going
out of their way to visit a centre to relay information that won’t be used for a specific investigation. Some people mentioned that existing reporting websites are too lengthy and could be streamlined (e.g. report-it.org.uk).

Other people said that they were more comfortable reporting through a third-party, particularly somewhere they are already going for support and they trust the staff, e.g. Tameside People First, LGBT Foundation, Community Security Trust. They said it is important to have face-to-face contact with someone who will listen and is able to help them, as well as take details about what happened.

What is abundantly clear is that there needs to be a variety of ways to report hate crime so there are options available for the victim. Different methods will suit different people – and the same victim may find different methods appropriate depending on the circumstances of each event. They can choose whether they want to speak to someone directly – and this could be the police or a third-party – or if they would prefer to report remotely via a number of different mediums.

**Third-party reporting centres**

A third-party reporting centre is a place, independent of the police, where anyone can go to report hate crime either in total confidence, or to the police with the support of the centre. A review into third-party reporting centres, commissioned by GMPCC and carried out by New Economy, found that:

- There were 209 centres across Greater Manchester (according to GMP and local authority hate crime web pages).
- Many reporting centres only listed a physical address, i.e. no email address or phone number, thereby requiring victims to visit at a time when the centre is open.
- All 209 centres were surveyed and 42 responded (20%). It is likely that many didn’t respond because they no longer consider themselves to be a reporting centre. Four respondents indicated they no longer had the expertise to provide the service.
- Over half of the centres who responded (23) didn’t receive any hate crime reports in the last year, and only three reported recording more than four.
- Those that are receiving reports don’t record information in a consistent way, indeed many don’t record crucial information such as the type of crime or the motivation.
- There is no consistency in what the reporting centres do once they have received a report, in terms of passing the information on to the police, and/ or supporting the person reporting.

Therefore, while the concept of third-party reporting centres is well received by victims and their advocates, and they are certainly well intentioned, taken as a whole they are not providing a consistent and rigorous service for dealing with hate crime. The review of centres and our conversations with victims show that they work best when they are based in an organisation that victims are already in contact with because of their personal characteristic for which they are being abused, e.g. place of worship or support centre. People are less likely to know whether generic public buildings, such as council offices, libraries, leisure centres, etc are also a reporting centre, and victims are less inclined to
disclose distressing information to someone they’ve never met before. These generic buildings were also less likely to respond to the review’s survey and those that did were more likely to say that they didn’t have the capacity to function as a reporting centre any more. Many victims said that reporting centres don’t need a permanent physical base, but it could be a function of a group which has drop-in sessions in different locations (e.g. Roma Voices of Manchester) or a social group that meets regularly (e.g. Gothic Meet-up Manchester).

Some people mentioned the importance of reporting centres being able to take reports and support victims who are being abused for a number of different personal characteristics, e.g. a gay Muslim man. We have already ascertained that reporting mechanisms need to be focused on the needs of the victim, and therefore it is important that any reporting centre is able to take a report regardless of what the hate motivation is, and they should be knowledgeable about other support services to refer the victim to if they don’t feel they can provide specialist support. This may require additional training for reporting centres.

Greater Manchester local authorities and police partnership teams have been working with voluntary and community organisations for many years to increase the number of reporting centres, and some have provided training, mystery shopping and have a minimum set of standards to which centres should be adhering. However, there doesn’t appear to be any consistency across the conurbation, which may result in victims receiving a different service depending on where they live. Additionally, there seems to be little cross-conurbation working or opportunities for local authorities, police partnership teams and reporting centres to learn from each other and share good practice.

**Reporting good practice: Community Security Trust (CST)**

CST has been a third-party reporting centre for the Jewish community for several years. Over time they have developed a solid process for receiving reports, passing information to the police and receiving updates on the progress of cases. This has involved educating the community about the details to look for, the phrases to use, and the information that will be useful for a police investigation. They have a strong relationship with the police, and in place is a data sharing agreement so they can compare statistics and see whether the police are receiving a similar number of reports to them. CST believes that they have helped to build up trust between the community and the police, and so victims are more confident to report directly to the police now.
Reporting good practice: Hate crime on the Metrolink

Over the Metrolink’s 60 miles of track and 92 tram stops, there are 250 passenger emergency call points, 850 CCTV cameras on the platforms, sub-stations and entrance points, and each tram has six internal cameras. These are linked up to a dedicated CCTV control room which is monitored in live time. The footage is kept for 28 days and will be provided to the police to help identify suspects and witnesses as part of a criminal investigation. Anyone experiencing or witnessing hate crime (or any crime) can push an emergency call point and alert the driver and the CCTV control room. The driver can stop the tram and/or close the tram stop to preserve evidence, and all staff will work with the police for speedy identification, arrest and conviction of offenders.

In September 2015, a teenager was severely assaulted at the Bowker Vale Metrolink station. The CCTV control room staff and driver saw the incident and instantly reported it to the police. They provided witness statements and the CCTV footage, which was instrumental in helping identify and convict the offenders, both of whom received custodial sentences.

Challenges for Greater Manchester Police and Community Safety Partnerships:

➢ Which reporting mechanisms are working most effectively, e.g. telephone, online or third-party reporting centres?
➢ How can good practice be applied to other places or communities?
➢ Are other reporting mechanisms required in order to meet the needs of different victims in different circumstances?
➢ Where there are gaps in geographies or communities of interest reporting hate crimes, and how can these be filled?

Commitment from GMPCC:

➢ To ascertain the most effective reporting mechanisms across Greater Manchester and host events for partners to share good practice.
Chapter 5: Providing an effective response

Reporting hate crime is only the first step, and many people would like further action to be taken to help them deal with the aftermath. The exact nature of post-reporting support will depend on the individual, what happened to them, and the extent of their existing support networks, but common themes include:

- Being believed
- Reassurance they have done the right thing by reporting
- Someone to talk to who has the time to listen
- Feedback on what is happening with the investigation
- The offenders brought to justice

What should happen when hate is reported to the police?

The police are trained to ask whether the person reporting thinks it is a hate crime. If they feel it is, this is flagged on the computer system and a victim risk assessment undertaken, which includes whether they are likely to be intimidated witnesses and need an enhanced service under the Ministry of Justice’s 2013 Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. The officer should also refer them onto appropriate support services for victims. During the investigation, particularly at the interview stage, the officer will explore the motivation of the crime in more detail.

The groups we spoke to had mixed experiences of reporting to GMP call operators and police officers. The CST told us they are generally asked whether they think it is a hate crime, which allows the victim to define what they perceive the motivation to be. However, other people told us they are not asked this question. Others said that in some instances they have explicitly stated they believe it was a hate crime but the police have challenged them to prove it was motivated by hate. They felt that the onus was on them to prove there was hate motivation rather than their perception being accepted.

“We were very satisfied with how the police handled it; they were very kind and understanding. However the crime was later reclassified as public disorder when we felt it was clearly a hate incident, we found that annoying, as it felt like the very essence of why we reported was seen as not relevant. We were motivated to report to the police in the first place because of the drive we had seen for people to report hate crime.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

GMP’s Hate Crime Policy and Procedure provides direction for how officers should carry out a hate crime investigation and the issues they should consider for victims and witnesses. This includes reassurance, creating a comfortable environment to give them the confidence to disclose what’s happened, ascertaining their needs and exploring their
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5 GMP’s Hate Crime Policy and Procedure can be accessed here: http://www.gmp.police.uk/content/WebAttachments/A902DDDD4CD8149180257CED0050D768/$File/GMP%20Hate%20Crime%20Policy%20January%202014%20updated%20May%202014.pdf
perceptions. The policy explicitly states that victims and witnesses perceptions should not be challenged:

“Explore perception, as it can reveal further evidence or incidents – but do not challenge it. It must be stressed that even if there is little background to the perception, it must be accepted.” (GMP, 2014, p17)

If victims of hate crime experience indifference or rejection from the police, this in effect victimises them for a second time, and is called ‘secondary victimisation’. The Hate Crime Policy and Procedure has a section which specifically deals with secondary victimisation and states:

“Secondary victimisation takes place whether or not the police are indifferent or reject victims if that is what the victim perceives about the interaction. Whether or not it is reasonable for them to perceive it that way is immaterial. The onus falls entirely on the police service or other agency to manage the interaction to ensure that the victim has no residual perceptions of secondary victimisation.” (GMP, 2014, p12)

However, as we saw in the previous chapter, some victims have felt that they were not taken seriously or were dismissed by the police. It’s widely accepted that hate crime is under-reported and it can take a lot of courage to report it, therefore, if a victim has taken this initial step it is crucial that officers and staff do their utmost to respond to the individual needs of the victim.

“If it’s mentioned, it matters.” (LGBT Foundation)

Other issues raised with us include:

- Cases reported to the police but not recorded on the computer database so when they telephone for an update there is no record of their case.
- Reported cases not being followed up properly, for example statements not taken and cases being closed prematurely.

Bad experiences erode trust and confidence, and victims may be less likely to make further reports about any types of crime.

“People say the police here are just like they are back home so there is no point in trying to complain. This can leave communities quite vulnerable as they don’t feel confident that they will get protection from the police so they might not contact the police in a situation that requires police assistance.” (Refugee Action)

The importance of receiving updates on their crime, or feedback on how information they provided has been used, was mentioned in all facets of our research. People were very critical when they hadn’t received any feedback and those who don’t currently report said they would be more likely to if they knew what action would be taken. Therefore, in order to increase confidence, it is important for the police to manage expectations about what
they will do with the information about each crime or incident they receive – whether it will be used for intelligence to build a picture of where hate crime occurs or whether it will be specifically investigated. If it is being specifically investigated they would like updates on the progress of the investigation.

“I do report but the last two incidents I have had no feedback.” (Survey respondent, victim of religious hate crime)

“When something is reported and you want an update, you have to ring around trying to locate the officer, he may be on leave, not on shift, etc. You end up chasing your own crime up when you’re dealing with the aftermath of what has happened to you. It’s all stressful.” (Hate crime themed public forum)

One focus group participant said, “Wouldn’t it be wonderful if the police were more like Amazon? If I buy something on Amazon I can track its progress online. I can tell whether it’s left the warehouse and where it is on its journey to me. Why can’t I do that with the crimes I report? It would be brilliant to type in my crime reference number and know what investigation has been carried out so far, all the way till the case is resolved.”

Good practice: Keeping victims informed

A number of police services, including West Yorkshire and Avon and Somerset, allow victims to report and track the progress of crimes online. Greater Manchester Police is exploring this as an option for inclusion in its future IT contracts.

Training for frontline officers and call operators

Many advocate groups mentioned they would like to be involved in training frontline officers and call operators. This echoes a recommendation from a report into how police tackle hate crime in Nottingham:

“The report suggests that officers are trained using a range of real cases as examples, as well as bringing in support from external agencies to facilitate contact with a range of victims. The police also need more resources that can help to ‘signpost’ them to agencies that can help to support victims. The report also recommends that external agencies play a greater part in providing 24-7 assistance to relieve the pressure on police particularly during evenings and weekends.”

(Trickett, 2015, p82)

Previously GMP has involved advocate groups with training officers and staff, for example Better Things and LGBT Foundation. Currently the service is reviewing its hate crime
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training, which presents an opportunity to involve a broader range of groups supporting victims with different personal characteristics.

**Reporting AND supporting centres**

There was strong support from victims, advocate groups, the police, local authorities and other partner organisations for centres to do more than just take reports, but also to follow them up with the police, and to provide support to help victims cope and recover from the crime. Some reporting centres are already providing this as part of their day-to-day work, for example CST, LGBT Foundation, People First. Dedicated training would be beneficial for staff in all centres so they know how to take reports for the police, and the mechanisms for following them up so victims are kept updated (where they wish to be).

**What do you think people need to help them cope and recover?**

“Just to be aware that they are not alone and that someone will listen to them and offer support.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

“To be dealt with in a confidential and sympathetic manner.” (Survey respondent, victim of multiple motivations of hate crime)

“To be believed. To be listened to. To have someone to talk to. To feel safe.” (Survey respondent, victim of disability hate crime)

**Safe places and safe routes**

A ‘safe place’ is a public place where anyone can go if they are feeling scared or vulnerable and need help right away. This could include anything from feeling unwell to being harassed or bullied. Any public place could be a designated ‘safe place’ – in parts of the country where schemes exist these tend to be municipal buildings. As hate crime can occur at any time of the day or night, it would be beneficial if places that are open outside normal office hours participate in schemes, such as petrol stations, supermarkets and fast food outlets.

Our research found that there was strong support from victims of hate crime for Greater Manchester to adopt a safe place scheme. The notion of ‘safe routes’ was also mentioned during some of the focus groups. The concept of a ‘safe route’ scheme would entail people being able to look up where streets are well lit and are monitored by CCTV so they can plan their journey accordingly.
Good practice: Safe Places Schemes

Starbucks has teamed up with the Seattle Police Department’s Safe Place Program to offer their stores as a safe haven for people fleeing LGBTQ attacks. 2,000 employees across 97 branches will be trained on how to respond to, and help LGBTQ victims of violence, as well as effectively report hate crimes to the police.

The Safe Place Scheme operating in Avon and Somerset, as well as Devon and Cornwall, works by members carrying an ‘I need help’ card with the contact details of someone they can trust. If they need help when they are out and about, they can go to any location that displays the Safe Place sticker on their window. By showing their card to Safe Place staff, they should get help.

Victim services’ website

In April 2015, Police and Crime Commissioners became responsible for providing many services for victims that were previously under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice. In October 2015, Tony Lloyd launched the Greater Manchester Victim Services’ website⁷, which makes it easier for people who have been victims of crime to find information and access support services, even if they haven’t reported the crime to police. The website brings together information about victims’ services and the criminal justice system under one roof. People can call a helpline, read practical advice and information, or search an online directory to find details of a local support service.

What do you think people need to help them cope and recover?

“I can't speak for everyone, but the overriding feeling is that of vulnerability, rejection and isolation. To have information/publicity on how to cope/manage such situations, with different examples/scenarios. Guidance on where to get support from.” (Survey respondent, victim of disability hate crime)

⁷ http://www.gmvictims.org.uk
“I think the support needs to be tailored to the individual, and that individuals are given the tools they need to get what support they need. For example, a website where there are details of support groups, etc would be good.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

Challenges for Greater Manchester Police:

- How can the service further encourage reporting and engender confidence that hate crime is a priority?
- What more will be done to equip police officers and call operators with the knowledge, tools and tactics to effectively respond to victims of hate crime, including translating GMP’s Hate Crime Policy and Procedure into practice?
- How can a broader range of advocate groups and victims be involved in developing policies and procedures, and training for officers and call operators?
- How can officers manage expectations about whether they will investigate, or whether the information will be used to build a picture of hate crime in the area?
- What procedures can be implemented so victims are kept informed of their case?
- How is information and intelligence received from increased reporting being used by integrated neighbourhood police teams to identify hotspots and offenders?

Challenges for Community Safety Partnerships:

- How can you support the development of third-party reporting centres so they are providing an effective and consistent service?
- Are there opportunities for ‘safe places’ and ‘safe routes’ in your area?

Commitments from GMPCC:

- To facilitate the development of an agreed set of minimum standards for third-party reporting and supporting centres across Greater Manchester.
- To check the reality faced by victims by dip-sampling GMP records and mystery shopping third-party reporting centres.
- To work with private sector organisations to develop potential ‘safe places’ across Greater Manchester.
Chapter 6: A successful resolution

Many victims of hate crime told us that it would help them cope and recover if they knew that the offenders have been caught and brought to justice. However, ‘justice’ can take a different shape for different people, and many said it was important for victims to be given a say in the solution or the outcome of their case.

What do you think people need to help them cope and recover?

“Something to happen as a result of the incident.” (Survey respondent, victim of homophobic hate crime)

“To know the perpetrators have been caught.” (Survey respondent, victim of multiple motivations of hate crime)

GMP’s data for outcomes of hate crimes in the last year shows that a third resulted in a charge or court summons (32%), and a community resolution was used in 16% of cases. However, in 45% of cases evidential difficulties meant the case could not be progressed. This is split between victims not wanting to support a prosecution, and the police or Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) having insufficient evidence to move forwards. No doubt the reasons behind both issues are complex, and it would be worth conducting more research to discover why, with the aim of reducing the number of cases that don’t have a positive resolution for victims.

Table 3: Outcomes of hate crime, September 2014 to August 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Sept 2014 – Aug 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidential difficulties:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect identified; victim supports action</td>
<td>1,117 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect identified; victim doesn’t support further action</td>
<td>337 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect not identified; victim doesn’t support further action</td>
<td>325 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge/ summons</td>
<td>809 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resolution</td>
<td>400 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautions - youths and adults</td>
<td>83 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in public interest (police and CPS)</td>
<td>61 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution prevented: Suspect under age/ too ill</td>
<td>40 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,510</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greater Manchester Police

Between January and September 2015, 222 suspects of crimes with hate as an influencing factor have been prosecuted. Of these, 103 were found guilty, 18 were found not guilty, and 49 have a decision pending. Of the 103 found guilty, the top three sentences were a fine or
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8 Data caveat: The data presented is for hate crimes only. It is based on the date of the outcome rather the date the crime was recorded as investigations may not yet have finished for crimes recorded more recently. Data is correct as of 13/10/2015; if the data is refreshed, the results could change.
compensation, imprisonment or community order. Other sentences included Youth Rehabilitation Orders, referral orders or suspended imprisonment.

Restorative justice

In the 12 months between September 2014 and August 2015, 16% of hate crime cases recorded by the police have been resolved using some form of community resolution, of which restorative justice is one example.

Explanation of restorative justice

Restorative justice is a process where the people who have been harmed by crime or conflict meet or communicate with those responsible for causing the harm.

For the victim, it helps them by feeling involved in bringing the offender to justice. It is a chance for them to meet the offender in a safe environment where they can explain how the incident affected them, and they can ask questions about why they were targeted. Hopefully this can reduce the fear of it happening again.

For the offender, it forces them to take responsibility for their actions and allows them the opportunity to hear and think about the harm they have caused. It is not about issuing an apology or being asked for forgiveness, unless the victim feels ready. It is about offenders being held accountable for their actions by facing the person they have harmed. It can also result in them less likely to offend again.

Both the victim and the offender have to agree for a restorative justice process to take place.

Anecdotal evidence from the focus groups and themed public forum found that in some cases, restorative justice hadn’t been carried out by the police according to College of Policing guidance. An advocate for refugees gave examples where it was imposed on the victim without explaining the concept to them. Another example was given where the police officer told the victim, “The offender is sorry, let’s leave it at that shall we?”

There was strong support across all facets of our research for restorative justice to be used to deal with hate crime. For the victim, benefits include helping them come to terms with what’s happened and to feel empowered as they are involved in bringing the offender to justice. It should also challenge the perpetrator’s attitude and hopefully change their behaviour because they realise their actions were morally wrong, not just unlawful. However, the underlying principle must be that it’s used when the victim wants it, and they should not be pressurised by the police or another agency. Other key messages for how restorative justice could be used include:

- It could be used for first time ‘thoughtless’ offenders, as well as more serious cases.
• It could be used in conjunction with other criminal justice disposals, such as caution, charge or summons.
• It must be victim-led, but the offender must also agree and make a genuine effort. Where an offender shows no remorse, restorative justice should be stopped and alternative criminal justice disposals used.
• A meeting shouldn’t necessarily need to include the victim if they are too nervous to meet the offender, and they could be represented by a family member, friend or other advocate.
• The process should be conducted by trained people so the victim is properly supported, and the perpetrator really understands the impact and consequences of their actions.
• Delivery by schools within schools, albeit carefully managed and perhaps less formal.

What do you think people need to help them cope and recover?

“I would enjoy the opportunity to speak with people who hate and marginalise to explain how I feel and put them in a position that may enable them to respect and empathise.” (Survey respondent, victim of abuse due to size)

“That the offence is taken seriously by the police - as it was taken in this case - so that the perpetrator realises that there are consequences for one’s actions.” (Survey respondent, victim of racial hate crime)

“Some restorative action where abusers are made to acknowledge their behaviour.” (Survey respondent, victim of multiple motivations of hate crime)

“Supervised meeting with attacker to let them know impact.” (Survey respondent, advocate for someone who was abused because they dress differently)

The Police and Crime Commissioner has commissioned Restorative Solutions to undertake a scoping study of the restorative justice provision across Greater Manchester and to develop a restorative justice framework. This will be done in three phases: mapping and partnerships, design and delivery planning, and building capacity and capability.

Success stories

There was a lot of demand for stories of victims who have successfully gone through the criminal justice system to be widely promoted, as it was felt that this will increase confidence that hate crime is taken seriously and justice can happen. Greater Manchester Victim Services’ website will include many of these examples, and it was also suggested that they could be included on other partners’ websites.

A few people said that the media have a role to play in inciting hate crime, particularly amongst people from different ethnicities and faiths. Many people felt they could use their

[www.gmvictims.org.uk/restorative-justice#hear-from-others-who-have-been-through-it](http://www.gmvictims.org.uk/restorative-justice#hear-from-others-who-have-been-through-it)
power and influence to portray positive messages of diversity and tolerance, as well as highlight successful prosecutions.

**Restorative justice case-study**

During Jewish New Year in 2011, Jack, who was wearing his kippah, was walking home from the synagogue in Salford when the driver of a passing car shouted an obscenity at him because of his Jewish faith. Taking down the registration number of the car, Jack passed it on to Greater Manchester Police and didn’t expect to hear anything more. He also reported it to the Community Security Trust. One week later, police contacted Jack to say they had found the offender who had admitted to the abuse.

Jack was offered the option of restorative justice. After speaking with his family, Jack decided to go ahead as it would give him the opportunity to meet the offender face-to-face and confront him with the impact of his crime. Local police officers supported Jack throughout the process, briefing him beforehand about how the process worked and what would happen during the meeting. Officers told Jack that if at any point the offender wasn’t being sincere in his remorse then the restorative justice process could be stopped and the criminal justice route pursued instead. Jack took a local Rabbi with him for support and during the meeting he felt fully in control and was able to ask the offender why he had shouted the offensive word. The offender apologised and explained it was a thoughtless act and that he and his family were disgusted with his behaviour. As well as the face-to-face meeting, the offender also wrote a letter of apology.

Jack said, “I found the restorative justice process incredibly rewarding. It allowed me to understand the mindset of the offender – who was of similar age to me – and give him the opportunity to see the consequences of his crime. If used appropriately restorative justice has a positive impact on victims and offenders. Where the victim is comfortable and the crime fits, I would wholeheartedly encourage other people to go down this route.”
Challenges for Greater Manchester Police:

- What is the profile of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’?
- What can the police, Crown Prosecution Service and victims do to decrease the proportion of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’? What can the Police and Crime Commissioner and other partners do to support this?

Challenges for Community Safety Partnerships:

- How can partners effectively use community resolutions, including restorative justice, so that there is a satisfying resolution for victims?
- Where are there opportunities to highlight and promote cases where victims of hate crime have gone through the criminal justice system and had a satisfying resolution?

Commitment from GMPCC:

- To support organisations to build capacity and capability to deliver community resolutions through the restorative justice framework.
APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES FOR PARTNERS AND COMMITMENTS FROM GMPCC

Challenges for Greater Manchester Police:

**Increasing confidence to report hate crime**

1) Which reporting mechanisms are working most effectively, e.g. telephone, online or third-party reporting centres?
2) How can good practice be applied to other places or communities?
3) Are other reporting mechanisms required in order to meet the needs of different victims in different circumstances?
4) Where are there gaps in geographies or communities of interest reporting hate crimes, and how can these be filled?

**Providing an effective response**

5) How can the service further encourage reporting and engender confidence that hate crime is a priority?
6) What more will be done to equip police officers and call operators with the knowledge, tools and tactics to effectively respond to victims of hate crime, including translating GMP’s Hate Crime Policy and Procedure into practice?
7) How can a broader range of advocate groups and victims be involved in developing policies and procedures, and training for officers and call operators?
8) How can officers manage expectations about whether they will investigate, or whether the information will be used to build a picture of hate crime in the area?
9) What procedures can be implemented so victims are kept informed of their case?
10) How is information and intelligence received from increased reporting being used by integrated neighbourhood police teams to identify hotspots and offenders?

**A successful resolution**

11) What is the profile of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’?
12) What can the police, Crown Prosecution Service and victims do to decrease the proportion of crimes that are closed due to ‘evidential difficulties’? What can the Police and Crime Commissioner and other partners do to support this?
Challenges for Community Safety Partnerships:

Preventing hate crime through education

1) Where is hate crime education already taking place within academic institutions and with the general public? How can the gaps be filled?
2) How can a comprehensive education and awareness package be established to ensure consistency across Greater Manchester?
3) Where are there opportunities for publicity materials developed for Hate Crime Awareness Week 2016 to be used throughout the year?

Increasing confidence to report hate crime

4) Which reporting mechanisms are working most effectively, e.g. telephone, online or third-party reporting centres?
5) How can good practice be applied to other places or communities?
6) Are other reporting mechanisms required in order to meet the needs of different victims in different circumstances?
7) Where are there gaps in geographies or communities of interest reporting hate crimes, and how can these be filled?

Providing an effective response

8) How can you support the development of third-party reporting centres so they are providing an effective and consistent service?
9) Are there opportunities for ‘safe places’ and ‘safe routes’ in your area?

A successful resolution

10) How can partners effectively use community resolutions, including restorative justice, so that there is a satisfying resolution for victims?
11) Where are there opportunities to highlight and promote cases where victims of hate crime have gone through the criminal justice system and had a satisfying resolution?

Challenges for schools, colleges and universities:

Preventing hate crime through education

1) To what extent does hate crime exist in your organisation?
2) What more can be done to tackle the motivation behind the hatred, and how attitudes and behaviours can be challenged and changed?
Commitments from GMPCC:

*Preventing hate crime through education*

1) To support the development of additional education in schools, colleges and universities, as well as public awareness campaigns.

*Increasing confidence to report hate crime*

2) To ascertain the most effective reporting mechanisms across Greater Manchester and host events for partners to share good practice.

*Providing an effective response*

3) To facilitate the development of an agreed set of minimum standards for third-party reporting and supporting centres across Greater Manchester.
4) To check the reality faced by victims by dip-sampling GMP records and mystery shopping third-party reporting centres.
5) To work with private sector organisations to develop potential ‘safe places’ across Greater Manchester.

*A successful resolution*

6) To support organisations to build capacity and capability to deliver community resolutions through the restorative justice framework.
APPENDIX 2: HATE CRIME SURVEY RESULTS

About the survey

Hate crime is any crime that is targeted at a person, or their property, because of hostility or prejudice because of who they are. This could include disability, race or ethnicity, religion or belief, sexuality, gender identity, etc. Since April 2013 Greater Manchester Police records crimes motivated by hostility or prejudice towards people from alternative sub-cultures, such as goths.

Tony Lloyd is clear that Greater Manchester should be a place where everyone can live their lives without fear of being harassed, abused or attacked because of who they are. He is determined to ensure that anyone who is a victim of hate crime has the confidence to report it to the police, and that the police respond respectfully and appropriately.

This short survey will take about five minutes to complete and will help Tony and Greater Manchester Police to tackle hate crime and support people affected by it.

Section 1: Experience of hate crime

1. Have you ever been harassed, abused or attacked because of who you are, or do you know someone who has been?
   177 people answered this question, of which:
   - 54% yes they had
   - 38% knew someone else who has
   - 7% something has happened but they are not sure if it’s a hate crime

2. Why do you think you (or they) were targeted? (please tick all that apply)
   132 people answered this question, of which:
   - 48% race or ethnicity
   - 36% sexuality
   - 30% religion or belief
   - 22% disability
   - 16% dress differently
   - 6% gender is different to the one assigned at birth

3. How were you (or they) harassed, abused or attacked? (please tick all that apply)
   146 people answered this question, of which:
   - 61% said nasty things to their face
   - 57% shouted nasty things across the street
   - 32% picked on them again and again
   - 28% threatened to hurt them
   - 26% ‘moderate’ violence, like pushing or shoving
   - 25% more severe assault, like punching or kicking
   - 23% ignored them, left them out, or isolated them
   - 18% broke or stole things or damaged their car or home
17% sent nasty messages on Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat or other social media
16% spat at them
14% made nasty telephone call(s) or sent text message(s)
10% wrote something bad about them, like graffiti
8% attempted or succeeded in taking money

4. Who has harassed, abused, or attacked you (or them)? (please tick all that apply)
   145 people answered this question, of which:
   - 59% a group of strangers
   - 50% a stranger
   - 20% someone they go to school, college, university with
   - 19% neighbour
   - 16% someone they work with
   - 8% friend
   - 6% relative
   - 4% a teacher
   - 1% carer
   - 5% other professional, for example doctor, key worker, police officer

5. Where has this ever taken place? (please tick all that apply)
   143 people answered this question, of which:
   - 79% in the street
   - 30% in a park or open space
   - 27% on public transport
   - 22% at work
   - 19% in school, college or university
   - 17% in a public building
   - 13% in their home

6. Unfortunately, some people experience this on more than one occasion, and for some it can be a regular occurrence. How often do you (or they) experience this?
   149 people answered this question, of which:
   - 4% daily
   - 11% several times a week
   - 10% several times a month
   - 21% several times a year
   - 35% once or twice in their life
   - 18% don’t know/ can’t remember

Section 2: Reporting hate crime

7. In general, do you (or they) tell the police when you have been harassed, abused or attacked?
   135 people answered this question, of which:
   - 17% yes, it happened once and they reported it
   - 16% yes, every time
4% yes, most of the time  
9% yes, some of the time  
11% yes, but not very often  
44% no, they don’t report it to the police

8. Some people have told us that they don’t report it to the police because they don’t think it’s a police priority, or they think nothing will be done, or they don’t know how to. Please would you tell us why you generally don’t tend to report it:  
*Open-ended responses*

9. What do you think can be done to encourage more people to report it to the police?  
*Open-ended responses*

10. In general, what has happened after you (or they) report an incident to the police?  
(Please tick all that apply)  
*82 people answered this question, of which:*  
- 52% they took down details of the incident  
- 39% they visited them at home  
- 28% they told them there was nothing they could do about it  
- 24% they called them on the phone  
- 23% they approached the person who harassed, abused or attacked them  
- 18% they don’t know what the police did  
- 13% they asked them to go to a police station  
- 13% they told them to ignore it  
- 9% they didn’t contact them at all

11. How did you (or they) feel about the way the police responded?  
*90 people answered this question, of which:*  
- 16% very satisfied  
- 27% fairly satisfied  
- 12% fairly dissatisfied  
- 36% very dissatisfied  
- 10% didn’t know

12. Was the person or people who harassed, abused or attacked you (or them) prosecuted?  
*122 answered this question, of which:*  
- 76% no  
- 9% yes  
- 15% don’t know

*If you have been involved in a hate crime where the offender(s) has been prosecuted. We would be very keen to hear more about this. If you’d be willing to talk to a member of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s team about this, please add your contact details at the end of the survey.*
13. In general, do you (or they) tell any of the following when you have been harassed, abused or attacked? (Please tick all that apply)

131 people answered this question, of which:
- 72% yes, they tell a friend or relative
- 30% yes, they tell an organisation
- 11% yes, they tell someone else, like a carer, or social worker
- 14% no, they don’t tell anyone

14. If you (or they) don’t tell anyone about it – why not? (Please tick all that apply)

16 people answered this question, of which:
- 75% there’s no point telling anyone because they can’t do anything anyway
- 31% it happens too often to tell anyone
- 31% they’re embarrassed
- 19% it’s not important enough to tell anyone
- 13% they’ve been told to just ignore it
- 6% because they’re worried about repercussions
- 6% it’s too hard to explain what happened

Section 3: Supporting people affected by hate crime

15. After the incident(s), who do you (or they) turn to for help with coping? (Please tick all that apply)

132 people answered this question, of which:
- 60% family
- 55% friends
- 15% organisation
- 11% support worker
- 8% police
- 7% someone else
- 20% no-one

16. What do you think people need to help them cope and recover?
Open-ended responses

17. Have you (or they) ever done any of the following to stop someone from harassing, abusing or attacking you? (Please tick all that apply)

128 people answered this question, of which:
- 65% avoided going to certain places
- 43% changed their usual routine
- 27% stopped going outside
- 20% changed their phone number
- 16% moved house
- 13% left Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, or other social media
- 13% tried to change the way they look
- 9% changed school, college or university
- 9% changed jobs
- 16% no, they haven’t changed anything
Section 4: Final thoughts

18. Is there anything else you’d like to tell us about your experiences of hate crime?
   *Open-ended responses*

19. If you’d be willing to tell us more about your experiences of hate crime please let us know the following details so a member of the team can contact you (we won’t pass this information to anyone outside the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner):
   *Open-ended responses*

Section 5: Demographics

Tony Lloyd is committed to making sure that everyone in Greater Manchester has the chance to have their say on police and crime issues. This way, he can fully understand the needs of Greater Manchester’s wonderfully diverse communities and shape a police service that is fit for everybody. Therefore, whenever we consult, we collect some information about the people taking part. You do not have to provide this information if you would prefer not to, however we would really appreciate it if you would.

20. Which local authority area do you live in?
   *126 people answered this question, of which:*
   - 30% Rochdale
   - 17% Manchester
   - 10% Salford
   - 7% Bury
   - 6% Bolton
   - 6% Oldham
   - 4% Tameside
   - 4% Trafford
   - 3% Stockport
   - 2% Wigan
   - 8% didn’t live in Greater Manchester
   - 1% didn’t know

21. How old are you?
   *130 people answered this question, of which:*
   - 1% 15 or younger
   - 2% 16 or 17
   - 9% 18-24
   - 11% 25-34
   - 23% 35-44
   - 32% 45-54
   - 17% 55-64
   - 4% 65-74
   - 0% 75+
   - 2% rather not say
22. What is your ethnic group?

125 people answered this question, of which:

**White**
- 73% White British
- 2% White Irish
- 0% Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- 1% Other White background

**Mixed/ Multiple ethnic groups**
- 2% White and Asian
- 1% White and Black Caribbean
- 0% White and Black African
- 0% Other Mixed/ Multiple ethnic background

**Asian or Asian British**
- 9% Pakistani
- 5% Indian
- 2% Bangladeshi
- 1% Chinese
- 2% Other Asian background

**Black/ African/ Caribbean/ Black British**
- 1% African
- 0% Caribbean
- 1% Other Black/ African/ Caribbean background

**Other ethnic group**
- 1% Arab
- 2% Other ethnic group
- 2% would rather not say

23. What is your religion?

119 people answered this question, of which:

- 32% Christian
- 16% Muslim
- 4% Jewish
- 3% Hindu
- 2% Buddhist
- 1% Sikh
- 1% Other religion
- 40% No religion
- 3% Would rather not say

24. What is your gender identity?

123 people answered this question, of which:

- 56% woman
- 42% man
- 2% would rather not say
25. Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were originally assigned at birth?
   124 people answered this question, of which:
   95% yes
   3% no
   2% would rather not say

26. What is your sexual orientation?
   126 people answered this question, of which:
   75% Heterosexual/ straight
   8% Gay man
   8% Gay woman/ lesbian
   4% Bisexual
   1% other sexual orientation
   4% would rather not say

27. Do you have a long-term limiting illness or disability?
   127 people answered this question, of which:
   75% no
   23% yes
   2% would rather not say

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey and share your experiences with us.
APPENDIX 3: HATE CRIME THEMED PUBLIC FORUM AGENDA

Wednesday 28th October 2015
10-12pm (registration opens 9.30am, refreshments 12-1pm)
Maccabi Community & Sports Club, Bury Old Road, Prestwich, Bury M25 0EG

AGENDA

1) Welcome and housekeeping (Jim Battle, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner)

2) Excerpt from ‘Black Roses’ by Simon Armitage

3) Opening address from Tony Lloyd

4) Policing hate crime (ACC Rebekah Sutcliffe, Greater Manchester Police)

5) Tackling hate crime on the Metrolink (Peter Cushing, Metrolink Director, Transport for Greater Manchester)

6) Group discussion and feedback

7) Raising awareness of disability hate crime (Andrew Barber, People First Tameside)

8) Question and answers

9) What happens next: Assurances and challenges from Tony Lloyd