HATE CRIME.

TOGETHER WE CAN END IT.

Manchester's Hate Crime Strategy Consultation
Summary of Responses
Introduction


Consultation

2. The consultation sought views on the current strategy from a broad range of sectors and bodies, and gleaned ideas and suggestions for inclusion within the forthcoming 2016–2019 strategy.

3. Responses to the consultation were submitted via an online questionnaire available on the Making Manchester Safer and Council websites. A free postal address option was available for hard-copy questionnaires, which were circulated to all libraries, third-party reporting centres and police enquiry desks.

4. A consultation launch event was held in May 2015 for partners and stakeholders, and a similar event was held at the Challenging Hate Forum in July 2015. At these meetings there was an offer for bespoke consultation sessions, which resulted in a number of focus groups being held for communities of interest. Victim Support undertook an online survey and face-to-face interviews with victims of hate crime to better understand their experiences, views and perceptions.

Responses

5. Forty-one responses were received online and via the post, and over 100 delegates attended the consultation events.

6. The consultation events generated constructive and informative debate on what delegates thought about the old strategy and what they would like to see in the new one. Contributions were wide-ranging and valuable. As a whole, contributions to the consultation represented an important part of the information considered in the process of developing the Hate Crime Strategy 2016–2019.

Online questionnaire

7. The online consultation questionnaire was available on the Making Manchester Safer and Manchester City Council websites from 27 July 2015 to 14 September 2015. Forty-one responses were received.

8. Respondents were invited to answer 16 questions. Levels of response to each of the 16 questions varied. Each of the 41 respondents completed at least one of the questions. Respondents were not required to declare their location, but were asked to provide their postcodes.
Postal submission
9. Responses to the consultation were received from individuals and organisations via post. These hard-copy questionnaires were then inputted into the online survey. Responses from attendees at Manchester Sparkle were included in this.

Consultation event
10. Over forty delegates attended a consultation session at the Friends Meeting House on 28 May. Community and partner agencies were represented, including some from the third-party reporting centres. At this event approximately two hours were allocated to the discussion around the current Hate Crime Strategy, seeking delegates’ views on what they would like to see included or changed within the forthcoming strategy.

Other events
11. On request, a number of focus group sessions were held with communities of interest, including young people, and disability, faith and community groups. More than sixty people attended these events. Participants gave their views and feedback on the current strategy and put forward ideas and suggestions on what should be included in the next Hate Crime Strategy and how it could be made particularly relevant to their strand.

Victim Support interviews
12. Fifty-nine online surveys and 21 face-to-face interviews were completed by Victim Support to identify triggers for reporting crime and victim experiences of the criminal justice system.

Summary of findings
13. The following is intended to provide a summary of responses received either in written form or captured from discussion at the consultation events. Since submissions to the consultation were often provided in different formats, answering all, some or none of the questions asked, we have summarised responses based on the key themes and issues that emerged.
14. The key outcomes from the consultation were to essentially glean from the delegates and participants what lessons had been learned throughout the life of the past strategy, and to hear opinions of what should be included in the new three-year strategy.
**Reporting**

15. Differing experiences among communities were highlighted in reporting hate crime. Delegates felt this should not be the case and that it should be the same for everyone. A number of delegates thought the issue of Islamophobia is not taken seriously or is being forgotten, and that the same was true of anti-Semitic hate crimes and incidents. It was suggested that the severity of these warranted them to be considered strands in their own right.

16. The information postcards describing the differences between a hate crime and incident were considered to work very well. Some people do not report at the first opportunity, and it was felt that if they visited a third-party reporting centre (TPRC) and had the opportunity to take a card and read the information contained on it, it may prompt them to report in the future.

17. Feedback from the online surveys illustrated that only a third of those who had experienced a hate crime had reported it. Reasons for not reporting were wide and varied, including a lack of expectation that anything would be done, fear of repercussions, and ‘it wasn’t anything major’.

   Of those who did report, all were happy with the way it was handled.

18. A True Vision reporting app was suggested, along with developing links with Childline and Silverline as other reporting avenues.

19. Manchester City Council’s Report Line and True Vision website were generally felt to be underused or unknown.

20. It was felt that training with regard to hate crimes, incidents and how to report was important for parents and carers of people with disabilities.

**Confidence to report**

21. The community needs to have more confidence in the police and the Council to encourage reporting. Points were made about collaborative working between different faith groups, eg. opening up buildings and centres to the public to promote cohesion and raise awareness.

22. LGBT, Muslim groups and learning disability groups identified that work needed to be done to increase the confidence in communities to report hate crime. Delegates said that it was important for people reporting hate crime to be taken seriously. It was felt that better publicity around successful prosecutions would help. There was a feeling that low-level abuse was tolerated due to the fact that the Muslim faith was noticeable, eg. women wearing the hijab. The example of the work of the Sophie Lancaster Foundation was cited as good practice.
Third-party reporting centres

23. At the consultation launch, the training at the third-party reporting centres was reported to be very good, and organisations were grateful for the provision of the training. Some of the groups fed back that training needs to be refreshed and service standards need to be the same at all centres.

24. In all sessions carried out there was limited awareness of who to report issues to and where to report them, as many of the groups were not aware of third-party reporting centres (TPRCs). It was felt there was a lack of local awareness about the location of the TPRCs, and that they should be better publicised.

25. It was suggested that there should be Hate Crime Reporting Champions in schools.

26. One comment was: “I believe having multiple reporting centres is a waste of money. Most people will be happy to report by phone rather than needing a walk-in centre.”

27. In the online consultation, 84% supported work to be undertaken to increase the number of third-party reporting centres.

Communications

28. It was raised in many of the forums that there should be a focus on a more positive message around hate crime, ie. a focus on celebrating diversity and cohesion. Some suggested events celebrating different cultures, food, music, dress etc.

29. It was raised that there needs to be more advertising of the strategy’s existence within communities. Reporting on successful prosecutions, events, activities and opportunities was important in the groups. Some examples of mechanisms to better publicise the strategy were through the use of mail, websites, email signatures, TV, and radio links.

30. Feedback suggested that workshop settings are the best way to raise awareness among learning-disabled people. Delegates reported feeling more comfortable having a face-to-face consultation with police and authority figures. Video and role play would also be useful tools.

31. Young people consulted felt that many young people commit hate crime or incidents because of prejudices learned from parents or the media. These root causes need to be targeted. They felt it was important that awareness is raised with parents, and that it should be part of the school curriculum.

32. Issues were raised from many delegates with regard to prejudice portrayed in the national media, and the impact it has locally.

33. In many groups it was suggested that people need to know the consequences and effects of their actions, and that if they commit hate crimes, these consequences would be serious.

34. It was raised that information about hate crime needs to be accessible and easy to understand.

35. People liked the hate crime/incident postcards and said they were useful to have in schools, third-party reporting centres etc.

36. There were several suggestions for a True Vision or a reporting app for phones.

37. In many of the sessions it was identified that communication was more effective when in conjunction with groups representing that community, eg. faith groups, LGBT groups, and peer-to-peer work with young people.

38. In many sessions the issue of online hate crime was raised, in particular that people did not know how to deal with it or where to report it. It was felt that more of a stand should be taken against online hate crime and incidents.

39. All online respondents supported education work to be carried out around the issue of hate crimes and incidents.
Hate Crime Awareness Week (HCAW)

40. Of those who had heard about HCAW, it was generally considered that was a worthwhile and positive event. It was identified that there needs to be more time to plan and apply for funding. For some it was felt that the January timeslot was not necessarily the most appropriate as it is too close to Christmas. Many organisations shut down over this period and many think it is a bit rushed. Others felt it was good, as there are not many other events at the time.

41. It was reported that HCAW activity should not stop after the week of action and launch event. One proposal was to have the HCAW launch in line with National Hate Crime Awareness Week in October, and then run the funding pot throughout the year for groups to bid into when they would like to do an event. A summer time slot was also felt to be more appealing, as people are more likely to come out at night in the summer months. In addition, it was felt that a school input was needed. A student delegate felt that as a group, students were generally unaware of HCAW.

42. In the online survey almost half of the respondents had heard of it, and of those, half had attended events. Most (84%) thought it should be held every year.

Addressing hate crime

43. It was highlighted that not enough appears to be known about the criminal justice process and the victim’s journey. More feedback on successful prosecutions should be given and perpetrators named and shamed.

44. It was identified that we should be measuring the number of prosecutions as well as the number of recorded hate crimes and incidents.

45. A comment received online was: “Raise more awareness around the criminal and civil sanctions available for perpetrators of hate crime and incidents.”

46. It was suggested that the strategy should address the issue of cyber bullying, particularly peer to peer among young people.

47. More should be done to challenge online posts that promote hate, eg. Islamophobic and anti-Semitic websites.

48. Delegates felt that action should be taken against perpetrators of hate crime.

49. It was suggested that arresting people and sending them to court is not always the best course of action; however, there should be something done to show the offender their behaviour is wrong.

50. It was identified in interviews with victims of hate crime that perpetrators need to be dealt with more quickly by the criminal justice system.

51. It was felt that victims should be better informed about the process of the criminal justice process so they know what to expect and what can be achieved.

52. Victims should know more about support services that are available when reporting hate crime.
Engagement

53. The groups highlighted the need to engage with communities early in the strategy’s development. More community involvement is needed in writing the strategy rather than being agency-led. Feedback on drafts from the communities needs to be encouraged at various stages, and regard must be given to user-friendliness.

Strategy language

54. Feedback suggested that the language in the current strategy was quite negative and reactive, eg. prevent, action, incidents etc. It was felt that language in the new strategy could be more supportive, empowering and encouraging.

55. It was thought that language had been a key barrier to building awareness of hate crime in particular communities and this needed to be addressed. It was felt that thought should be given to the types of format used in literature and publicity around hate crimes and incidents. Work-placed briefings for staff on how to signpost reporting was also suggested, so that more front-line staff know about the strategy and can promote its aims.

Strategy strands

56. In all sessions and online, the existing strands were supported, ranging from 84% support online for alterophobia, to 100% support for religion or belief. Other suggested strands included age and immigrant, and it was suggested that disability should include both visible and invisible disabilities.

57. In many of the sessions and also online there were requests to identify both anti-Semitism and Islamophobia as defined strands due to the prevalence of incidents over the past few years.

Strategy objectives

58. Over 90% of people supported each of the objectives in the online consultation.

59. The objectives were also supported in the face-to-face sessions.

60. Additional objectives suggested were as follows:
   - Building cohesive and resilient communities where hate crime and discrimination are not tolerated
   - Finding where hate comes from and the causes of hate
   - Dealing with online hate crime and cyber bullying
   - Cross-cutting issues of hate crime
   - Zero tolerance of hate crime.
Next steps

61. Following the consideration of the consultation findings, the Hate Crime Strategy will be refreshed. This will be circulated in draft form, and the findings from the consultation will be a critical read for key partners and organisations across the city. Further amendments will be made in response to this, before it is submitted to the Community Safety Partnership for approval.