

<b>ITEM 4</b>			
<b>Report Name:</b>	<b>Third Party Reporting Review</b>		
<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Barnet Safer Communities Partnership Board (SCPB)</b>		
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> January 2016		
<b>Enclosures:</b>	None		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Ray Booth Safeguarding Adults Board and Chief Executive of Barnet Mencap		
<b>Outcome Required:</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"> Information Only:  Decision Required:  Feedback/comments required: <b>X</b> </td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> </tr> </table>	Information Only: Decision Required: Feedback/comments required: <b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information Only: Decision Required: Feedback/comments required: <b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Restricted</b>	No		

## 1. Introduction

The Barnet Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) has reviewed the operation of Third Party reporting sites, as part of its commitment to improve access to justice for adults at risk.

This report details the findings from the review and includes a number of recommendations. By putting these measures in place it will help the SAB achieve the following outcome:

Ensure adults at risk know how to report a crime and have confidence that they can access the criminal justice system.

This review also builds on the work of the Community Safety Team and the Safer Communities Partnership Board, which looks at Third Party Reporting in the wider context of tackling Hate Crime in Barnet.

The number of Hate Crime reports in the borough is low and most of the current Third Party sites take very few reports. There is a view that hate crime and hate crime incidents are common but these are not reflected in the data.

Hate Crime was defined by the Home Office in 2007.

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

A hate crime incident refers to a non-crime incident, based as above, on perception and personal characteristics.

Anybody can report to the police if they are a victim of crime and can indicate where hate, based on these personal characteristics, is in their view a motivating or aggravating factor.

But people often face barriers which make it difficult to report directly to the police. Third Party reporting sites provide an alternative for people.

In Barnet, Third Party Reporting sites were established from December 2010. In August 2014, the Community Safety Team found the following sites were still operating for Barnet residents:

- Sangam
- GALOP
- Homeless Action in Barnet
- The Network
- Grahame Park Housing Office
- Barnet Homes
- Barnet Multicultural Community Centre
- Barnet Mencap
- Community Security Trust

These organisations were invited to join the review group alongside the police, the Community Safety team and representatives from Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust and the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust (see appendix 1)

## **2. Why Review?**

Most of the Third Party Reporting sites took on this function five years ago. Staff at the sites received training in the new procedures but there has been limited support for the participating organisations since the launch.

The Review Group has looked at Hate Crime and reporting across all the strands but has had a specific focus on disability hate crime.

As well as exploring issues for the current Third Party sites and their reporting activity, the review group has engaged with disabled

people and voluntary organisations, looked at good practice models in London and recommended a viable model for Barnet.

In July 2014 the police reported to the SAB there had been only 1 report of disability hate crime investigated in the past year.

Hate Crimes/incidents are believed to be widespread but significantly under-reported. More reports of hate crime, including disability hate crime, are needed so that they can be investigated by the police, action can be taken against the perpetrators, to reduce the risk of similar incidents and, very importantly, there is support for the victim.

The review was intended to get a clearer picture of Hate Crime in the borough and to explore what would increase people's confidence to report Hate Crime.

In recent years there has been a lot of work in Barnet on hate crime, particularly with people with learning disabilities. There have been conferences, drama and the Mencap campaign, Stand By Me. This work has been effective in helping people to recognise hate crime and telling people what they can do about it. But it seems to have had no effect on the number of Disability Hate Crime reports.

Nationally, there have been more crime reports, which could be the result of improved reporting, a willingness of people to come forward or reflect a real increase in crime. Reported hate crime has also risen but the victims of hate crime generally are less satisfied with the police and are more affected by the crime, including a loss of confidence and feeling vulnerable.

Under-reporting is seen as a major challenge, especially for disabled people. In London, disability accounts for only 0.9% of reported hate crime. They are less likely to do this where people

are isolated, do not recognize they are a victim of crime and do not believe that anything will be done if they are a victim of crime. Boosting confidence, so that people will report hate crime, is a priority in MOPAC's strategy. The strategy recognizes that reporting needs to be easier and more accessible, including smart phones, online options and links to Third Party or non-police reporting facilities.

### **3. What did the review group find in Barnet?**

#### **Third Party Reporting Sites**

The Review Group has established a picture of how the current sites are operating. The sites had confirmed to the Community Safety Team that they were willing to continue taking Hate Crime reports. But there was little activity at most of the sites, except for GALOP and CST, both specialist sites operating across London, including Barnet.

Most sites had no publicity, promoting their role as a Third Party Reporting Site, or relied on material that was very out-of-date. Staff at the sites had not been trained, or had had no further training since 2010. Staff take very few reports and complain that when they do there is no feedback mechanism to let them know what has been done with the report.

In addition, the Third Party sites do not routinely consider signposting victims of Hate Crime, if they are an adult at risk, for additional support. Staff could refer people who wanted it to prevention services, like Mind, BCIL and Barnet Mencap.

#### **Engagement Activity**

Discussion at the Partnership Boards, the Safeguarding Adults User Group and the Learning Disability Network helped the Review Group get a fuller picture of Disability Hate Crime, and the issues people face over reporting it. At each meeting disabled people

reported experiencing harassment, anti-social behaviour, difficulties on public transport, especially around schools, as well as crimes such as fraud.

People were asked what stops them reporting Hate Crime and what would make it easier.

Some issues were common for people with learning disabilities, physical disabilities and mental health needs.

People gave the reasons why people do not report Disability Hate Crime:

- People are not aware how to make a report or where to do it
- People are afraid to make a report in case there is retaliation from the perpetrator
- People do not realise the harassment etc they experience is not acceptable and unlawful and are likely to blame themselves, and feel disempowered especially when exploited or the victim of scams.
- People do not know what constitutes a crime, and are not always clear what is a Hate Crime.

People with learning disabilities talked about the police, sometimes finding them intimidating, especially when in uniform and do not feel they will be taken seriously by the police or others. They do not feel that officer know how to deal with them and require police-awareness training.

They feel they would need support with communication when making reports, such as Makaton and picture board, and most people would want someone with them to provide support. They also felt there should be more places for people to make reports that were local and accessible, such as cafes and shops.

People at the Mental Health Partnership Board and those at the PSI Board were not sure the police were always identifying reports as Disability Hate Crimes. Some were very sceptical that anything would be done or thought the sanctions were insufficient, so saw no point in making reports. Other people said that individuals might not report Disability Hate Crimes or incidents because they did not see the bigger picture and the wider benefits of reporting.

People with mental health needs also felt that safeguarding investigations were not picking up potential Disability Hate Crimes. Abuse may well be a criminal act, meeting the criteria for a hate crime but there is a failure to make the necessary connection between abuse and a criminal offence.

People at the Boards talked about measures that would encourage them to report Disability Hate Crime:

- Ensuring staff are trained to identify hate crime
- Increase the awareness of crime
- Building more supportive communities. People report an increase in risks and stigma, in part, due to media portrayals of disabled people as “benefit scroungers”
- People who do report need support and feedback throughout the process
- Increase the number of sites in the community where people can make a report, that are safe and well-publicised

People also expressed the view that the terminology is confusing, especially ‘Third Party Reporting’ and should be replaced by something clearer, such as Hate Crime Reporting Centre.

### **Good Practice**

The Review Group has looked at good practice guidance, or practical examples across London and England where Hate Crime Reports are higher than those in Barnet.

The Community Security Trust (CST) described the way it tackles anti-Semitic Religious Hate Crime. CST is widely-known in the Jewish community and well-respected. Reporting methods are clearly promoted. People are encouraged to report first to the police, then to CST, but the organisation is a Third Party site too. CST has a victim-centred approach and benefits from strong, clear messaging and brand. Staff are trained and telephone lines are staffed during office hours. The CST has a data-sharing agreement with police forces, which allows them to cross-reference CST reports.

The CST's model has influenced Tell Mama. The Review Group has heard about the work of GALOP and from the police about MPS pilot sites in Croydon and Greenwich. Here, the police have made a presumption of Hate Crime where the victim is disabled. But this measure has not led to a significant increase in the number of recorded Hate Crimes.

True Vision is the police website focused on Hate Crime. Its guidance includes forms for reporting and safety tips but this is not widely available in local organisations. The local engagement also raised the challenges in people reporting online.

The group has approached organisations like Stop Hate Crime UK and Stay Safe East, which focuses on Disability Hate Crime and is like GALOP, funded and supported by MOPAC.

The group has discussed the benefits of generic Third Party Reporting sites, where people can report any type of Hate Crime or more specialist groups, like GALOP and CST, which is accessible to specific communities.

The Crown Prosecution Service has produced a useful briefing for front-line staff and looked at some of the lessons in Hidden in Plain



Sight and the Joint Review of Disability Hate Crime, published in May 2015.

There is an interesting example of a model in Kirklees, in West Yorkshire, which achieves a high number of Hate Crime reports by people with learning disabilities. There were 52 reported crimes last year, and 84 incidents broken down into categories of crime, with equalities data etc. One of the features of the scheme has been its easy reporting systems and the use of safe places – shops and cafes – in the area.

#### **4. What needs to be in place**

The engagement activity and the review of current policies and guidelines point to ways we can improve the reporting of Hate Crime, and in particular Disability Hate Crime, in Barnet. It shows too the need for better coordinated support for victims of Hate Crime. This will encourage more people to report it, make the reporting process easier and provide follow-up support for people who want it.

A number of things need to be in place if these improvements are to happen.

- a) Hate Crime Reporting sites. This review has looked at the operation of Third Party Reporting sites. It would be helpful at this stage, however, to redefine the terminology used. Almost all the people consulted were confused by the term Third Party Reporting. The suggestion is that Hate Crime Reporting Site is a much clearer description. True Vision use 'non-police reporting site' but it is more useful to talk explicitly about Hate Crime Reporting sites.
- b) The Community Safety Team will confirm the current Hate Crime Reporting sites that are willing to continue to function after April 2016. There should be work to identify new sites and to establish a list that is easy to manage, so that the

Community Safety Team can add/remove organisations that are active Hate Crime Reporting sites.

- c) Promotion. Very few of the people consulted knew about the Hate Crime Reporting sites. Once the sites are confirmed, there needs to be a publicity campaign, with leaflets, news articles, to make people aware of the sites and their location. The sites themselves should display posters and leaflets about their function as a place to report Hate Crime. What is also needed is clear and consistent branding.
- d) Pathways. There should also be publicity for clear pathways, so that, as well as people themselves reporting Hate Crime, professionals can signpost them to an appropriate site. People should in turn be offered additional support, if they need advice and information once they have made a report. People can be referred or signposted to appropriate voluntary or community organisations (see Appendix 2).
- e) Reporting Procedure  
There should be a simple reporting procedure, supported by revised paperwork, and a range of options for people to make a report. People should be able to make Hate Crime reports in person, directly to the police or at Hate Crime Reporting sites, or by telephone. People should have access online, via computers or smart phone apps.

Reports should include common basic features and minimum standards for the action to be taken when reports are made. Reports should be made to the police, on an individual basis where there is consent to do this, or anonymised, and utilised for the purpose of intelligence.

- f) Monitoring. Reports should be monitored as type of Hate Crime and location, distinguishing Hate Crimes and incidents.
- g) MARAC. Where there are repeat victims or significant concerns about the risks for individuals these should be included in the Community MARAC procedures. This will

provide for effective decision-making and risk management on a multi-agency basis.

h) Training

A new training programme will be needed for front-line staff who have responsibility for taking Hate Crime Reports, and for managing the process.

### **Support from the Safeguarding Adults Board and Safer Communities Partnership Board**

5. The Safeguarding Adults Board and Safer Communities Partnership Board are asked to support the recommendations in Section 4 and arrange for their implementation. The proposal is to have the above measures in place for a new Hate Crime reporting model for April 2016.

This model should reinforce the partnership-working approach outlined in MOPAC's A New Hate Crime Reduction Strategy for London.

The focus of the model is to put the victim at the centre of the process. The reporting system will support the right of disabled people and others to report Hate Crime, get the support they need to do this and throughout the criminal proceedings and to access any additional support they require.

### **Safeguarding and Hate Crime**

The Board are also asked to clarify the processes for Disability Hate Crime and safeguarding adults at risk, especially the points at which these processes link, to ensure that the support and options for people are clear and comprehensive.

### **Information-sharing**

Partners on the Boards should utilise existing models to facilitate information-sharing between organisations and extend their remit to cover the reporting of Hate Crime.

### **Budget**

The Boards will advise how to access the budget needed to set up and run an effective Hate Crime Reporting system in Barnet.

### **Implementation and Review**

The membership of the Review Group should be revised, and asked to oversee the implementation of the new model. The Group, with membership drawn from both Boards, will monitor the effectiveness of the model and review its working, until it is embedded in Barnet.

### **Awareness-raising Campaign**

The implementation of the new model should be supported by an Awareness-raising campaign. This will include further engagement work, informing people what has been agreed and seeking their views and advice about how to best ensure the implementation is effective and works for disabled people and others in the borough.

There should be a launch event to support this in April, promoted jointly by the Safeguarding Adults Board and the Safer Communities Partnership Board.

## **6. Conclusion**

The review of Hate Crime Reporting in Barnet has confirmed that there is widespread under-reporting. The engagement activities revealed that disabled people experience crime and significant levels of Hate Crime incidents that need to be recorded. By doing this, it would provide the opportunities to understand patterns and

trends and enable organisations in the borough to tackle Hate Crime more effectively.

The response by disabled people included a marked scepticism that reporting would not make any difference and so was not worth it.

In the autumn this year, Robert Buckland, the Attorney General, spoke of the need to improve “the way disability hate crime is reported, investigated and prosecuted”. He went on to say that it is only by understanding the perspectives of disabled people and listening to their needs that there can be meaningful change.

The review in Barnet highlighted the current shortcomings of the local Hate Crime Reporting system. By implementing the recommendations, and working on a multi-agency and victim-centred basis, the intention is to make this meaningful change and make a real difference for people in the borough.