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1. Introduction and Overview

In June 2016, the Northamptonshire Chief Executives’ Group endorsed in principal the Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19 (Draft) for final public consultation prior to full operational adoption.

Initially developed by Northamptonshire Police with interested parties including community and voluntary sector partners, the draft strategy was then embraced as a partnership strategy by the Northamptonshire Anti- Social Behaviour (ASB) and Hate Crime Strategic Group (NASB/HCSG).

The NASB/HCSG asked Northamptonshire County Council, through its Engagement Participation and Involvement Team (EPIT), to assist with and develop a consultation on the draft strategy, this included devising the methodology, conducting the fieldwork and analysing the feedback.

Hate reduction is an emotive topic and a very small percentage of feedback received has been considered as a hate incident. This feedback has been shared with the lead officers but ultimately redacted from this report.

This report is the analysis of the consultation results received.

Background

Northamptonshire is made up of seven District and Borough Councils, numerous Town/Parish Councils and the County Council. There are six Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) that cover these. The NASB/HCSG oversee partnership work around this draft strategy, and the NASB/HCSG strategically feeds it work into the Northamptonshire Chief Executives’ Group.

The draft strategy sets out the vision, aims and objectives of the partner agencies that are responsible for tackling hate related incidents in Northamptonshire, and identifies how agencies will work together to achieve this.
This draft strategy has been designed to:

- Direct a partnership approach to the prevention of and response to hate crime across Northamptonshire.
- Establish a method of ensuring that cases of hate crime are able to be discussed and dealt with at an operational level, in partnership with all appropriate agencies.
- Enable all partners to have a consistent and clear approach to tackling hate crime in Northamptonshire i.e. one vision, one approach.
- Provide a template from which local service delivery plans will be produced.
- Introduce standardised documents, meeting formats and a single set of service standards that victims across Northamptonshire can expect to receive.

What is a hate incident/ hate crime?

Hate incidents and crimes are motivated by hatred of a certain characteristic or perceived characteristic of the victim. Although all of the characteristics below are valid, only the first five in bold are currently officially recorded by Central Government:

- Race (Racism)
- Faith or Religion
- Sexual Orientation (Homophobia)
- Gender Identity (Transphobia)
- Disability
- Alternative Lifestyles (dress style, physical appearance, culture)
- Gender
- Age
There is a clear difference between a *hate crime* and a *hate incident* in relation to statutory powers to intervene. Collectively, the draft strategy is about the reduction in *hate crime* in Northamptonshire.

Definition of a **HATE INCIDENT** is

“All incident, which may or may not constitute a criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.” (Association of Chief Police Officers – ACPO 2007).

Definition of a **HATE CRIME** is

“All hate incident which constitutes a criminal offence, perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.” (Association of Chief Police Officers – ACPO 2007).

**How was the draft strategy formulated?**

The draft strategy was formulated from work led by Northamptonshire Police and Northamptonshire County Council.

Using evidence from the Institute for Public Safety, Crime & Justice (IPSCJ), a local joint venture between Northamptonshire Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) and University of Northampton.

In January 2016, Northamptonshire Police conducted a “community” based consultation which pulled together the key issues to be included in a strategy for hate reduction. Attended by over 50 members of the public/ organisations, information gathered was incorporated into the draft strategy. More importantly, those attending said the draft strategy, once produced, ought to be subjected to further consultation.

The revised draft strategy was then circulated to all members of the NASB/HCSG for further comments. Following this feedback, it was finally tweaked and it is that final draft strategy on which full public consultation comments/ feedback was sought. See appendix 3.
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It is worth emphasising, that Northamptonshire Police along with other statutory agencies are already charged with developing coordinated responses to hate matters and practice. The proposed consultation on the draft strategy aimed to give these agencies an opportunity to *quality assure* some current practice and to further identify gaps and improvements.

2. Consultation Methodology

The consultation sought to ascertain the views and comments from all interested parties to help influence the design and development of the final hate reduction strategy for the County.

In particular the consultation sought to quality assure the manner in which hate reduction work is carried out in the county; to identify any gaps in strategic thinking/activities; and if desired, an opportunity to join a community reference group which could help develop the future delivery/ actions plans associated with the strategy objectives.

Due to the specific nature of the consultation, the key audience identified to be consulted with comprised of the following groups:

- Residents of Northamptonshire (i.e. the public/customers).
- Statutory partners, charged with statutory duty placed upon them through Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act (1998).
- Stakeholder organisations with specific interest in hate and/ or crime reduction.
- Faith, community and voluntary sector.
- Other affected parties and stakeholders.

The following outlines the method used to generate the material/ data for analysis.

The consultation was carried out in compliance with NCC’s Consultation and Engagement Policy and Standard of Required Practice.
Identified stakeholders included: residents, local strategic partner organisations, councillors, locally operating voluntary and community organisations, interested members of the public, schools, plus others. Due to the breadth of potential stakeholders a questionnaire was devised and actively promoted by Northamptonshire Police and Northamptonshire County Council’s Hate Crime/ Anti social behaviour lead officers.

A copy of the questionnaire and details of the consultation was made available on a dedicated internet web page on NCC’s consultation register, which is where all of the Council’s consultations are published. The draft strategy was also posted on this site. www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/consultationregister

The online questionnaire was open to all.

The questionnaire was broken down into two main sections. The first section sought to gain a qualitative and quantitative understanding of respondent’s views of the strategy’s four key objectives. The second section sought to gain an understanding of gaps in the strategy and whether the respondent wished to be further engaged/ involved with on the development of future work.

The consultation was promoted to a large number of key stakeholders, including:

- Members of Northamptonshire County Council’s Consultation Register.
- Members of the county’s Residents’ Panel.
- Local community and voluntary sector organisations and faith groups.
- Schools and educational establishments.
- Healthwatch Northamptonshire.
- Northants 50+ Network and other older people reference groups.
- Carers Partnership.
- Social Housing Providers.
- County, Borough and District Councillors.
- Other interested parties.
Through stakeholder analysis, key organisations were asked to help promote the consultation amongst their members and other distribution channels.

As well as being promoted via various partners’ communication channels, this consultation was also posted and publicised via the Council’s Facebook, Twitter and other social media accounts. Respondents were given the opportunity to participate through these social media sites, although no responses were received via them.

The consultation began on 18th July 2016 and ended on 30th August 2016, giving six weeks of consultation.

3. Summary of Questionnaire Feedback

The following is a summary of the findings from the questionnaire. It is recommended this summary is read in conjunction with the full results which can be found in appendix 1. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in appendix 2.

A total of 111 people responded to the questionnaire, of which 77 respondents were individuals, with 15 respondents were from organisations. (19 respondents did not answer this question).

Responses were received from all district and borough areas of Northamptonshire, with 65% of individuals responding from the areas of Northampton, Kettering and East Northamptonshire.

All respondents were asked questions about the four key objectives of the strategy. Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the areas of activities defined within each key objective. Respondents were able to comment on their opinion.

Key Objective 1: Prevention and Early Intervention – Breaking the Cycle.

The focus of this objective was about ensuring a holistic approach to tackling hate which emphasised prevention and changing behaviour. In order to ensure that efforts
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are made to prevent hate incidents or to tackle them at an early stage, eleven areas of activities were stated for respondents to consider. There were 107 responses to this question. 4 respondents chose to skip the question.

Most respondents, nearly 90%, either strongly agreed or agreed. Just under 7% (6.6%) of respondents disagreed. Under 3% (2.8%) responded “don’t know”.

Of the 107 respondents who answered this question, 52 made comments.

From the respondents that “strongly agreed / agreed”, the majority highlighted education as a key area. This was not just in terms of children and young people through school and college but also older generations who may not be fully aware of what constitutes a hate crime. This was closely followed with respondents’ comments about community engagement and cohesion with the individuals being valued and all faiths, cultures, beliefs and lifestyles respected.

The importance of enforcing sanctions for proven hate crimes was commented on with a mix of both preventative and reactive activities to support the strategy. Many comments included the need for resources to be in place to support the activities and the need for specific details to be considered in the implementation.

Those respondents who commented with “neither agree or disagree” highlighted that some initiatives were already in place and felt that these activities should be
Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19 (Draft)- Consultation Report concluded first to avoid potential resistance to more. One comment identified that in trying to “do good” often groups within a community could be stigmatised and all sections of communities are at risk of hate crimes and incidents.

Very few comments were added from the small number of respondents who “disagree / strongly disagree” with the areas of activities. These comments were around too much appeasement to certain faith groups, along with the feeling that even though a hate crime had been reported no action was taken. One comment felt the strategy was too ambitious and costly to implement.

Of the few comments recorded as “don’t know”, respondents felt the question was “too big” to give an accurate answer and felt the setup of the survey was inadequate for commenting on each activity.

**Key Objective 2: Dealing with Perpetrators**

The focus of this objective was about dealing quickly, appropriately and effectively with all perpetrators of hate incidents to prevent further offending. In order to identify appropriate enforcement method - through effective partnership work, whilst offering suitable support to help address the causes of behaviour and to enable long term change - six areas of activities were stated for respondents to consider. There were 102 respondents to the question of which 42 made comments. 9 respondents chose to skip the question.
Most respondents, over 80% (82.3%), either strongly agreed or agreed. Just under 8% (7.8%) of respondents disagreed with this key objective, and another 7% (6.9%) neither agree or disagree. 3% (2.9%) respondents answered “don’t know”.

From the 28 comments made by respondents who strongly agree / agree with the six areas of activities - education, including perpetrators in future development of processes and funding / resource issues were topics mostly commented upon. Preventative activities including changing thoughts, working with young people and schools and colleges, and having knowledge of victims or perpetrators of hate crime were commented on as being helpful. Involving perpetrators in both the development of training material but also attending some corrective / behavioural change sessions was commented on as being positive.

The issue of resource and funding was mentioned in five responses with a concern raised that although the listed activities looked good, funding cuts and staffing issues may stop these from becoming a reality.

Respondents who commented “neither agree or disagree”, mentioned dealing with “ring leaders” and too much “political correctness”. A comment highlighted that behavioural change and not just punishment would be effective.

There were no main themes to emerge from the comments made by the few respondents who “disagreed / strongly disagreed”. These comments focused on issues within the police and local authority departments and two comments felt there were other crimes that needed time and attention.

The two comments from responses in the “don’t know” section identified that the survey design made it difficult to give specific feedback to each activity and there was no image of what the implementation would be like.
Key Objective 3: Pathways of Support for Victims and Witnesses

The focus of this key objective is about providing sufficient support to victims and witnesses whilst identifying support to tackle the causes. Ensuring that victims are considered a priority in cases of hate and those who are vulnerable or repeat victims are identified early on. In order to provide appropriate and easily accessible support and information for those who are become involved in the criminal justice system, four areas of activities were stated for respondents to consider.

95 respondents answered the question, with 38 making comments. 16 respondents skipped the question.

Over 80% of respondents (83.2%) either strongly agreed or agreed. Over 7% (7.4%) of respondents disagreed with this key objective. 7% (7.4%) neither agreed or disagreed. 2% (2.1%) respondents answered “don’t know”.

From the 27 comments made by respondents who “strongly agreed or agreed” the main themes to emerge were the importance for specific support for victims of hate crime and having documents and reporting procedures that were accessible and available in different formats. Some comments focused on the need for specialised staff to be available to understand specific issues and concerns that victims of hate crime experience particularly those with a learning difficulty. The availability of paperwork/ forms/ literature for reporting need to be person centred and accessible such as in easy read format was also commented upon. Having trusted individuals in
the community to support the reporting processes and also having agencies involved committed to working together were also themes to emerge. All ages should be included in the future planning and individual agencies taking control for their input was also mentioned.

The few respondents who commented “neither agreed nor disagreed” identified the need for a specialist team to support victims; they mentioned that paperwork and administration would cause issues for supporting officers.

The respondents who “disagree /strongly disagreed” made comments in a negative vein stating the lack of depth in the strategy and victims not being engaged with.

The very few comments that came from respondents who said “don't know” were centred on the strategy being a wish list which had no tactical consideration.

**Key Objective 4: Communication- Training, Public Awareness and Information Sharing**

The focus of this key objective is about effective partnerships at a local level with statutory and other agencies sharing information and tackling hate crime. In order to provide a seamless partnership service that provides better outcomes for those involved - whilst informing both local residents of and visitors to Northamptonshire, how hate is going to be tackled - three areas of activities were stated for respondents to consider.

93 respondents answered the question, with 39 respondents making comments. 18 respondents skipped the question.
Just under 80% (78.5%) respondents either strongly agreed or agreed. 12% (11.8%) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed and 9% (8.6%) neither agreed or disagreed. 1% did “not know”.

A total of 26 comments were from respondents who “strongly agreed / agreed” with the activities. The main theme to emerge from these comments was the importance of training. Whether this is during the training induction of new staff, or through ongoing professional development. Also mentioned was the need for training to include community leads and members, especially in training to be volunteers. Other comments identified the need for robust communication systems tailored to the individual audiences. One comment in particular mentioned the importance of schools having clear guidance and information to fully support pupils who may have had an experience of a hate crime. Comments were also received around the need for individual agencies that support hate crime victims to be fully aware of their individual responsibilities, so no one slips through the net.

Respondents who “neither agree or disagree” were varied in their comments. Different training and resource issues were mentioned along with concerns that a specialised service may be outsourced thus losing specialism.

The comments made by those respondents that “disagree/ strongly disagree” were about raising the issues of what a hate crime is and having reported cases taken seriously. Training for all was mentioned also with resource issues being a concern.
The few respondent that chose “don’t know” commented on the way in which the “things were worded” which meant that there was “no fail benchmark”.

Identifying Gaps in the Strategy

Following the key objectives and the activities associated with them, respondents were asked their opinion on whether they felt anything was missing from the draft strategy.

47% respondents said “Yes”, and 34% said “No” respondents said that nothing was missing. Just under 19% respondents said “Don’t Know”.

Of those respondents who had said in their opinion that there was something missing, they were then asked to state one key point they would like to be considered. 38 comments were expressed with the following key points emerging.

Respondents felt that it was important that all issues of hate crime were considered as important. Comments included focusing on victims and the impact of the crime on families and wider communities. Respondents commented that local intelligence should be used and that input from the local community could have on local solution be valued.

Education was highlighted across the spectrum of working with very young children right across to the wider community; with again more emphasis on prevention work.
Resources were mentioned as concerning, with multi agency work across all forms of organisations, needing to come together effectively.

Respondents also commented about the language being used on the topic. Some commented about the need for integration, whilst others referred to harmony between all. References were made to cultural differences and linking national work alongside locality work in the fostering of good community relationship. Linking to the faith community was mentioned too. Comments were made about respondents’ experience of reporting hate crime.

Respondents commented on being aware about the breath of information and resources that would be required to make the strategy work. They wanted to see how in practice the strategy would work asking for more accountability and feedback.

**Working together**

A number of organisations and partners in Northamptonshire already support and work together on hate reduction. These organisations and partners were named and respondents were asked to think about other organisations who should be working on hate reduction work in the county.

Early on during the consultation it was noticed that one organisation had been accidently omitted from the list of organisations stated on the online questionnaire. This was rectified within a couple of working days. Up to this point only one single respondent has made a comment on this omission.

---

**Looking at this list of organisations, do you think there are any organisations that should be involved but are not currently included?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCC – Engagement, Participation and Involvement Team (EPIT) v1.0
Just under 47% (46.6%) of those answering this question responded by saying “Yes”. Under 30% (29.5%) responded “No” and less than a quarter (24.9%) responded “Don’t know”.

Most respondents to this question gave details of areas of services which they felt should be included and did not name actual organisations.

By far the most frequently mentioned service area respondents felt was missing were children and young people services, these included schools and other educational services. Disability groups and service providers, especially mental health, were also frequently mentioned, as were faith groups. Other service areas were housing associations and LGBTQ groups.

Some respondents actually felt too many organisations were already involved and due to the numbers they envisaged this would have a negative impact on decision making with concerns being raised that too many partners would make the strategy weaker instead of stronger. There were also a few comments about there not being enough ‘people/resident’ representatives and there being too many professionals influencing the strategy delivery, as well as not enough voluntary sector organisations involved.

Often when a specific organisation was mentioned it was only by a single respondent. A full list of these organisations is listed in appendix 1, but examples of the breadth or organisations mentioned included: Samaritans, First for Wellbeing, Citizens Advice Witness Service, Learning Disability Partnership Board, Magistrates, NHS, Healthcare Trusts, Bridge, Mayday, a Town Council and the Joint Action Group (multi-agency community liaison, initiated by the police).

One respondent did not know who all the listed organisations were or what they all do, whilst another wanted a better understanding of the range of voluntary sector organisations supporting the strategy as they felt their support would be key in its delivery.
Clarity and Understanding

The Hate Reduction strategy is a strategy for everyone working on hate reduction in the Northamptonshire. Respondents were asked to rate whether the strategy was easy to read and understand.

Of the 90 respondents who answered this question, over 60 respondents found the strategy to be “very clear or clear”. The remainder of the responses were split between “very unclear/ unclear” or “neither unclear/ clear”.

Further Involvement

Respondents were asked whether they would like to be involved in any further work to develop the action/ delivery plans associated with the strategy. A positive response was received, with 38 respondents putting their name/organisation forward. These respondents will be contacted for further involvement.

4. Conclusion

This consultation was designed to gather feedback on a draft strategy which had evolved and been prepared from extensive stakeholder involvement in early 2016. Due to the purdah period for the Police and Crime Commissioner election (May 2016) and the European Union referendum (June 2016), public consultation commenced in July 2016 for six weeks until the end of August 2016. 111 responses were received, from both individuals and organisations, with many comments made.

The topic itself, and the general national climate following the outcome of the Referendum vote, is emotive. A very small percentage of comments received could in themselves be categorised as hate incidents. These have been removed from this report.

In conclusion, respondents found the draft strategy to be clear to read and understandable. The vast majority were in agreement with the four key objectives and their associated activities. Overall, comments common to all key objectives, centred on how to enhance hate reduction work in the county. Respondents
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Training and education for all were common themes throughout. Some suggesting that more preventative work ought to be carried out in the home, in early years as well as within schools and colleges. Others suggested that education was required with the older generation to understand integration and general resistance to investment in hate reduction work.

Communication and accessibility to information was seen as being of importance, both for reporting procedures and for general awareness. Recognising the multi-faceted dimension of hate incidents and crime, the value and need of victim involvement was also highlighted. Involving perpetrators of the hate incidents/ crime were seen as necessary in seeking solutions.

Key messages to emerge from what respondents felt was missing from the draft strategy were about the impact of the hate incidents/ crime on the victim; on the family; and on the wider community. Developing mechanisms to use local intelligence, which also includes hearing, accessing and engaging local community voice was seen to be a prerequisite; along with using national work programmes on hate crime.

In particular, respondents wanted the draft strategy to be progressed to a final strategy. They wanted feedback and responsibility attached to the various work programmes. They asked that working relationships/ partnerships between organisations were effective and accountable.

Respondents identified types of organisations that needed to work together. In particular, they identified children and young people service; disability groups and their service providers, especially mental health; faith groups; housing associations and LGBTQ groups as missing from the current partnership work on hate reduction. They mentioned the need for genuine partnership working, which they felt had to have a mix of professional and public/ community organisations.
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Although the consultation was extensively promoted through various partners and portals, the equality monitoring data shows, from those who responded, most were white and middle to late aged. A very small percent of responses were received from black and minority ethnic communities; the LGBTQ communities or from those from a different faith other than Christianity. Moving forward with the strategy development only speculation can be made as to why this is the case, but this gap will need to be addressed in the development of any action/delivery plans. Likewise, respondents were scarce from some geographical parts of the county. These too will need to be investigated further.

In essence, the responses to this draft strategy is that hate incidents and crimes are less likely to be tolerated in Northamptonshire if everyone works together to challenge it. Furthermore, the draft strategy needs to be locally led and based on local needs and its effectiveness must be evaluated and continually monitored.

5. Equalities Statistics Summary

Equalities monitoring questions were included within the questionnaire for all those that responded as individuals. Not all respondents chose to complete this section of the questionnaire.

From the available completed responses, it can be ascertained that there was a fairly balanced mix between female (58.3%) and male (37.54%) respondents, with most of the respondents aged between 50 to 74 years (63%) or aged 20 to 49 years (30.1%).

26.4% of respondents identified themselves as disabled, with physical disability and mental health being highlighted as disabilities. The most common religion identified was Christian at 47.9% with 42.5% of participants choosing 'None'.

Predominantly respondents were British 88.0%, with 6.7% of respondents identifying themselves being from “other ethnic” backgrounds, and 4% preferring not to say. 1.3% of respondents were Asian or Asian British. There were no respondents who identified themselves as Black or Black British or Mixed/Multiple Ethnic background.
Most respondents were heterosexual with under 4% saying they were “bisexual or gay man” there were no respondents who identified themselves as “gay woman/lesbian”. 12.5% of respondents answered “prefer not to say”.

Most respondents were married (62.55%) with about 21% (20.8%) saying that they were single. Under 3% were in a civil partnership. Under 3% were widow/widower. About 7% (6.9%) or respondents “prefer not to say”.

Full statistics of the responses that was captured can be found in appendix 1.
Respondents to the questionnaire were informed of the agreed vision of the draft strategy.

The agreed vision is:

“We will work in partnership to help make Northamptonshire the safest place in England by providing an excellent service to victim and witnesses of hate crime, focusing on prevention, early intervention and robust enforcement.”

Questions 1 to 4

Question 1 to 4 of the questionnaire respondents were asked to assist with determining whether the draft 4 key objectives of the draft strategy were appropriate and fit for purposes in the reduction of hate incidents in the county. Each key objective was given with a description. Underneath the description all relevant activities associated with the objective was stated. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the activities stated. Respondents were also able to provide comments on why they agreed or disagreed.

Below is a breakdown of the responses from question 1 to 4, which correspond to key objective 1 to 4.

Question 1:

Key Objective 1: Prevention and Early Intervention – Breaking the Cycle

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 11 areas of activities?

a) Pro-actively engage communities in an effort to build community cohesion across all races, faiths, disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identities and lifestyles.
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b) Provide recreational, sporting and cultural projects to enable positive engagement opportunities to encourage integration.

c) Help to identify, establish and support third party reporting/action centres to enable and encourage as many victims of hate countywide to report incidents.

d) Work with children and young people (0-19 years or up to 25 years with special educational needs), as well local universities to encourage positive attitudes and behaviour towards all members of the community.

e) Encourage, support and enable education establishments to accurately record hate incidents, whilst promoting engagement with a countywide accredited anti-bullying scheme.

f) Embed restorative practices across our schools and within services.

g) Actively promote and encourage online safety and raising awareness of the impact of cyber bullying.

h) Consolidate a clear and efficient pathway from the point of report, through the partnership risk assessment, to consider what level of early intervention is most appropriate.

i) Ensure that there are opportunities for voluntary intervention. Engaging directly with young people and adults willing to understand the impact of their behaviour can enable them to take responsibility for their actions.

j) Ensuring there is a contingency plan that will enable effective intervention in the event of a larger scale hate threat/incident in Northamptonshire.

k) Ensuring that all statutory requirements around Prevent are adhered to.
107 respondents answered the question, 4 respondents chose to skip the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 response comments were given to question please tell us why. Below are the redacted comments.

- "Low level" hate crime is in all communities and is seen as low level by the people doing it and the people on the receiving end of it
- Community engagement and education is key. Robust enforcement will help act as a deterrent if consistently used and used in all instances, no matter how small.
- I particularly agree with d, as education is the key to making children and young adults more aware of what actually constitutes a hate crime.
- Nanny state
- Prevention and community cohesion are key, but so is having the confidence to report incidents
- It needs to be a multifaceted approach to encompass all activities/areas of life e.g. education/cohesion/support/criminal justice
- Many pro-active activities already exist to encourage interaction between communities and these perhaps should be exhausted first.
- My family have suffered 6 years of DHC … XXX….have never taken it seriously and recorded it as such. Indeed … XXX….twice made my special needs son shake hands with his bullies who assaulted him but took no action … XXX… would not believe us due to the nature of our disabilities
- I feel that it is all very one sided against the indigenous population
- There is too much appeasement towards … XXX…
- All well and good, but Neighbourhood policing has been, and continues to be slashed, seriously hampering prevention work.
- There is a gap in education of people to better understand and value difference
- We have a problem now where anything said can be construed as hate...as a kid I was called gay...never affected me. Today that would be considered a hate crime - as its implying I’m gay etc.
- We need to promote tolerance and harmony within our community.
- There needs to be a huge focus on cultural awareness from ALL groups in Northamptonshire. Hate goes both sides from the local residents and the immigration residents. Integration is essential.
- The kids need to have their parents bad attitudes shaken off first
- Mix of preventative and reactive work here
- Do you mean whether I think they are each a good idea, or whether I think there are things missing from the list? How do I answer if I have an issue with one item on the list, when your question is about the list as a whole? Very poor survey design.
- Nothing actually indicates what will actually be done - this is just a strategic list of objectives. In practice what does each area look like
- Agree this would be a good way forward if it is manned properly and committed to
- It is important to have a strategy to foster good community relationships and sense of belonging and responsibility and to deal with any negative incidents.
- It represents a multi-pronged approach which engages individuals, VCS organisations, educational institutions and statutory partners.
- I totally agree having been a victim of Anti Social behaviour myself
- But do you have the resources to do all of this?
- All good objectives, I would like to know what resources will be used to accomplish these goals.
- Slightly greater emphasis on the older members of communities who are more inclined to be unaware of all of the issues involved is required.
- Difficult to disagree with the objectives. It's the detail and how they are implemented that is important.
• The strategy was well consulted upon during development and is therefore a good reflection of stakeholder expectations around this agenda
• It is very important that you work with parents of children and communities especially faith communities as the young people in school being given an alternative view often cite the adults in their life as where they get their views from and it is hard for them to think against that
• The antonym of hate is love. Without love as the ultimate goal of changing behaviour in our society all prevention will need to be based on rules with different levels of punishment for transgression, based on severity of identified recorded hate incidents. At this juncture it will be useful to remind ourselves of a definition of the outcome of having love for our fellow human being - in response to speaking about it - Love is patient and kind. Love envies no one, is never boastful, never conceited, never rude; love is never selfish, never quick to take offence. Love keeps no score of wrongs, takes no pleasure in the wrongs of others, but delights in the truth. There is nothing love cannot face; there is no limit to its faith, its hope, its endurance. Love will never come to an end.
• Working within a school setting, I feel that we have a real duty to work with young people to change and challenge attitudes.
• Sounds logical. Would there be any education in schools for prevention and stop the offending cycle in adulthood?
• I want to see a county/local communities where every individual is valued, respected regardless of their background or birth.
• Encourage working with schools to help young children and teenagers explore and understand why their behaviour upsets someone else. Encourage the ethical curriculum by setting up a partnership with the independent Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education in Northamptonshire - contact Education department for details This is missing from the document
• If services are targeted within local communities, early help and awareness raising with young children, we hope to develop a sense of community, ownership, respect for each other.
• It’s all fine I suppose but lots of words - wordy worthy but does not inspire!
• They are needed to make sure these crimes end.
Do not think it will work with all communities.

Fun and some light-hearted competitiveness 'might' stop animosity towards certain groups/types/etc. Sports of any kind, even silly games are more likely to draw a crowd than some other methods of gathering people together. Releasing some of the stresses of day-to-day life would also enable better attitudes among differing cultures/groups, etc. making it easier to integrate with other people from a different culture/group, etc. Engaging people by any means is better than allowing people to form opinions without credibility, thus taking action on those mis-informed opinions.

Must ensure that faith/religion and ethnic origin includes all not just the minority

There needs to be a clear, targeted and resourced strategy to challenge prejudicial ideas and stereotypes about different sections of the community; replace misinformation and false information about different communities with factual understanding; challenge discourses of dehumanisation, "us" and "them", and notions of cultural, racial, national or faith superiority. The prevent agenda should be clearly targeted at all section of the community. Bigotry, and the potential to do harm to others, or to be radicalised, is not confined to one section of the community and initiatives that stigmatise of any one section of our community can do immense harm however well intentioned the initiative may be.

All of these points have been forgotten about by the council and the people.

Hate crimes and bullying should not go unpunished -there should be guidelines in place to deal with any incidents by the police and other agencies.

Need access for all ages, abilities, faiths and colours

I am wholly in favour of measures taken to reduce discrimination and hate and helps improve integration.

Don't focus on the diversity just treat people the same and provide a reporting pathway and act on all reports.

Holistic assessment of the difficulties and addresses ways to tackle them

Disability hate crimes and incidents are NOT taken seriously by police, cps, schools, councils, housing associations etc.

Far too complex and ambitious which usually equals expensive. It really isn't that big a problem round here.
The concept of "hate" crimes is misleading, any crime is serious but creating a special sense of "victimhood" is not the answer.

Too many statements in one question. I haven't got time to keep reading and re-reading. One statement one answer please.

Question 2

Key Objective 2: Dealing with Perpetrators

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 6 areas of activities?

a) Develop processes to ensure that perpetrators are identified and dealt with quicker and more effectively.

b) Take a multi-agency approach to dealing with perpetrators.

c) Ensure that perpetrators of hate are involved in the development of preventative programmes for those at risk of offending where appropriate.

d) Provide opportunities for long term behavioural changes and support those who wish to change their own behaviour through local support agencies.

e) Introduce the opportunity for hate cases to be discussed at an operational level alongside anti-social behaviour.

f) Look to use national best practise in recognising vulnerability factors research working with academia.

102 respondents answered the question, 9 respondents chose to skip the question.
44 response comments were given to question please tell us why. Below are the redacted comments.

- The younger children see and hear the comments and copy with no understanding of the hurt caused
- Support and education are the best strategy in fighting hate. Including perpetrators in designing prevention strategies is a great idea.
- It's all … XXX… - high ideals from an underachieving … XXX…
- It's the only way to ensure that all are treated with respect.
- Too many cases of hate crime seem to be protracted
- Needs to be a sustainable approach that will not just dip in and out when enter Criminal Justice System
- Dealing robustly with ring leaders who promote hate across all sectors should be the priority alongside individual perpetrators.
- Too much political correctness prevents a proper balance and people feel unable to speak out
- Clarity around sentence C, it should say either “Ensure that previous perpetrators of hate are involved in the development of preventative programmes” or “Ensure that perpetrators of hate are involved in preventative programmes”.
- The elephant in the room (as always) is the lack of available funding for this vital service and the focus on detection and punishment over prevention.
- education works,
- Same as before, poor survey design makes it impossible to give a
meaningful answer - however, I will say that identifying perpetrators must not be through hearsay and accusation and that there must be some evidence and legal process.

- Yet again this offers no image of what will actually be done beyond action plans and strategy meetings
- Once again will only work if all agencies are signed up to it
- If merging hate review meeting with ASB - it is important that the hate crimes are looked at with the victim at the centre, rather than the offender (which is the case with ASB I believe?)
- It recognises that perpetrators are part of a complex social system, and includes them in behaviour change and programme development. It's not simply a punishment approach.
- No comment
- "...perpetrators of hate are involved in the development of preventative programmes..." really? Shouldn't they be forced to complete the "finished" preventative programmes?
- Early intervention is often made more effective by early identification of which party (ies) will be responsible for ensuring that appropriate action is taken. (JAG, senior officers etc).
- All good on paper, but difficult to see how some could work, and is there the political will to divert funds to this area.
- An effective strategy must focus on offenders as well as victims (and locations)
- Changing how individuals think is important - enabling empathy - not sure you can change everyone's thoughts - deeply embedded in their religion for instance but it is the not acting upon them - acceptance is the ideal, tolerance is better than nothing. The 2010 Equality Act as a law of the land not just an opinion
- Prevention is better than cure' is an old saying. When one refers to a 'multi-agency' approach let us not forget that families are the 'first agency'.
- Within school we are often not aware where our students have engaged in anti-social behaviour or hate crime outside the school setting. Knowledge of this would help us to build a more holistic picture of the young person, and
put in place intervention.

- re "e" in my view this needs to be strengthened.
  Post Brixton riots in the early 1980s police operationally were required to report racist incidents/hate crime and anti social behaviour directed towards ethnic minority groups/individuals, and in that order of priority. From recollection they might have been referred to as community tension indicators.
  Locally multi agency groups met to discuss those reports and agree strategy and action to deal with them- and to hold each other to account.
  Add that sort of action and I would "strongly agree"

- see previous commenter preventing incidents

- People have to be made aware of the choices they make in life, will have consequences, and therefore unless restorative practices aren't embedded into challenging behaviours, young people will never learn.

- Ok but still too wordy and worthy, does not inspire confidence in simple direct clear actions

- perpetrators must be brought to book

- There are a lot more crimes that need to be dealt with quicker and more effectively than this issue!

- Yes, this would appear to be going down the right route, so instead of locking-up a criminal for this type of behaviour, they could be encouraged to see their own errors. I would imagine it could be quite frightening for the person who is ill-equipped to handle the British ways of life, our environment, culture and indeed 'odd' ways, if they cannot communicate their own choices to us. It could make a criminal out of someone who would not normally think that way. So, if educating people on their mistakes and helping them to integrate adequately within our society helps, it can't be a bad thing. The people acting on their own bad attitudes or behaviours learned, might be doing that as a reaction, and could have illness which causes it. Considering people, without good English skills and language, they may be in need of medical attention but be unable to source it alone. Regarding the situation where language is not the problem, and for the travelling community, etc., it would be better to provide suitable ground for their short-stay, XXX .... Offering opportunities to people for integration,
education and leisure could be seen as a positive step by the Travelling community..... XXX....

- But.....The structures for challenging perpetrators on a multi-agency basis must be properly resourced. Multi-agency working is not an excuse for each component agency to ensure they deal with incidents within their specific competencies.

- How can this work if the Police are continually reduced? Part-time Police officers cannot spend the time, has the council got the staff to police this? No!

- Yes - perpetrators should attend some sort of courses to identify their behaviour and its impact on others.

- It is better to involve relevant individuals and educate rather than alienate

- Stop hate before it escalates.

- Academia may not be best placed and may focus on their own needs e.g getting that PhD

- Police and others need to do this a lot quicker before hate crimes escalate

- See Key objective 1.

- If then age of the perpetrator is below 18/21, consider educational remedies.

---

**Question 3**

**Key Objective 3: Pathways of Support for Victims and Witnesses**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 4 areas of activities?

a) Provide a customer focused responsive service that has a robust approach to assessing the support needs of victims and addressing any safeguarding issues.

b) Work to a set of common service standards, produced and agreed by the partnership strategic group. These will provide guidance to all partners
Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19 (Draft)- Consultation Report across Northamptonshire to ensure a more consistent and transparent service for victims and witnesses.

c) Increase reporting by helping to identify, establish and support third party reporting venues, as well as promoting Keep Safe sites across the county.

d) Reflect the community’s needs in our service delivery by recording and analysing feedback through satisfaction surveys and other research methods.

95 respondents answered the question, 16 respondents chose to skip the question.

| Strongly agree | 34 |
| Agree          | 45 |
| Neither agree or disagree | 7 |
| Disagree       | 4  |
| Strongly disagree | 3 |
| Don't know     | 2  |

38 response comments were given to question please tell us why. Below are the redacted comments.

- Trusted people in the Community to be first person people can approach to report but not necessarily escalate what is happening then encouraged to report to relevant authorities.
- Words words words - how can you still peddle the ridiculous claim made by …XXX…to make Northants the safest place in UK?
- It's the only what to ensure that all are treated with respect.
- Victims will not report unless they have confidence in systems and organisations.
- Need to ensure all partner agencies are involved and clear understanding of roles within CJS to provide a dovetail of support for V/W's, putting V/W's at the heart of the process.
• How much red tape and administration will this entail i.e. For front line police officers.
• Victims are not supported enough.
• Get real and sort out real crime.
• Section a .. REMOVE THE WORD CUSTOMER replace with person...when using this service we are not customers we are people or victims of a hate crime...we could even be perpetrators of the hate crime - customer implies im paying for the service.
• Re d) - feedback - please try to ensure that monitoring questions are asked (optional of course) but it will help a more meaningful analysis of hate crime victims and also how they can be supported to get the outcomes that they would like.
• I just worry we don’t have the budget.
• Just sounds like a lot of buzz words with no substance behind them.
• as previous two answers - this is strategic level wish listing with no tactical consideration.
• I hope you make sure all reporting documents are also in easy read, as well as offered in different languages. Or a format that all can access including blind people.
• Is there going to be any commitment from … XXX… to ensure that there is specialist support for victims of hate crime? Their needs can be quite specific and although there is clear agreement for better partnership working there still appears to be a lack of dedicated staff and training to support victims of hate crime and understand their specific issues and concerns.
• The treatment of victims of hate crime needs to be consistent and of a high standard.
• I agree as I feel the victims of such incidents occurring need all the help and support they can get.
• I think to the only way to provide appropriate support to victims would be to establish a well-resourced team with specialist knowledge. This was lost with the abolition of the HCU in the Police and may now take years to restore a similar response. I therefore am sceptical that this will be established under the current plans.
• There is also a need for reporting procedures to be as simple and accessible as possible.
• Customer surveys are skewed towards community minded people like myself, and do not get the views of the silent majority.
• A partnership approach must have victims at its heart.
• Safety through anonymity in some cases.
• For society to take up ownership of the Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19 it must be seen to be working.
• I feel that often … XXX… is difficult to engage with, and access.
• Plus - ensure that agencies are held accountable for their response- how is that to be ensured?
• People need to feel confident that reporting a hate incident will have a positive effect.
• good for adults but don't forget children and teens - include families.
• Communities have to be engaged to develop strong communities, who will utilise local providers, to support the overall strategy.
• Very often the Victims of crime experience their nightmares repeatedly, whether or not the crime was repeated. But, all too often and with our prisons fit to burst from criminals, the crime goes unpunished by lack of beds within a prison, and not because the crime doesn't warrant reprimand & custodial sentences. Therefore, to the Victim it is more unfair than ever. The criminal is free to continue their crimes, while the Victim suffers their own personal prison sentence, which lasts a life-time very often. Allowing the Victims some ‘say’ in what should happen to the criminal may lighten the load, if its followed-up with the criminal. More support is needed for Victims of crime, and offering surveys through … XXX … could be an answer to solving problems with criminals’ punishments. The Victim could then see the punishment being met, if the Police are given the powers to put the criminal to work in the community, without release, and within the structure of length of time, type of work, etc. that the criminal must fulfil. Example; Mr. A. is burgled. Mr. B. is the criminal. Mr. A. completes a survey to offer resolutions to the problem he faces since the burglary. He could expect the Burglar to work by collecting litter every day for a year, from the streets and roads. A nominated person will escort Mr. B. in his
duties for that time, and only be kept locked-up at nights. During that year, the prisoner should be given opportunity to rectify his criminal behaviour not only by litter collections but by the additional expectations of Mr. A. The Survey would contain a list of these and the Victim can tick the box most appropriate to how he feels would rectify the matter, maybe attend AA meetings, if that is behind the crime, etc. A chance for improvement of the self, but chosen by the Victim.

- But ... see reply to Objective 2.
- Victims need to be supported throughout this traumatic experience and protected and to feel that they are not alone and vulnerable.
- Help needs to be focussed on the vulnerable.
- Customer focused should read person centred approach.
- Disabled people need to be believed by police and not disregarded as a pain in the backside.
- More buzzwords! Will it make a difference? Probably not but as long as there's a "wide ranging cohesive strategy" it looks we're doing something.
- As before.

Question 4

Key Objective 4: Communication - Training, Public Awareness and Information Sharing

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 3 areas of activities?

a) Ensure that relevant staff receive appropriate and quality training.

b) Raise public awareness of the impact of hate, whilst informing our communities of how to deal with and report it.

c) Ensure that we have sufficient information sharing in place to identify repeat and vulnerable victims and to ensure that data can be routinely analysed and evaluated to inform resource allocation and interventions.
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93 respondents answered the question, 18 respondents chose to skip the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 response comments were given to question please tell us why. Below are the redacted comments.

- To move forward as one community not separate people living in the same area.
- Mealy mouthed words.
- Equality.
- Victims do not always recognise behaviours as hate crime so it is important to raise awareness but also reporting agencies need to recognise a hate crime situation even when it is not apparent to the victim.
- Have to work within individual organisations DSA to ensure this process is supported otherwise information may be missed or not shared.
- How much training is involved for relevant staff? Will this impact operationally on their front line roles or personal time.
- Repeating myself again.....police don't take DHC seriously.
- People too scared to speak out in case they are wrongly labelled.
- I worry that this service will be soon outsourced as a public service as NCC is committed to selling off every service it creates, and that's when the service quality fails - which is constantly happening with lots of outsourced services.
• Focus on positives of difference rather than the negative of hate crime impact. More likely to influence with a positive education agenda.

• especially c) - important to understand how to prevent repeat victimisation and also to protect particularly vulnerable people.

• this is a list of things worded so that no matter what is actually done there is no fail benchmark.

• You need to make sure that the training is in induction programme of new staff, as staff seem to turn around quickly in lots of places.

• Training needs to be ongoing and updated regularly, so staff retain the information. Communication needs to be tailored depending upon the intended audience - general public, perpetrators, communities who are targets of hate crime.

• Staff are often blamed when things go wrong - strategies to follow and the financial resources to support this is important.

• For victims to receive a high quality and appropriate service it is essential that staff are trained. Public awareness needs to be raised and communities educated about how to report hate crime and the importance of doing so.

• No comment.

• You have said what but not how? Again where will the resources required come from?

• This will only be effective if it driven by the appropriate services, with dedicated staff who truly understand the impact of hate crime. I hope that the strategy put in place has the drive from within the statutory agencies as I feel this has been lost over the past 2 to 3 years.

• Although there appears to be some cross-over with the earlier three objectives.

• I agree, but the racism genie is out of the bottle, XXX…. There is also a drip drip feed in the media against older people, and this could get worse if there is a new recession.

• Effective partnership working requires appropriate and swift information sharing
How are you going to raise awareness? That is key.

While the state can help bind society together it can only do so having effective linked relationships at all levels.

As stated previously, knowledge of where our young people have been perpetrators and victims would allow us to identify support for them.

Please include raise awareness to sentencing to add to deterrence.

But re "c" who or which lead person/agency ensures all agencies are accessing/aware of the information highlighting repeat/vulnerable victims. Otherwise everyone might make the dangerous assumption that all are doing what they say they should?

work with the Inter Faith groups in Wellingborough and Northampton.

Require experienced knowledgeable people who can challenge anti oppressive practice.

Providing suitable funds are available.

(a) and (b) seem to be a waste of money and resources. Consider (c) to be a good idea.

I believe that Staff should always be trained fully, for whatever they may be dealing with, so preparation can be used by the Staff prior to shift. Leaflets dropped through letterboxes, placed in shops etc. could raise the awareness of ways to support Victims of crime, which could include other crimes, too. Access to personal information should be allowed only for the purposes of dealing with certain issues/crimes, to support vulnerable persons who become Victims of crime. Monitoring the environment of vulnerable persons could deter criminal activity. Regular input by Officers within the community close-by, could add confidence to the vulnerable persons ability to cope with crimes, if needed. In turn this would enable the vulnerable victim of crime to feel stronger and more in control of their emotional state.

Training should also be offered to volunteers in the community, particularly in
those communities that find it harder to deal directly with the police, with anyone outside of their own community. Also I would hope that engagement activities could be devised to encourage better integration with the wider community - because that underlies a lot of the attitudes this strategy is seeking to address. Unless this is recognised and tackled, none of these excellent intentions will have any lasting effect and hate will continue.

- Practices must be put in place to deal with guidelines in a professional manner.
- It is important that staff are trained to cope with potential situations.
- Should be joint training with statutory, non-statutory AND members of the public. Individuals are the experts in their own lives and should not be excluded from training with so called professionals getting priority for this. I am concerned about where the finance will come from to finance this "quality training".
- Sounds good on paper but will it make a clear difference to disabled people’s lives?
- "To ensure that data can be routinely analysed and evaluated to inform resource allocation and interventions" - right, so we’re not actually going to do very much but we’ll have the data! Just provide practical, measurable, deliverable targets and get on with it.

**Question 5**
In Question 5 respondents were asked their opinion on whether there was anything missing from the draft strategy.

91 responses were made, of which below is the breakdown

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another 20 respondents skipped this question.
Question 5a

This question asked those respondents who answered “Yes” to question 5, what one key point would they like to be included.

38 comments were provided. Below are the redacted comments.

- Please listen to residents and prioritise all fairly.
- An instant destruct button, what a waste of public money by pen pushers.
- More victim focus and those affected by hate crime as may be families / friends and impact within community groups.
- Particularly around how the strategy will impact on front line staff from various agencies, the time they spend on administrative issues around hate crime and the time investigating perceived ‘incidents’, particularly by front line police. This strategy does not seem to mention ‘purveyors or preachers’ of hate or facilities involved in the spread of hate and how this will be tackled, it only mentions ‘perpetrators’ which seems more focused on individuals. Surely this national priority should be reflected in Northamptonshire especially.
- Publish regular reviews and updates, including resource allocation
- Local people need to be included in discussions not just officials etc Find out what is really going on in the local communities by those that live there.
- The right to life is needed in the county and to do such requires both Northamptonshire Police and its County Neighbours to look to Faith for guidance regarding such …. XXX…..
- Northamptonshire Police should strive to recruit more PCSOs from diverse ethnic and social groups. This will enable police to get closer to the community it serves.
- The right of freedom of expression and freedom of religion as in the right to share your religion in a non-violent way (for example street preachers) should be taken into consideration.
- Again. This starts at a very young age where parents are bringing children up in a racist way. The kids need to be targeted first.
- This is just management speak so generalised that it is always going to
"succeed" rather than real strategies that will hold people to account.

- How you are going to follow through with reports, and what type of support you are going to give vulnerable victims. This may be in your back up paperwork.
- Maybe delivering a workshop or something similar in schools on hate related matters to make the young people more aware.
- Possibly being developed elsewhere, but this needs to be tied into a community cohesion plan/strategy to look at engagement with the communities that may be experiencing hate crime and are isolated as a consequence.
- Gender should be one of the categories.
- Not so much something missing, just that VCS organisations with expertise and local knowledge should be included in the training of staff.
- Where will funding and resources come from?
- To provide a specialist response to Hate Crime. It appears to me that although SPOCs will exist, years of experience (personally since 1995) have proven that it is only by having dedicated staff committed to Hate Crime that an impact will be made on tackling it. If this is not included I doubt that there will be the drive to implement the strategy.
- As mentioned above, greater emphasis on education of adults rather than 'raising awareness'.
- I think that education is the key. Start at nursery level. Nothing formal or overt, just the right attitudes and language. This will be a long term strategy.
- I am surprised by casual racism. Strangers, who, because I am white and middle aged, assume that I am going to agree with their racist attitudes. You have a hard task.
- Education starts at home with parents, then reinforced at school.
- At the beginning of this survey I chose to detail the antonym of hate. Also at the beginning of this survey the introduction talked of Northamptonshire aspiring to be the best! My sense is that the word 'LOVE' may justify our aim.
- More information on how the police can work with schools to improve information sharing, support for victims and awareness would be useful. Also, schools do not currently have access to ecins. Is this something which may be made available?
- Education in schools and sentencing awareness to increase deterrence.
Role of ethical curriculum in schools - see first comment for contact - review of curriculum due this year - by statute.

Appropriate funding.

Nominated Representatives from All groups/cultures/countries/faiths/disabilities, to be gathered together to form a Council. To make good their own group, from the knowledge of other groups, through meetings arranged by Police or NCC, where their voices can be heard and expressed as a way to solve problems within the community.

In serious and/or persistent incidents perpetrators of hate should be automatically excluded from the institutions and areas in which victims live and work. The seriousness of the incident should take into account the harm felt by the victim as well the actions of the perpetrator.

The Hate Crime Strategy should be merged with the Prevent Strategy. Those that hate or show strong prejudicial, bigoted, attitudes and behaviour that dehumanise others are on a path to potential radicalisation.

Encouraging integration of isolated and fearful communities into the wider community.

Offering "training" is only the beginning. Good supervision is also vital - as in giving workers & volunteers the opportunity to discuss incidents that arise, their reaction to them, and whether they could manage them differently - in a calm & supportive atmosphere.

In my experience training in a theoretical, and often simplified way is only the beginning of tackling difficult issues. Many (indeed most) incidents are more difficult to assess & awkward to respond to than training can easily deal with! Workers & volunteers learn by being able to discuss these in a supportive learning environment.

Cannot think of anything, but there are always tweaks that can be made!

Funding for all this preventative work.

A far quicker response to disability hate crime and action taken quickly against offenders rather than being told it is "low level ASB"

No definition of key success criteria linked to clear quantifiable targets with a clear responsible name against each. You don't even define "what good looks like", it's just airy fairy "strategy" with no defined deliverables at all. No
measures of success.

- Too much to answer, needs to be easier to read.

**Question 6**

A list of partner and organisations who were working together and supporting the strategy were stated.

Respondents were asked to state any organisations that were not named but should be included.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another 20 respondents skipped this question.

47 respondents named the following partners/organisations. Below is the information, redacted, which was received.

- Action for Children
- It is wise to set up a working party of core people otherwise the strength is lost
- Plain English Campaign, CAMRA, Tax Payers Alliance, Private Eye....
- Schools especially primary. Effective change happens quickest and has more lifelong impact the younger we begin to educate.
- Education, including Uni.
- SACRE (religious education in schools).
- Housing associations?
- Citizens Advice Witness Service .... XXX....
- Not organisations but victims of DHC should be invited to tell the REAL story of how DHC affects them and is compounded by these organisations above not
taking it seriously and ignoring and disbelieving them.

- The ordinary people too many official types here. Need people from Residents Associations and on the street surveys.
- CYP Voice
- Schools
- CAFCASS
- The Open Air Mission and different faith groups.
- mayday, Bridge, Samaritans, religious groups of all sects.
- Schools
- Marketing
- Gay and lesbian group
- Transgender group
- First for Wellbeing?
- And the problem is that there are too many people around the table to make effective decisions.
- As you are aiming up to 24 year old should the schools and colleges be represented in a direct way.
- The University of Northampton
- NHS
- MIND
- Race equality councils? Organisations that support refugees. Representatives of different Faith groups.
- It would be useful to understand the range of Voluntary and Community Sector organisations supporting the strategy - these organisations are key to effective delivery.
- Lowdown
- Northamptonshire LGBTQ Partnership
- Schools and Religious Organisations
- St Andrews or other Mental Health Organisation
- Disability organisations
- Any disabled organisations in Northamptonshire
• There appears an imbalance between the state agencies and named voluntary and community bodies. Does this mean none have signed up to this Strategy? I sincerely hope not as this would mean the whole strategy will be imposed rather than owned by my neighbours and my family.

• Schools. Education starts young.

• Is the Interfaith Forum or Churches Together part of the Voluntary Sector involvement?

• Educational establishments - schools, colleges, academies, university, free schools, Supplementary Schools partnership, Saturday schools, Sunday schools. Are all missing.

• Northampton LBGT group

• Don't know what several of these are about.

• The Samaritans or MIND.

• Why is Northamptonshire Rights and Equality Council excluded from this list? Are they not a key and leading player in helping to deliver this strategy? I am very disappointed that they are not explicitly recognised.

• Church groups

• Oundle Town Council

• Joint Action Group (multi-agency and community liaison, initiated by the police)

• Healthcare Trusts in the county.

• Education facilities. Education before becoming a problem is the key to solving the issue.

• There are already a lot of organisations involved. Experience says that this can mean conflict of information, and communication issues.

• University of Northampton

• CPS, SCHOOLS/EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS, HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS, LIAISON AND DIVERSION MENTAL HEALTH TEAM.

• Good grief, just how many does it need? How can that many organisations possibly reach a consensus? You may as well include the local birdwatchers group to avoid discriminating against them.

• Samaritans and Women’s Refuge unless these are included in Voluntary and Community Sector.

• There does not appear to be an representation from any Mental Health workers
Voluntary and religious groups such as the Salvation Army, not just the array of highly paid so-called "professionals above. Much of this type of thing would have been called "bad manners" years ago.

- Samaritans
- Local magistrates
- Education not under council control.

**Question 7**

Question 7 asked respondents to rate how the clear the strategy is to read and understand.

90 respondents answered this question with 21 respondents skipping the question. The rating was measured on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 was very unclear and 5 Very clear. An option of don’t know was also provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Very Unclear</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Unclear</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Neither Unclear or Clear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Clear</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Very Clear</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 8**

Question 8 asked respondents in which capacity they were completing the consultation questionnaire. 92 respondents answered this question with 77 saying they were individuals and 15 respondents identifying themselves as organisation. 19 respondents skipped this question.

Depending on how respondents identified themselves, either as individuals or organisation, they were redirected to either questions about themselves or asked to provide information about the organisation.
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If the respondent identified themselves as an organisation they were then asked to state the organisation’s name. 10 respondent named organisation as below:

- Woodnewton A Learning Community.
- Citizens Advice Witness Service.
- Roman Catholic.
- Northampton Inter Faith Forum.
- Northants British Poio Fellowship.
- Member of the Church of England.
- Sponne School.
- Nene CCG.
- Northampton Womens Aid.
- Northamptonshire Learning Disability Partnership Board &
  Northamptonshire/Community Housing & Support Network &
  Northamptonshire/ Local Partnership Group & East Midlands National Forum &
  Northamptonshire Local/Mencap Committee Group & Next Steps.

Those respondents who identified themselves as individual were later on in the questionnaire automatically redirected to the equality monitoring questions. The data to this can be found in the section called “demographic questions.

**Question 9 - Helping to develop action / delivery plans**

All respondents were asked whether they would like to help in the developing the actions/ delivery plans associated with the strategy.

A total of 29 respondents supplied their contact information.

**Demographic Questions**

Respondents were asked them about which part of the county they lived in.

Individual respondents identified themselves as coming from the following district/ borough areas of Northamptonshire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The “other” response specified “rural community.

Furthermore, respondents who identified themselves as individuals in response to Question 8, they were at the end of the questionnaire directed to the equality monitoring questions.

2) What gender are you?
There were 72 responses to this question. 37.5 % answered Male, 58.3% answered Female, and 4.2% answered Prefer not to say.

3) Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?

There were 69 responses to this question. 2.9% answered Yes, 88.4% answered No, and 8.7% answered Prefer not to say.

4) How old are you?

There were 73 responses to this question. 0.0% answered 0 to 9, 0.0% answered 10 to 19, 4.1% answered 20 to 29, 26.0% answered 30 to 49, 45.2% answered 50 to 64, 17.8% answered 65 to 74, 2.7% answered 75+, and 4.1% answered Prefer not to say.
5) Do you have a disability?

There were 72 responses to this question. 26.4% answered Yes, 70.8% answered No, and 2.8% answered Prefer not to say.

5a) If Yes, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?

There were 20 responses to this question. 9 answered Mental Health, 6 answered Physical Disability, 1 answered Hearing Impairment, 2 answered Learning Disability, 0 answered Sight Impairment, and 2 answered Other.
6) What is your religion or belief?

There were 73 responses to this question. 42.5% answered None, 47.9% answered Christian, 0.0% answered Hindu, 0.0% answered Jewish, 2.7% answered Muslim, 0.0% answered Sikh, 0.0% answered Buddhist, and 6.8% answered Prefer not to say.

Other responses:
- What has it to do with you?
- "No" is not appropriate. I have a belief it's just not listed. I am a Humanist.

7) How would you describe your ethnic origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Group</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There were 70 responses to this question. 88.0% White Background 1.3% answered Asian or Asian British, 0.0% answered Black or Black British, 0.0% answered Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background, 6.7% answered Other Ethnic Group, 4.0% answered Prefer not to say.

Other responses:
- Anglo Scottish White
- I am not a number
- Anglo Scottish
- British
- White/British

8) If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

There were 72 responses to this question. 2.8% answered Bisexual, 2.8% answered Gay Man, 0.0% answered Gay Woman / Lesbian, 81.9% answered Heterosexual, and 12.5% answered Prefer not to say.

9) Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?
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There were 72 responses to this question. 94.4% answered Yes, 0.0% answered No, and 5.6% answered Prefer not to say.

10) What would you describe your marital status as?

![Marital Status Chart]

There were 72 responses to this question. 62.5% answered Married, 20.8% answered Single, 2.8% answered Civil Partnership, 2.8% answered widow/widower, 4.2% answered Other, and 6.9% answered Prefer not to say.
What is this consultation about?
Northamptonshire County Council, on behalf of Northamptonshire Anti-social Behaviour and Hate Crime Strategic Group would like your views on their proposed draft Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19.

Developed initially by Northamptonshire Police, through engagement with a range of stakeholders, including community groups, the draft strategy has now been embraced as a partnership strategy document. It has further been endorsed by the Northamptonshire Chief Executives’ Group for consultation. It sets out the joint vision, aims and objectives of key partner agencies that are responsible for tackling hate related incidents in Northamptonshire.

The agreed vision is:
“We will work in partnership to help make Northamptonshire the safest place in England by providing an excellent service to victim and witnesses of hate crime, focusing on prevention, early intervention and robust enforcement.”

The aim of this consultation is to assist the partners to determine whether the draft key objectives – which place a significant focus on preventative work - are appropriate and fit for purpose in the reduction of hate incidents in the county.

These objectives are:
- Prevention and Early Intervention – Breaking the Cycle.
- Dealing with Perpetrators.
- Pathways of Support for Victims and Witnesses.
- Communication: Training, Public Awareness and Information Sharing.

Local delivery plans will be produced based on the final strategy.

What is a hate incident and/or crime?
Hate incidents and crime are motivated by the hatred of a certain characteristic or perceived characteristics. The following five characteristics are officially recorded as hate incident and or crimes by central government.
All hate crimes are hate incidents but not all hate incidents are hate crimes. If no crime has been committed but someone has been treated unfairly, verbally abused or just been made to feel ashamed by someone because of these characteristics this is a hate incident. Examples are provided in the draft strategy.

For more information on hate crime and or incidents please see Hate crime and hate incidents webpage and for a link to the draft strategy, please see Draft Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-19 (PDF format 518KB).

How can you give us your feedback?
Please could you take about 10-15 minutes to tell us your views by completing this questionnaire? Your feedback will be used to help us gain a better understanding of issues that matter to you and will help us shape the future of hate reduction work in Northamptonshire.

Your feedback will be part of a report with many other people’s feedback, so you will not be personally identified.

You do not have to answer all of the questions. If you don’t want to answer a question, or don’t know the answer, then please move on to the next question. We would be grateful if you could complete and return this survey by 5pm on 30th August 2016 to:

Engagement, Participation and Involvement Team  
Integrated Wellbeing Services  
Public Health and Wellbeing  
Northamptonshire County Council  
County Hall, PO Box 177

If you have any queries or would like a copy of this questionnaire in another format please contact us either by email EPIT@northamptonshire.gov.uk or telephone 01604 367611.

Thank you for helping us by completing this questionnaire.
Key Objective 1: Prevention and Early Intervention – Breaking the Cycle

Our focus is ensuring a holistic approach to tackling hate which emphasises prevention and changing behaviour. We want to make sure our efforts are on preventing hate incidents or tackling them at an early stage. We will:

a) Pro-actively engage communities in an effort to build community cohesion across all races, faiths, disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identities and lifestyles.

b) Provide recreational, sporting and cultural projects to enable positive engagement opportunities to encourage integration.

c) Help to identify, establish and support third party reporting/action centres to enable and encourage as many victims of hate countywide to report incidents.

d) Work with children and young people (0-19 years or up to 25 years with special educational needs), as well local universities to encourage positive attitudes and behaviour towards all members of the community.

e) Encourage, support and enable education establishments to accurately record hate incidents, whilst promoting engagement with a countywide accredited anti-bullying scheme.

f) Embed restorative practices across our schools and within services.

g) Actively promote and encourage online safety and raising awareness of the impact of cyber bullying.

h) Consolidate a clear and efficient pathway from the point of report, through the partnership risk assessment, to consider what level of early intervention is most appropriate.

i) Ensure that there are opportunities for voluntary intervention. Engaging directly with young people and adults willing to understand the impact of their behaviour can enable them to take responsibility for their actions.

j) Ensuring there is a contingency plan that will enable effective intervention in the event of a larger scale hate threat/incident in Northamptonshire.

k) Ensuring that all statutory requirements around Prevent are adhered to.

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 11 areas of activities

Please tick (√) relevant answer

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know

Please tell us why:
Key Objective 2: Dealing with Perpetrators
Our focus is dealing quickly, appropriately and effectively with all perpetrators of hate incidents to prevent further offending. We want to identify appropriate enforcement methods through effective partnership work, whilst offering suitable support to help address the causes of behaviour and enabling long term change. We will:

a) Develop processes to ensure that perpetrators are identified and dealt with quicker and more effectively.
b) Take a multi-agency approach to dealing with perpetrators.
c) Ensure that perpetrators of hate are involved in the development of preventative programmes for those at risk of offending where appropriate.
d) Provide opportunities for long term behavioural changes and support those who wish to change their own behaviour through local support agencies.
e) Introduce the opportunity for hate cases to be discussed at an operational level alongside anti-social behaviour.
f) Look to use national best practise in recognising vulnerability factors research working with academia.

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 6 areas of activities?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please tell us why:
Key Objective 3: Pathways of Support for Victims and Witnesses

Our focus is providing appropriate and sufficient support to victims and witnesses whilst identifying support to tackle the causes. We want to ensure that victims are considered a priority in cases of hate and those who are vulnerable or repeat victims are identified early on. We need to provide appropriate and easily accessible support and information for those who become involved in the criminal justice system. We will:

a) Provide a customer focused responsive service that has a robust approach to assessing the support needs of victims and addressing any safeguarding issues.

b) Work to a set of common service standards, produced and agreed by the partnership strategic group. These will provide guidance to all partners across Northamptonshire to ensure a more consistent and transparent service for victims and witnesses.

c) Increase reporting by helping to identify, establish and support third party reporting venues, as well as promoting Keep Safe sites across the county.

d) Reflect the community’s needs in our service delivery by recording and analysing feedback through satisfaction surveys and other research methods.

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 4 areas of activities?

Please tick (✓) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please tell us why:
Key Objective 4: Communication - Training, Public Awareness and Information Sharing

Our focus is having effective partnerships at local level with statutory and other agencies on the sharing of information and tackling hate. We want to provide a seamless partnership service that provides better outcomes for those involved, whilst informing both local residents of and visitors to Northamptonshire, how hate is going to be tackled. We have identified the following areas of activities. We will:

a) Ensure that relevant staff receive appropriate and quality training.
b) Raise public awareness of the impact of hate, whilst informing our communities of how to deal with and report it.
c) Ensure that we have sufficient information sharing in place to identify repeat and vulnerable victims and to ensure that data can be routinely analysed and evaluated to inform resource allocation and interventions.

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these 3 areas of activities

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please tell us why:
5. In your opinion is there anything missing from the draft Northamptonshire Hate Reduction Strategy 2016-2019?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

Yes [ ]
No [ ]
Don’t know [ ]

5a. If you answered ‘Yes’ above, and if we could include one key point what would you like to see included?

[ ]
Organisations working together and supporting this strategy are:

- BeNCH Community Rehabilitation Company
- Borough Council of Wellingborough (BCW)
- Corby Borough Council (CBC)
- Corby Clinical Commissioning Group
- Daventry District Council (DDC)
- East Northamptonshire Council (ENC)
- Kettering Borough Council (KBC)
- National Probation Service (NPS)
- Nene Clinical Commissioning Group
- Northampton Borough Council (NBC)
- Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)
- Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Northamptonshire Police
- Northamptonshire Rights and Equality Council (NREC)
- Northamptonshire Youth Offending Service (NYOS)
- Office of Northamptonshire Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC)
- South Northamptonshire Council (SNC)
- Voice
- Voluntary and Community Sector

6. Looking at this list of organisations, do you think there are any organisations that should be involved but are not currently included?
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This draft strategy is for everyone working on hate reduction and we want to make sure that everyone can understand it. It is important that the language and wording used is clear and easy to follow.

7. Can you help us to rate how clear the strategy is to read and understand by using a scale of 1-5, where 1 is 'Very Unclear' and 5 is 'Very Clear'?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unclear</th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please tell us in which capacity you are completing this consultation questionnaire?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If an organisation, please tell us the name of the organisation.

8a. If you are responding as an individual, which borough or district of Northamptonshire do you live in?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corby</th>
<th>Daventry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>South Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>Not applicable – responding as an organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)
We know that we need to work with all members of the community to help reduce hate incidents. If you would like to help us in developing the actions/delivery plans associated with this strategy then please give us your name and email/contact details. These contact details will not be used in any way other than to contact you and the answers you have given to this consultation will remain anonymous.

Name:

Email contact:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
### About you (equality monitoring)

1) **What gender are you?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Prefer not to say

2) **Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefer not to say

3) **How old are you?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Do you have a disability?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefer not to say

4a) If Yes, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?

- Mental Health
- Hearing Impairment
- Physical Disability
- Learning Disability
- Sight Impairment
- Other

5) **What is your religion?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] None
- [ ] Christian
- [ ] Hindu
- [ ] Buddhist
- [ ] Jewish
- [ ] Prefer not to say
- Any other religion (please write in)

6) **How would you describe your ethnic origin?**

Tick one category within the option which best describes your background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian or Asian British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background</th>
<th>Black or Black British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>Other Black Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mixed / multiple background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic group (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Prefer not to say

7) **If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Bisexual
- [ ] Gay Man
- [ ] Gay Woman
- [ ] Lesbian
- [ ] Prefer not to say

8) **Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefer not to say

9) **What would you describe your marital status as?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

- [ ] Married
- [ ] Single
- [ ] Civil Partnership
- [ ] Widow / Widower
- [ ] Prefer not to say

---
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1.

**JOINT VISION**

We will work in partnership to help make Northamptonshire the safest place in England by providing an excellent service to victims and witnesses of hate, focusing on prevention, early intervention & robust enforcement.

2.

**Organisations supporting this strategy**

BeNCH Community Rehabilitation Company
Borough Council of Wellingborough (BCW)
Corby Borough Council (CBC)
Corby Clinical Commissioning Group
Daventry District Council (DDC)
East Northants Council (ENC)
Kettering Borough Council (KBC)
National Probation Service (NPS)
Nene Clinical Commissioning Group
Northampton Borough Council (NBC)
Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)
Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service
Northamptonshire Police
Northamptonshire Rights Equality Council (NREC)
Northamptonshire Youth Offending Service (NYOS)
Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC) Office
South Northamptonshire Council (SNC)
Voluntary and Community Sector
Voice
3. **Introduction**

This strategy sets out the vision, aims and objectives of the partner agencies that are responsible for tackling hate related incidents in Northamptonshire, and identifies how agencies will work together to achieve the vision.

4. **Background**

Hate incidents and crimes are not always recognised or correctly identified as such. There can be cross over with anti-social behaviour and/or criminal behaviour that leaves hate not being accurately recognised as a causal factor for offending behaviour, if it is in fact recognised as an issue at all. Raising awareness of what hate incidents and crimes are within the community, as well as professional and voluntary organisations is a vital component of providing an effective service to help prevent and tackle prejudice and discriminatory behaviour.

It is imperative that the impact of the behaviour on the victim is considered from the outset, rather than just responding to the presenting behaviour of the offender. This approach should enable a more holistic and effective service of response and support for victims and perpetrators, pooling resources and identifying gaps.

Data and statistics on hate crime are primarily available through the police due to its nature. Hate incidents should be reported to and recorded by all agencies, although there is little data available to show lower level incidents, or the impact of early intervention, if indeed there is any.

A report produced by the Home Office in 2014 highlighted that in the year 2013/14 there were 44,480 Hate Crimes recorded by the police, a 5% increase on the previous year. All 5 strands had had increases on the previous year but increases in sexual orientation, disability and transgender strands were explained by an improved police identification of these offences.

**Proportion of offence by Hate Crime Strand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nationally</th>
<th>Northants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Faith</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Home Office have noted that at the time of the murder of Lee Rigby (May 2013) the number of racist and religious/faith offences increased. As the racist strand is by the largest, this incident is cited as being a reason why the number of Hate Crimes increased in that year¹.

¹ ‘Hate Crime in Northamptonshire (August 2015) – Threat and Risk Assessment’. 
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The British Crime Survey for 2012/13 stated that they estimated that there were Nationally 278,000 Hate Crimes. This is 7 times the number that police forces recorded (42,236 crimes). The most common reason given for not reporting an incident to the police was because the victim believed that the police would or could not do much about it  

The National reports from the government make four key points:
- Hate Crime is increasing.
- Hate Crime is under reported.
- Hate crime victims are more likely to be emotionally affected.
- Hate victims are less likely to be satisfied by the police handling.

Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act (1998) places a statutory duty on relevant authorities to consider the impact they have in exercising their powers and delivering services, and do all they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in their area. Relevant authorities include local authorities, police, health, probation and social housing providers. Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) have now evolved from the original Crime & Disorder Partnerships (CDRPs) but their function remains the same in ensuring a multi-agency approach to all forms of crime and anti-social behaviour.

The national Prevent agenda is concerned with recognising and identifying individuals who may be vulnerable to becoming radicalised and therefore has very close links with hate crime. All local authorities now have a responsibility to ensure that they have certain measures in place to address any potential threat.

5. **Defining Hate Incidents & Crimes**

Hate incidents and crimes are motivated by hatred of a certain characteristic or perceived characteristic of the victim. Although all of the characteristics below are valid, only the first five in bold are currently officially recorded by Central Government:

- ✓ Race (Racism)
- ✓ Faith or Religion
- ✓ Sexual Orientation (Homophobia)
- ✓ Gender Identity (Transphobia)
- ✓ Disability
- ✓ Alternative Lifestyles (dress style, physical appearance, culture)
- ✓ Gender
- ✓ Age

---

2 An Overview of Hate Crime in England and Wales – Home Office, ONS and Ministry of Justice
There is a clear difference between a **hate crime** and a **hate incident** in relation to statutory powers to intervene. All hate crimes are hate incidents but not all hate incidents are hate crimes, as explained below. The underpinning rationale behind a hate crime or incident is **perception**. It is the perception of the victim or any other person (e.g. a witness) that is the determining factor of a hate crime/incident.

**Definition of a HATE INCIDENT**
“Any incident, which may or may not constitute a criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.” (Association of Chief Police Officers – ACPO 2007)

- Examples include name calling, making jokes/banter, making people feel really uncomfortable, ignoring/isolating them, or encouraging others to behave in such a way. These can all be done online, in person, via letters or other methods.

**Definition of a HATE CRIME**
“Any hate incident which constitutes a criminal offence, perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate.” (Association of Chief Police Officers – ACPO 2007)

- Examples include harassment, intimidation, damage to property, physical assaults, verbal abuse including threats and bullying which can also be done in person or online, via letters and other methods.

### 6. National Context of Hate

There are numerous pieces of legislation in England & Wales that address hate, prejudice and discrimination, providing guidance, tools and powers with which to tackle the low level to more serious cases. This includes ASB, housing and other specific legislation as listed below:

- Equality Act 2010
- The Human Rights Act 1998 (article 8)
- The Data Protection Act 1998 (sections 29(3) & 35(2))
- The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (section 115)
- The Health & Social Care Act 2001
- The Police Reform Act 2002
- The Anti Social Behaviour Act 2003
- Respect Action Plan, issued by the Home Office, 2006
- The Management of Police Information guidance, issued by Northamptonshire Police, 2012
- Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and Agreements, issued by the Home Office, 2007
- The Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003
- Housing Act 1985 & 1988 (schedule 2, ground 2 & 14)
- Housing Act 1996 (sections 135, 152 & 153)
- Local Government Act, 2000
- The Protection from Harassment Act 1997
- Anti-terrorism, Crime & Security Act 2001
- Criminal Justice Act 2003
- Racist & Religious Hatred Act 2006
- Common Law Powers of Disclosure
Individual organisations are also likely to have their own policies, tackling specific issues that may be more prevalent to their local communities.

The national perception and response to migration in the UK is also something to consider in the context of preventing and tackling hate.

7. **Local Context of Hate**

7.1 Northamptonshire is made up of seven District and Borough Councils, numerous Town/Parish Councils and the County Council. There are six Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) that cover these.

The Northamptonshire ASB and Hate Crime Strategic Group oversee partnership work around this strategy. This group currently meets every two months and is made up of representatives from the police, county/district/borough councils, fire, OPCC and other key agencies. This group feeds into the Chief Executives’ Group.

Until May 2014 Northamptonshire Police had a specialised Hate Crime Unit that facilitated a specialist and focused response to the more serious cases of hate and supported a monthly countywide Hate Incident Review Group (HIRG) meeting. As this no longer exists, the response to hate crime has been somewhat ambiguous. A new police lead was appointed in November 2015 and this strategy is designed to direct a partnership approach to the prevention of and response to hate across Northamptonshire.

As the current level of under reporting and dissatisfaction may be a reflection of a lack of service response, part of this will be to establish a method of ensuring that cases of hate are able to be discussed and dealt with at an operational level in partnership with all appropriate agencies. This may mirror or link up with the management of anti-social behaviour (ASB) cases through ASB Action Groups (ASBAGs) that could potentially become Hate and ASB Action Groups (HASBAGs), as the attending partners are likely to be the same.

7.2 **One vision, one approach**

It is essential that all partner agencies have a consistent and clear approach to tackling hate and implementing legislation locally. This strategy provides a template from which local service delivery plans will be produced, with the aim of achieving the joint vision. An important aspect of this will be through the introduction and use of standardised documents, meeting formats and a single set of service standards that victims across Northamptonshire can expect to receive.
7.3 The Institute of Public Safety & Criminal Justice (IPSCJ)
The Northamptonshire Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) with Northamptonshire University worked on a joint venture to set up the ‘Institute for Public Safety, Crime & Justice’ (IPSCJ) which opened in April 2014. The team of experienced analysts, researchers and trainers lead expert practitioners and associates of academic contributions to crime prevention, crime science and criminal justice practice. We will be working closely with the Institute to gather evidence based information to help support and strengthen our approach to tackling hate crime across Northamptonshire.

7.4 NREC & Voluntary Sector Organisations
Based at Northampton College, the Northamptonshire Rights Equality Council (NREC) campaigns for social justice in Northamptonshire by supporting and representing individual victims of discrimination and hate, as well as monitoring hate incidents. They raise awareness of the rights of individuals not to experience discrimination and to have their human rights upheld. NREC work in partnership with the statutory agencies and play an important role in helping to prevent and reduce hate, just as many individuals and organisations from the voluntary and community sector across the county do.

7.5 Voice – the Victim & Witness service for Northamptonshire
‘Voice’ is the new independent service for all victims and witnesses in Northamptonshire. Voice offers a range of practical and emotional support as well as access to therapeutic services, available as and when required. These services help those affected by their experience to cope, recover and thrive.

7.6 Victims’ Voice
Following the 2013 ‘Victims’ Voice’ report conducted by the OPCC, five recommendations were made in relation to hate. These were:

- Hate crime should be more actively and effectively managed with outcomes which better satisfy the needs of the victims, particularly in the parts of the county where this is identified as a pernicious and ongoing problem.
- The police need to consider how longer-term cases of hate-based victimisation are managed, to ensure issues are ‘flagged’ on systems, investigated and attending officers suitably briefed of the full circumstances.
- Support services for victims of hate crime should be designed to provide long term, quality service that meets their needs, particularly in relation to counselling and confidence-building.
- The police should evaluate the current levels of knowledge and skill across offices and staff in dealing with hate crime and the knowledge of offices and staff in respect of the diversity of their communities.
- The Northamptonshire Police, Crime & Justice Institute, once established, should undertake a research study into the experiences of these victims of hate crime, in order to shape the improvement of future services and response.

7.7 E-cins
The Partnership has invested in a case management system provided by a Community Interest Company called Empowering Communities. This system enables multiple agencies to use one hub for case management and the sharing of intelligence around hate incidents/crime, as well as other areas of community safety work. Security settings can be set by individuals and/or partners entering data and there is a tasking capability that makes partnership working quicker and more transparent. This system is constantly evolving and can be adapted for local use.

The partnership has recruited a temporary E-cins Development Officer to help embed use of the system across Northamptonshire throughout 2016. E-cins is already being used to brief operational case management meetings around ASB and will do so in the same way for cases of hate.

As intelligence is vital to enabling effective early intervention, it must be considered whether e-cins is the appropriate system to capture this. Northants Police are switching to Niche in 2016 as their primary crime and intelligence system, therefore it should be agreed how intelligence can most effectively be captured across the partnership.

7.8 The Countywide Traveller Unit (CTU)

The CTU became operational in December 2003 following a formal agreement between Northamptonshire County Council, the local Borough and District Councils (not including East Northants Council), Northamptonshire Police, Northamptonshire Chamber of Commerce and Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, where each council agreed to delegate its executive functions, in relation to the management of unauthorised encampments, to the CTU. A protocol with Northamptonshire Police allows a common approach to enforcement countywide.

The CTU brings together a specialist multi-disciplinary team to deal with Traveller issues across the County in a co-ordinated and proactive way. The aims of this are:

- To manage unauthorised encampments on public land in accordance with the service standards, implement a common and consistent approach, and ensure application of best practice.
- To reduce the problems associated with encampments by tackling anti-social and unacceptable behaviour.
- To promote awareness of the CTU and its aims and objectives as the single point of contact, providing education and understanding on Traveller issues to the settled, business and Travelling community.
- Provide advice and guidance to private landowners and if requested, initiate legal proceedings at the landowners expense.
- To advise on and support the establishment of permanent and transit sites in line with the recommendations of the current Northamptonshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA).
- To provide advice and support on health and social care for Travellers.
- To provide advice and support on education for Travellers.
• To work with partners in other authorities, the voluntary sector, and the Police, to address issues of social exclusion amongst Gypsy and Traveller communities and to encourage reporting and action in respect of ‘Hate Crime’.

7.9  The Police conducted some **community consultation** in January 2016 that was attended by over 50 members of the public. This has helped develop this strategy and further consultation through the County Council Engagement Participation Inclusion Team (EPIT) will ensure a level of co-production in the process. The aim will be to have some quality assurance prior to finalising this document and developing the action plan.

7.10  **A Threat & Risk Assessment for hate crime in Northamptonshire was conducted and a subsequent report produced by Northants Police in August 2015.** The aim of this report was to identify the nature and extent of hate crime in order to assess its threat and risk in Northamptonshire and therefore help develop a more effective strategy to reduce it.

8. **Outcomes**

The strategy will demonstrate improved outcomes for our:–

**Local communities** – we will work with victims of hate to identify them earlier, understand their needs and provide efficient and effective services that meet their needs. We will hold perpetrators to account for their behaviour and offer them opportunities to change their behaviour.

**Local partner agencies** – will be able to understand and have a clear direction on how we support victims of hate including the emphasis on taking action as early as possible and how to deal efficiently with those responsible for hate in their neighbourhoods. Partners need to develop some baseline measures that evidence changes brought about as a result of the strategy.

9. **Where do we want to be?**

The following aims have been identified to achieve the vision. A delivery plan will be developed from these.

9.1  **Prevention & Early Intervention – breaking the cycle**

*Ensuring a holistic approach to tackling hate which emphasises prevention and changing behaviour. Early intervention must be considered as a core theme throughout all of these objectives.*

Early intervention involves taking action as soon as possible to tackle problems that have already emerged, with the aim of preventing them from developing. We want to focus our efforts on preventing hate incidents or tackling them at an early stage, through a number of key activities:

9.1.1  **We will pro-actively engage communities in an effort to build community cohesion across all races, faiths, disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identities and lifestyles.** Enabling and supporting local communities to develop relationships to gain greater awareness and understanding of different cultures, beliefs, abilities and lifestyles, therefore improving tolerance. Identifying community champions/leaders to work with the partnership and plan events for long term inclusivity.
9.1.2 We will provide recreational, sporting and cultural projects to enable positive engagement opportunities to encourage integration. Activities should be developed locally and in conjunction with potential participants. Local residents and volunteers should be used where possible to help embed activities within communities and sustain engagement through incentivising them to lead or coach groups in their activities.

9.1.3 We will work with children and young people (0-19yrs or up to 25yrs with special educational needs), as well as local universities to encourage positive attitudes and behaviour towards all members of the community. Discouraging discrimination at a young age is essential. Engagement with schools, higher education and youth services through, for example appropriate PSHE curriculum or life skills work is key to building tolerance and develop respectful citizens.

9.1.4 We will encourage, support and enable education establishments to accurately record hate incidents, whilst promoting engagement with a countywide accredited anti-bullying scheme. Schools need to take responsibility for providing an accurate picture of the situation across the county and ensuring they have procedures in place to deal with hate.

9.1.5 We will embed restorative practices across our schools and within services. Restorative practices bring victims and perpetrators together to explore the impact and harm caused by the incident(s) and, when possible, to decide how to repair the harm.

9.1.6 We will actively promote and encourage online safety and raise awareness of the impact of cyber bullying. Many hate incidents and crimes occur online but the impact can be equally as harmful and should therefore be dealt with, with the same level of response.

9.1.7 We will consolidate a clear and efficient pathway from the point of report, through the partnership risk assessment, to consider what level of early intervention is most appropriate. Clearly identified procedures for all partners need to be established, agreed and embedded in line with service standards. Prevention and early intervention require a prompt assessment and response to be effective, therefore a robust partnership pathway is crucial.

9.1.8 We will ensure that there are opportunities for voluntary intervention. Voluntary intervention at an earlier stage is integral to achieving long term behavioural and attitudinal change but must be culturally knowledgeable. Engaging directly with young people and adults willing to understand the impact of their behaviour, can enable them to take responsibility for their actions with support and guidance from professionals. This approach can be more effective, sustainable and should require less resource in the long term. Early voluntary intervention should therefore be seen as a preferred method over reactive enforcement, as illustrated in Figure 1 below.
9.1.9 We will ensure there is a contingency plan that will enable effective intervention in the event of a larger scale hate threat/incident in Northamptonshire. Partners will work together to ensure that there is a plan in place in case of any events that happen on either the international or national stage that may threaten the safety of our communities. The plan will address encouraging reporting and enabling effective multiagency work to ensure that those involved and victims are appropriately supported and sanctions are imposed on perpetrators.

We will work closely with community leaders, core multi-agency group/partners and community support workers across the county in various voluntary and statutory organisations to ensure that community tensions are monitored particularly after national and international events. As there tends to be a spike in hate crime incident reporting after such events, communication is key element of a cohesive contingency planning and we must aim to increase community confidence by ensuring a clear, articulate and co-ordinated approach to help tackle exploitive messages, counter myths and misinformation.

9.1.10 We will ensure that all statutory requirements around preventing radicalisation and extremism are adhered to. All local authorities and police have a statutory responsibility to safeguard around the threat of those vulnerable to radicalisation. Those vulnerable to radicalisation and extremism are often basing their syllogism on prejudice, stereotyping, dehumanising, hating and/or potentially harming or committing violent acts against any group defined by reference to race, colour, ethnic or national origins, religion or any other protected characteristic.

We will ensure that all authorities are mindful that the delivery of Prevent initiatives is effective. Historically, some initiatives have had a negative impact on community cohesion, disparately targeting sectors in the community, making them more vulnerable to hate crime and incidents.
9.2 Dealing with perpetrators

_Dealing quickly, appropriately and effectively with all perpetrators of hate incidents_

We want to deal with perpetrators quickly and in the most effective way to prevent further offending. Identifying appropriate enforcement methods through effective partnership work, whilst offering suitable support to help address the causes of behaviour and enabling long term change.

9.2.1 We will develop processes to ensure that perpetrators are identified and dealt with quicker and more effectively. The vast array of legislation, including the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act (2014), provides the police and other partner agencies with sufficient enforcement tools and powers to deal with all types of hate. These need to be fully understood by all professionals who can use them. Time delays, lack of evidence gathering and miscommunication can enable issues to continue, sometimes unnecessarily. Evidence gathering begins at the point of report through the agency that received it and early intervention methods need to be considered at that point depending on the risk assessment.

9.2.2 We will take a multi-agency approach to dealing with perpetrators. Often a perpetrator is known to more than one agency who may be taking a course of action specific to their service. A more effective and successful approach is likely to be identified when all services have a complete overview of the individual involved. Services working in isolation can make the impact much worse for the victim and easier for the perpetrator to continue. The use of E-cins can support this significantly.

9.2.3 We will ensure that perpetrators of hate are involved in the development of preventative programmes for those at risk of offending where appropriate. Diversionary activities require local engagement and understanding of the causes. Using those who have previously offended to develop diversionary activities allows them to make a positive contribution to their local area. Incentives such as coaching or leadership awards in sport can be offered through positively influencing and encouraging those at risk of offending to engage.

9.2.4 We will provide opportunities for long term behavioural changes and support those who wish to change their own behaviour through local support agencies. Identifying and taking advantage of these opportunities will be an important process. A directory of local support agencies should be readily available for this process to be successful and all partners are responsible for contributing to and referring to it. Drug & alcohol services and anger management are an example of the main support services that may need to be available for perpetrators and where appropriate should be considered alongside any enforcement action.

9.2.5 We will introduce the opportunity for hate cases to be discussed at an operational level alongside anti-social behaviour. The current Anti-social Behaviour Action Groups (ASBAGs) provide the perfect platform for such cases to be discussed, with the appropriate audience across the CSPs. They should both be managed on e-cins, which is now used at the primary briefing tool for partnership operational discussion. Therefore Hate & ASB Action Groups (HASBAGs) could cater much more efficiently with any cross over.
9.2.6 We will look to use national best practise in recognising vulnerability factors research working with academia. Gaining a better understanding of causal factors and response through social science.

9.3 Pathways of Support for victims and witnesses

Providing appropriate and sufficient support to victims and witnesses whilst identifying support to tackle the causes.

We want to ensure that victims are considered a priority in cases of hate and those who are vulnerable or repeat victims are identified early on. We need to provide appropriate and easily accessible support and information for those who become involved in the criminal justice system.

9.3.1 We will provide a customer focused, responsive service that has a robust approach to assessing the support needs of victims and addressing any safeguarding issues.

9.3.2 We will work to a set of common service standards, produced and agreed by the partnership strategic group. These will provide guidance to all partners across Northamptonshire to ensure a more consistent and transparent service for victims and witnesses.

9.3.3 We will increase reporting by helping to identify, establish and support third party reporting venues, as well as promoting Keep Safe sites across the county. As victims of hate may not feel comfortable going outside of their own community, it is important to enable reporting and provide support through local, non-statutory parties in locations and environments that will encourage them to speak up. Although they are not reporting centres, Keep Safe locations play an important role in providing a safe place for those who may be vulnerable and or feel victimised.

9.3.4 We will reflect the community’s needs in our service delivery by recording and analysing feedback through satisfaction surveys and other research methods.

9.4 Communication: Training, Public Awareness & Information Sharing

Having effective partnerships at local level with statutory and other agencies on the sharing of information and tackling hate

We want to provide a seamless partnership service that provides better outcomes for those involved, whilst informing both local residents of and visitors to Northamptonshire, how hate is going to be tackled.

9.4.1 We will ensure that relevant staff, receive appropriate and quality training. Training is crucial for all partners to increase their knowledge and ability in tackling hate. It is essential
that training on the tools and powers within legislation are delivered to all appropriate staff, providing them with the knowledge, understanding and confidence in using them. Consistent, multi-agency training should be delivered across the partnership to ensure uniformity in delivery. Training for staff at the point of report (e.g. call handlers) is vital for them to be able to identify hate, as well as vulnerable and repeat victims correctly and consistently. Case law and best practice are a necessary and important aspect of guidance, requiring frequent updates to be shared county wide through the Strategic Group.

9.4.2 We will raise public awareness of the impact of hate, whilst informing our communities of how to deal with and report it. A partnership communication plan, led by the Strategic Group on all community safety issues will enable more powerful messages and promote confidence in our services. We will challenge attitudes and behaviour through the individual and partnership work we promote, reinforcing the message that hate will not be tolerated in our communities.

9.4.3 We will ensure that we have sufficient information sharing in place to identify repeat and vulnerable victims and to ensure that data can be routinely analysed and evaluated to inform resource allocation and interventions. Protecting victims and responding appropriately to perpetrators can only be done through clear and accurate information sharing between partner agencies. This helps to avoid time delays and duplication of work, ensures efficient evidence gathering, identifies any gaps in service delivery, assists with conducting accurate risk assessments, ensures appropriate interventions are put in place for perpetrators, victims and witnesses and prevents unnecessary repeat contact with victims and witnesses. The use of E-cins offers the opportunity for improved information sharing and case management across Northamptonshire as more agencies sign up and make use of the intelligence, case working and task management modules. E-cins should be used as the briefing tool for all HASBAGs, enabling updates, tasking and information sharing to be done in live time. HASBAGs will follow a similar/constant agenda format countywide to ensure consistency in approach and language, as agreed by the Strategic Group. A full list of SPOCs across the agencies will be maintained and accessible.