



Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - Wednesday 9th April 2025, FHQ Enderby

1. Welcome and Attendees:

Clare Hornbuckle – OPCC
Nupur Chamund – OPCC
Insp Will Prince – Force Hate Crime Lead
Sgt Angela Cartwright
Darren Goddard – Crime Registrar
David Findlay - Chair
Barbara Czyznikowska
Ajay Aggarwall
Rosie Klair
Jenny Ardley Oakden
Nandini Chakraborty
Brigitte Heller
Lisa Vine – ETP

2. Introductions and Apologies

Richard Chapman.

3. Urgent Business

Chair congratulated elected deputy Chair Rosie Klair.

4. Action Log and Officer Feedback

Insp Prince advised all officers had been provided with feedback. Insp Prince advised that Sgt Cartwright gave feedback over the phone for case one, sergeant responded well to feedback and took it on board, OIC accepted and responded well to feedback. Regarding second case, OIC and Sergeant no feedback received.

5. Hate Crime Performance Pack

Circulated 1 week prior to panel. Insp Prince gave a brief verbal overview, stating that overall recorded hate crime has reduced in recent quarter, stating that this is in line with seasonal trends. Insp Prince cited a reduction in confidence and satisfaction, explaining that the Force are currently doing some research to understand the reasoning behind this,

adding that low numbers of crimes can sometimes affect volatility of percentages. Racial remains most prevalent strand of hate crimes in Leicester City Centre. Insp Prince advised that South Leicester contains a busy custody suite which results in high recording of crime across all types in this area.

Lisa asked what a positive outcome is. Insp Prince explained that this was a number of outcomes, including a charge or postal acquisition, conditional cautions which often involve victim awareness courses and community resolutions which are a tier below a caution. Regarding confidence and satisfaction, Force is doing work to improve investigation standards across all areas in an effort to raise confidence and satisfaction levels. Darren Goddard added normally it means that the evidential threshold is met for a positive outcome.

Action: OPCC to request a summary paper on OOCRs from Insp Marc Crisp.

Barbara queried whether there is a link with communication campaigns on managing expectations from a public perspective in terms of service delivery to ensure it is understood what is achievable in terms of outcomes and prevent low confidence and satisfaction figures. David echoed these comments citing victim expectations too.

Rosie added that she would expect that victim's expectations are managed throughout investigations and these conversations should be being had anyway. Angela stated that the Force should be doing this, however even if following process and procedure correctly, a victim may feel that the service still does not feel sufficient in relation to their feelings around the case which is beyond remit of Force and may still lead to negative views.

Darren stated that historically victim follow up has not always been good locally but there have been significant improvements made in recent years.

Barbara queried whether any themes had been identified in the feedback to which Insp Prince responded that there were currently no emerging themes among negative feedback.

Rosie queried the 2% percentage point difference between achieving and non-achieving margins for hate crime satisfaction KPIs locally. Insp Prince advised this would be followed up and brought back to the panel.

Jenny queried the methodology of calling victims to review their confidence and satisfaction. Currently, the Force state to victims that they will get a call within 12 weeks but this could come at any time. Jenny suggested that sending a text before calling victims without a couple of days notice would increase response rate. Jenny explained that there was a risk that of disturbing victims at inconvenient times and potentially retraumatising victims if they are not aware of when a conversation is coming about a traumatic crime they have experienced. Darren responded that there was potential for hate crime SPOCs to have this conversation with victims and advise a timeline for contact. Jenny stated that a simple text to victims to prepare victims will increase engagement and reduce risk of disengagement and traumatisation.

Action: Insp Prince to follow up on potential of sending a text ahead of calling victims with C/Insp Adam Wardle and feedback to panel.

Lisa noted that she believes the LGBT figures are still under reported based on her own professional knowledge, citing a recent professional event she attended where almost all attendees stated they had been a victim of a hate crime but did not report. Insp Prince advised that a new hub is being launched to encourage reporting and hoped that this would improve the confidence of victims. Lisa agreed and advised that she promoted the positive work of the panel and encouraged reporting.

6. Panel Cases for Consideration

Three cases were prepared for the panel, however due to significant issues identified within case one, discussion took up most of allocated meeting time. This panel focused entirely on online-based crimes at request of panel members. The following gradings were recorded:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies and procedures)	
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies and procedure)	1
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	

Case ID	Classification	Rationale
Case 1	3	Recording officer repeatedly mis-genders victim throughout report log. Supervisor rationale was of very poor quality.

Case A –

Regarding Case A, the Force advised that they normally would not intervene with officer feedback until panel feedback is received. However, upon checking the case in advance to ensure redactions the Force noted a serious issue in which the filing sergeant has repeatedly misgendered victim throughout the crime report. The Force did not wish to delay in promoting learning and preventing repetitions of this practice, and took proactive action to send learning to the OIC and Sergeant. The Force are also planning to roll out communications Force wide on the importance of representing victims correctly, as mistakes such as this can significantly impact trust and confidence of victims in the Police.

Lisa noted that the issue of misgendering contributes to the reasoning why people who identify as transgender often do not report hate crime. Lisa noted some wording in the report from the recording officer which stated that the case was being 'treated as innocent

until proven guilty' which prompted Lisa to ask query why there was a lack of investigative urgency and suggested this could be interpreted as transphobic to an external reader, even if not the intention. Insp Prince advised that this wording is not unusual in crime reports to provide rationale in stating no third-party evidence however accepted that the wording could have been improved and understands the point made. Lisa added that another paragraph which explained that the victim logged on to the social media account to see the derogatory comments comes across as victim blaming, as it suggested that the victim sought out the offence.

Lisa asked what training the Force get around supporting trans individuals, including staff, victims and perpetrators etc. Insp Prince advised that nothing specific was in place for this beyond Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Training. Lisa responded that she had also attended this training programme as part of her wider role with the ETP, stating that it was of poor quality and was therefore not surprised that service was falling short as a result of this. Lisa emphasised that she understands the demand placed on officers but queried why officers were not double checking their paperwork, particularly as the victim was explicit and brave enough to state that they were transgender.

Jenny added that objectively, this inaccuracy in recording is part of a wider issue in which victims will be being failed as their cases are potentially being mishandled. Jenny equally stated that ethically it also felt somewhat unfair for panel members to scrutinise the Force if they are not being provided with training that is up to standard in the first place. Insp Prince stated that the EDI training is being reviewed at Chief Officer level following the raising of concerns in the December Ethics and Transparency Panel.

Barbara queried whether different training needs are identified for different officers and if these needs can be met, such as officers who would benefit from shadowing others as well as receiving training. Darren responded that the Force is on a transition to become more victim focused which is being delivered as part of the training which should improve the victim experience.

Brigitte stated that while training is essential, it is only effective if the attitudes of the organisation evolve over time too, and that it is important that culture reflects the training provided.

Rosie queried what the learning will be from this case and how it will be escalated within the Force, citing the importance of preventative and educational awareness. Rosie stated that individual level feedback is important however queried how wider learning is shared at an organisational level. Insp Prince noted that the Force highlight learning through internal comms and campaigns and that there was a planned upload to Force's intranet based on this case to share the learning.

David observed that this case felt like a microcosm of society and the persistent lack of understanding of the LGBTQ community.

Action: Insp Prince to circulate force-wide learning around accuracy of recording hate crimes on Force intranet.

Action: Insp Prince to meet with Lisa Vine outside of meeting to discuss how the Force can better consider the LGBTQ community in terms of training needs.

Working through the scrutiny question set, the panel discussed whether or not the hate element had identified at the point of recording. Panel agreed that the case had been labelled as hate related as the element of transgender had been recognised at initial recording. Angela advised that the only option available to the recording officer is to tag as 'hate' at point of call and not specifically which type of hate, however correct protocol at point of recording had been followed in line with the options available to the officer.

Darren advised that the crime has been recorded as malicious communications which is sending communication with intention of causing alarm, distress or anxiety. Last year the Home Office issued guidance around online mal comms and freedom of speech. HO reminded forces that advised practice is to start with belief of victim but then Forces need to consider whether the average person would believe the words to be grossly offensive and therefore this process of reviewing does not always make some comments unlawful. Forces therefore must consider whether comments hit the threshold for unlawful. Lisa responded that this is not generic, this is personal, explaining that in this case there was an inexplicit call to violence. Lisa explained that if this went to the average person to review, they may take it at face value and not identify the threat that is present when reviewed in context that is personal to the victim.

Lisa made the observation that if Forces are going to start policing based on the general population's views, the queer community are dramatically at risk of being dismissed. Lisa queried the relevance of this legislation, stating that this feels as though it is an old piece of legislation that has not kept up to date with how people communicate online in current times. Insp Prince confirmed that this legislation was introduced in 1988.

Lisa asked why this case was not swapped from mal comms to harassment. Darren responded that this was a supervisory question which would be captured in the feedback. Insp Prince added that regarding harassment, there would have to be evidence of similar incidents against the victim. Angela stated that when a case is classified as domestic, the Force put a domestic report through with the case. Angela explained that the officer in case has said that on this occasion there was no violence and that the parties do not reside together/have had no contact over two years, therefore it had been reviewed and did not qualify for harassment. Lisa responded that this felt contradictory to the escalation of language used against the victim which would suggest to the average person that there has been other contact within the two years. This was not disputed by the board, however there was no evidence to prove this indefinitely.

Panel classified handling of the case as 3 – inappropriate and inconsistent with Force policies and procedure. While some aspects had been followed correctly, the supervisory footprint was insufficient and the observation of misgendering the victim felt a significant failing to panel.

7. AOB

Panel members raised that the frequency of meetings does not feel sufficient to get through enough cases per year as panel often use time reading and discussing cases.

Action: Clare to explore possibility of increasing meeting frequency however know this may not be possible due to staffing and resource in OPCC. Clare to explore workaround of making room available from 5pm to allow for reading in advance.

Action: Clare to add timings to meeting agendas and remove introductions.

Insp Prince gave an overview of the Speak out Space going live imminently. This is a hub funded by the OPCC that is being delivered by the prevention directorate in Force, in partnership with different agencies across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. The speak out space will be a one stop hub for raising awareness of hate crimes, providing supportive information and pathways to reporting hate crimes. This was well received by the panel.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 9th July 2025

Meeting end 20:07.