



Police Accountability and Legitimacy Group (PALG)

Microsoft Teams

28 September 2022

Attendees	
Police & Crime Commissioner Team	
Suzi Graham (SG)	Policy and Research Officer
Hannah Jenkins-Jones (HJJ)	Strategic Lead for Scrutiny, Assurance and Equality
Lee Jones (LJ)	Chief Executive
Lisa Morgan (LM)	Policy Officer
Claire Perrin (CP)	Policy Officer
South Wales Police	
Superintendent Jason Rees (JR)	Force Lead for Hate Crime
Carol Woodward (CW)	Head of Assurance and Inspection
T/Chief Superintendent Martyn Stone (MS)	Head of Community, Partnerships & Cohesion
Martyn Jones (MJ)	Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
PALG Partner Members	
Ian Davey (ID)	StopHateUK
Grace Krause (GK)	Learning Disability Wales
Tina Reece (TR)	Welsh Women's Aid
Jasmine Jones (JJ)	Gypsy Traveller Wales
Joanne Maksymiuk-King (JMK)	Race Council Cymru
Becca Rosenthal (BR)	Victim Support
Dave Vice (DV)	Adferiad Recovery
Roisin O'Kelly (ROK)	Platform
Kate Jones (KJ)	Thrive Women's Aid
PALG Independent Members	
Alex Drummond (AD) (CHAIR)	Independent Member
Tony Esmond (TE)	Independent Member
Samar Small (SS)	Independent Member
Catherine Doherty (CD)	Independent Member

	Item	Content
1.	Welcome & Introductions	1.1 AD welcomed attendees and noted apologies.
2.	Minutes of the last meeting	<p>2.1 AD flagged that two members of the group share SK as initials and how this would be an issue with the minutes – going forward there will be a way to tell them apart.</p> <p>2.2 AD requested a change of the previous minutes (Point 7) to include the offer of people being able to write-in to NS with any observations, thoughts or comments on the presentation from the meeting that may have been realised or would be more comfortable sharing after the discussion.</p> <p>2.3 AD reminded the group that the meeting is a safe space for speaking openly and that post-meeting write-ins are always welcome.</p>

<p>3. Hate Crime – Presentation, Discussion and Breakout Session</p>	<p>3.1 Superintendent JR provided an overview of Hate Crime and the procedure around it. It included the Victims Journey, statistics,</p> <p>3.2 JR explained the policy for dealing with a call for service. Due to the sensitivities and importance of dealing with Hate Crime victims promptly, there are currently 2 options for this attendance – Emergency Response (arriving within 15 minutes) and Non-Emergency Response (within 60 minutes). There are exceptional cases that are a 72-hour response.</p> <p>3.3 JR explained that for scrutiny and oversight, the call for service will go through a Bronze Inspector for referral to a Sergeant and finally a Constable, who will be the attending officer – this Constable is usually the first point of visual contact for the victim of Hate Crime. It is expected that the attending officer understand the circumstances to hand, ask important questions like the victim’s preferred method of contact and wider support they may need as well as taking Positive Action. Positive Action includes the key points of taking Statements, providing Public Protection Notices and partner referrals upon identifying vulnerability, offering contact details and conducting risk assessments.</p> <p>3.4 Statistics (2021-2022, Jan-Sep) show that there has been an overall slight decrease in Hate Crime reported. There has been a rise in reports for protected characteristics: Religion, Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation. There has been a decrease in reports for: Disability and Race. The question is raised of the underreporting potentially being due to a trust and confidence issue or willingness for victims to come forward. “Lower level” offences still make up the majority of Hate Crime offences. The cases are dealt with positively and the needs of the victim are maximised along with the punishment for the offender. There has been a drop in positive outcomes and there has been a drop in every sub-category: Charges, Summons, Cautions, Restorative Justice Process referrals.</p> <p>3.5 JR mentioned how victims not being supportive of prosecution is a big issue and would be appreciative of advice on how to help increase the support. More ongoing challenges are Criminal Justice System Victim expectations vs reality, stopping reoffending, accessing wider support network and controlling the narrative.</p> <p>3.6 SS queried if there was any data on victims of Hate Crime, more specifically the number of repeated victims – a negative experience will likely affect their expectations with the next instance of reporting. JR will get access to this data and noted how repeat victims are prioritised within the structure.</p> <p>ACTION – JR to obtain data on repeat victims of hate crime</p> <p>3.7 JJ queried if the race and religion data was determined by the victim as to whether they felt it was a hate crime towards their race or religion and requested a further breakdown of the race data due to the size of the data pool in order to see any patterns and develop a narrative. JR answered that the force is victim led in terms of how the perception of how the victim interprets the offence and that there is a Crime Integrity Team within South Wales Police which ensures the categorisation of crime going through the process to make the data as accurate as possible. Work is ongoing to improve the breakdown of Race data and should be complete in the next few weeks, manually pulled data is available at present.</p>
---	--

3.8 BR asked for verification that the Hate Crime statistics were Crimes not Incidents and whether or not Incidents later became Crimes and whether or not the new College of Policing guide will be an ongoing challenge. JR confirmed that they were in fact Hate Crimes and College of Policing guidance will be welcomed.

Breakout Session for 15 minutes.

3.9 AD welcomed everyone back and asked for observations.

3.10 GK mentioned that people with disabilities may not be aware of a crime when it happens due to having likely grown up in a difficult environment causing lines to be blurred, it is important to make people aware of what is and isn't allowed. In addition, AD queried if officers were proactive in recording instances of Hate Crime even when the victim was unaware that they had experienced a Hate Crime. JR commented that there is work ongoing around organising a workshop in order to teach Officers how to identify a Hate Crime and how to ensure that victims are aware of what they have experienced.

3.11 There is also a need to create trust by making the Police safe as there is sincere doubt about whether or not the police is the suitable institution to address issues against minority work. JR noted that this is something all Forces are struggling with and that there is no current working method for this problem. Engagement remains an ongoing priority to aid in this issue.

3.12 GK also queried what was in place for victims in terms of protection in cases where accusations are made against people who are still in a victim's life etc. In addition, AD queries what understanding and training Officers have around this type of scenario. JR answered that as part of the Criminal Justice route, referrals are made to partner services for support where necessary.

3.13 ID queried how successful the officers were at keeping to the response time targets. JR answered that there is always a wider policing demand which makes it difficult to always hit targets, but aspirations are always high to hit these targets. JR offered to pull and send over the data.

ACTION – JR to obtain data on response targets for hate crime

3.14 ID queried the allocation process. JR confirmed that the process is as follows: The call is picked up in the control room to understand the initial call, the grading is then determined, a risk assessment is conducted on the call, and an officer is dispatched through a Bronze Commander and is tagged on the terminal. Once on the terminal, there is a responsibility to action the call ASAP. Oversight for the ongoing enquiry and investigation involves a Sergeant overseeing the quality assurance of the investigation. Hate Crime officers dedicated to each basic command unit will review the incident after roughly 24 hours.

3.15 Following a query from ID, JR confirmed that Hate Incident data is still being collected

3.16 BR commented on how perpetrator education is lacking and that there is a gap in the data on instances where victims have decided not to pursue their cases and what the reasons behind these decisions may look like.

		<p>3.17 SS commented that while the data that is available is useful, it doesn't answer a lot of the questions the Force needs to answer e.g., the reason for repeated behaviour and experiences. It was suggested that the group find the questions they want to ask, find out what data is needed and make a request for specific data.</p> <p>AD suggested the need to determine the difference between race / faith / ethnicity. JR answered that there is a gap in the data as the categories are broad where there is a need for them to be broader and more defined.</p> <p>HJJ added that the Force has a Victims Satisfaction Unit which includes Hate Crimes, this involves contacting victims to ask about their experiences as a way to gather data. It was suggested that this data could be pulled and prove valuable to the group.</p> <p>ACTION – HJJ to request hate crime data from the Force Victim Satisfaction Unit</p> <p>3.18 KJ queried if the October update to Niche will allow for recording what the ethnicity etc of the victim was as well as what it was perceived to be by the perpetrator. JR answered that it would be difficult to record that data and is currently not being recorded but the suggestion will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>TE added that education for perpetrators is reactive rather than proactive and highlighted the opportunity of feeding into schools to teach young people about Hate Crime in partnership with the new curriculum being introduced in schools around wellbeing. JR commented that School Liaison Officers are spread across the Force area. AD queried if there was contact between the Force and the education department on a political level of how the education curriculum interfaces with police. JR answered that a National All Wales School programme run by Faith McCready is now live and agreed that becoming involved in the school environment is highly important and is something currently being pursued by JR.</p> <p>3.19 AD thanked JR for the presentation and answering all questions to a high standard. Sending questions post meeting (to SG) is encouraged by AD to ensure that voices are heard at all times.</p>
4.	<p>Counter Terrorism / Prevent Programme – Previous meeting's presentation discussion, Letter from the PALG Chair, Next steps</p>	<p>4.1 AD mentioned how she had sent a letter to the Force after the presentation from the last meeting and asked for members of the group to share their reflections and observations in order to share a unified response.</p> <p>4.2 GK queried if the written response she had sent was received – AD confirmed it was and agreed that the points raised were useful.</p> <p>GK had raised that the overall response and points raised was important but that there were concerns around the praise given to the Force for having autism specific consultants - men with autism were more likely to be investigated under the prevention of extremist/terrorist behaviour. This created a link between extremist/terrorist behaviour and autism. GK argued that while they were more likely to be looked at, they were not more likely to actually be extremists or terrorists.</p> <p>AD agreed that there is a concern that autistic men are perceived this way which will result in a stereotype being formed, AD raised the question of how this can be prevented. It was agreed to alter the comments written to fit this discussion and for research to be shared with GK.</p> <p>4.3 AD noted how a frustration from the presentation was that it didn't specifically teach listeners how prevent works in practice and asked if anyone in the group had experience making a referral through the prevent programme or has known anyone who has been</p>

		<p>involved in the prevent programme. ID offered to send the minutes and letter to a colleague who will likely have some feedback for the letter.</p> <p>ACTION - ID to obtain colleague's comments on AD's letter</p> <p>4.4 GK queried the nature of the letter from the Chair. AD clarified that ideally there will be 2 letters, 1 letter from the chair as an individual and 1 letter from the group regardless of if the feedback is different in each. SG extended the offer to accept post meeting feedback by email after sending the letter again following further reflection.</p>
5.	5.PALG Outcomes – Difference PALG has made over 5 years	<p>5.1 LJ and HJJ presented a poster with the highlights of PALG achievements over the past 5 years, specifically on the topic of identifying recording errors in Stop and Searches. LJ highlighted the value of the diversity of a group with conflicting opinions sometimes is in avoiding working in a bubble and thanked the members of the group for working together to achieve high levels of scrutiny. LJ ensured the group that their effort is passed on to the relevant people. It was agreed that the work of the PALG group would continue to be condensed into an easy read format.</p> <p>5.2 AD thanked LJ + HJJ for the presentation and commented that the information was useful to remember the work that has been accomplished as well as inspire new members in terms of the difference the group can still go on to make.</p>
6.	Partner Updates	<p>6.1 BR updated the group that the Wales Hate Support Centre coordinates a lot of support around Hate Crime Awareness Week and that there is a calendar events and social media pack that will be distributed shortly and encouraged the group to keep an eye out for any events that they may be interested in attending.</p>
7.	AOB	<p>7.1 AD asked the group to suggest topics of discussion. DV suggested a topic around substance misuse and mental health and how the Force are supporting vulnerable people – and how people are identified as vulnerable.</p> <p>7.2 SG requested post meeting suggestions via email and requested feedback of the breakout format used in the meeting. The group overall agreed that this format was useful.</p> <p>7.3 AD thanked the group for their attendance and closed the meeting.</p>

Action Table

Action	Owner
JR to obtain data on repeat victims of hate crime	JR
JR to obtain data on response targets for hate crime	JR
HJJ to request hate crime data from the Force Victim Satisfaction Unit	HJJ
ID to obtain colleague's comments on AD's letter	ID