

Hate Crime Guidelines Review Criteria

Thank you for reviewing the Hate Crime Guidelines. To achieve as much transparency as possible we are seeking feedback from a range of internal and external stakeholders to ensure achieve best practice in this area of crime response. The background and criteria below aim to give you some guidance when reviewing this document. If you have any questions about the reviewing process or the guidelines in general, please contact Caroline Booth on [REDACTED].

Background

Once finalised and approved these guidelines are **for internal POLICE use only and will be classified OFFICIAL: Sensitive**. Case studies and examples have been used throughout that may cause offence to some reviewers, this is not intended. However, as a police training document it is considered necessary to use language and symbolism that officers may come across to help avoid ambiguity when it comes to determining hate crimes and incidents.

The **target audience for the guidelines are frontline police officers and investigators**. Police will have the guidelines as a quick reference on the NSW Police Force's (NSWPF) intranet page, which will then direct them to further resources or information if they require additional help. As such, they are intended to only around 20 pages long. The purpose is to give an overview of hate crimes and incidents, the Engagement and Hate Crime Unite (EHCU) and the NSWPF's response to them. It is *not* a Standard Operating Procedure or Policy and therefore does not have depth on procedures. It is also not an academic report, and while citations have been used when appropriate some sections, such as the definition of hate crime, has come from a wide combination of research and sources and agreed upon with key members of the EHCU.

Feedback Criteria

- **Clear** – uses plain English and describes things in a straightforward, easy to understand way.
- **Concise** – this is a reference document, it should include an overview of all aspects of hate crime and incidents, however it is not intended to be a procedural document. It should be as concise as possible to deliver all necessary information.
- **Contemporary** – It uses contemporary knowledge and research around hate crimes and incidents where applicable.
- **Logical** – The order of the guidelines and steps outlined are logical and make sense.
- **Inclusive and uses appropriate language** – While it is not possible to include very category of person who might experience hate crime, these guidelines should be as inclusive as possible. There is some language used that might cause offence in order to demonstrate real examples of hate crimes and incidents, overall, we want to ensure the guidelines use language that is appropriate and acceptable to the different groups we are referring to.

If you see any spelling or grammatical errors, please make a note.

REVIEWER'S NAME & OCCUPATION: Professor Jane L. Ireland, Forensic Psychologist

CATEGORY	COMMENTS	SECTION/PAGE REFERENCE
Clear	<p>It is very good and extremely comprehensive. I am going to focus on constructive points, to assist.</p> <p>The layout is a little hard to follow. Can it be presented more logically, so all definitions at the start, then procedure etc. Definitions are appearing throughout. So, for example, 5.2.1. is already defined in 5.2. Core sections need to be set out on their own page (e.g. procedures), and not merged onto a page with other detail (this may, of course, be a conversion issue and just because it is in draft).</p> <p>Remove the use of several different colours – all the case studies could be in the same colour, for example, to allow them to be easily identified. The colours are part of the navigation but the colours are varying a lot. This does cause a problem as well if people are using software to have this read to them, as it will cite all colours – I will return to this later.</p> <p>What is the point of the scenarios? They are presented but no direction given – this may just be a need to introduce them (e.g. p 12)</p> <p>Hate incident pg 5 – the opening sentence is not clear. I think it may just be a grammar issue.</p>	Various
Concise	<p>It is very concise – it could be more concise with the removal of some repetition of definitions. I capture this later.</p>	
Contemporary	<p>This is fine and applicable. I just wondered if there was a more relatable survey than a UK one for NSW.</p>	5.3

<p>Logical</p>	<p>I would refer to the section on clear as what I indicate there also applies. I think the policy element needs to go before legislation. Here you have the commitment statement and that really needs to be at the start – it is a little like a mission statement and so should be at the forefront, as it is so important.</p> <p>The victims of hate crime section I feel should go earlier – after the NSW commitment statement – it would give the real sense that victims were also at the core of this policy and not just tucked away.</p>	<p>4 and 5</p> <p>5.3</p>
<p>Inclusive, with appropriate language</p>	<p>Yes it is and has made an excellent attempt at bringing in all levels of diversity.</p> <p>I just have a few comments to improve:</p> <p>'Race' and 'Religion or Faith' in 3.2. I would not include examples as, by the very act of doing this you are highlighting one group over another. It just adds nothing but when I read this I could see that examples were focusing on Jewish, Muslim and LGBTI. So, I would remove the use of e.g. in these sections.</p> <p>Sex or gender in 3.2. Remove 'they are inside' and replace with 'regarding their gender'. The concept of this just being an 'inside' issue and, by definition, a biological issue is sometimes picked up negatively as it fails to capture self-identity etc. I am just highlighting it as an easy fix.</p> <p>The picture for the nature of language on pg 15 is not educational. The others are. It actually seems the use of an offensive picture as an illustration from the past. These are offensive images and they need to be included only for very clear educational purposes and not used only as illustrations. It really stands out from the others, which are clearly explaining what to look for. I think it can just be removed.</p> <p>Location of the incident. I would remove this picture. What is the relevance? Is this a place where hate crime occurs? I think it could bring you into difficulty by including it as a random image.</p> <p>Escalation of violence. The section on Incel should be moved elsewhere. It does not fit to just include this here. Can it be highlighted elsewhere?</p>	<p>3.2</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>6.11</p> <p>6.11</p> <p>6.11</p>

	<p>Timing. Do you need the examples? These are not going to be classed as recent shortly. I am not sure they add anything.</p> <p>The hate crime scenario where a post is displayed is problematic. Why has this been pulled out as an example as it has not happened before. I actually felt it could be seen as spreading hate and highlighting issues for the Jewish community (who do appear in examples....) and the Purim festival. This example is just set out differently to the others. I just think there needs to be some thought on how we are educating and the fine line between that and actually promoting hate. If it is truly educational and can only be captured via an image (e.g. such as the gestures at 6.1.1, pg 14) then it is justified. If it is just to illustrate then it may not be required and, of course, we can't use images like this without a clear purpose.</p>	<p>6.11</p> <p>6.11</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Can the 'lightbulbs' appear on a page at the back (as well) so that they work as a good reference? It will just make it more of a working document.</p> <p>Section 4, first line (pg 7), remove 'does have' and replace with 'has'.</p> <p>Section 4, 4.1 lightbulb. Full stop after hatred and then this to This.</p> <p>Pg 19 bottom – 6.4.1, comma after Act 2013).</p> <p>The pictures need a description – this is part of standard practice for those who are partially sighted and will be using software to have the procedures read out to them. Graphics are not read out – you need a caption e.g. Picture shows... It is important, of course, to get this right considering the content as well. I accept it is for internal use only but you may have employees who this applies to who want to access this document.</p>	<p>Various</p>