

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:

CATEGORY	COMMENTS	SECTION/PAGE REFERENCE
Clear	<p>Unclear what a 'fact sheet' is and if this would accompany the guideline document. The light bulb symbol (4.1) refers to sentencing rather than sentencing and the points to prove. For example, the light bulb comment in 4.1.1 refers to a high threshold but still appears to lack clarity in terms of an example of threshold. There seems to be a different approach in different areas in the document, so section 4.2 provides more detail in terms of practice with 'The three questions to Consider before the DPP' (p9). So, I acknowledge that the purpose is not to go into depth but I think format and level of detail provided could be more consistent across offences in the document. It is unclear if this is intended to be policy guidance, policy practice guidelines or something in between. For example, policy reference to prevention, reduction and disruption is mentioned there is nothing in relation to broad direction provided by the document in other areas of practice (e.g. section 4.2, 5.2).</p>	4.1, 4.2
Concise	<p>The document is very concise, but clearly needs to be accompanied by other support material in some cases legislation and points to prove for an offence. I think it would be useful to have an introduction to set out what the document intends to do. My interpretation/understanding is that the document seeks to define difference that are relevant to hate crime and the appropriate legislation. It does not provide detailed instruction in relation to the offences within the legislation or the practical points to prove for an officer on the ground. With this in mind the document could direct the reader to other sources that would cover the offences in more detail to assist with practical application of these offences. I think section 1 could provide more detail to make this clearer.</p>	1 Purpose & Scope
Contemporary	<p>It would be useful to have some up to date statistics/records of hate crime offences so the reader can see the extent of the problem along with under reporting information and concerns.</p>	

<p>Logical</p>	<p>There are parts of legislation used in section 4.1 (aggravating factors) but not points to prove in the offence, this may be helpful. Also, the telecommunications section is referred to but is not presented in the same way as the example of 'aggravated offences' in section 4.1 mentioned above.</p> <p>5.1 the research referred to in 5.1 is over 20 years old. Usually I would expect this research referenced alongside more up to date research or references or police figures on the number of reports, estimates of under reporting. It is unclear how SF Parrabell refers to the NCSPP report that follows straight after it. It appears a bit confusing with dates from 1976-2000 and 2018.</p>	<p>4.1, 5.1</p>
<p>Inclusive, with appropriate language</p>	<p>I would recommend the words used to demonstrate a hate offence should come from a secondary source, either research, court or case files of previous offences. These could be more powerful and based in reality for the reader.</p>	
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Consistency in content detail and format across the various offence types would enhance the document.</p> <p>I think the hate crime definition should come at the beginning of the document (5.2.1)</p> <p>There does not appear to much emphasis on prevention/reduction or disruption other than making reference to the policy.</p> <p>Could provide sources of information (blog, website, police resource) where officers can remain up to date beyond the life of the guidelines or learn more about the subject.</p>	