



Working group – reporting back

WG number and topic: Day 2, Capacity building for law enforcement and criminal justice systems

Chair: Aija Kalnaja, Head of the Training Unit at the European Police College (CEPOL)

1. *What suggestions for concrete action were made?*

- **Training on hate crime must be a core part of entry training** for police, and should also be provided to judges and prosecutors and other criminal justice practitioners. Training should be part of a much broader response to capacity building, reflecting cultural changes;
- **Clear governmental declarations that hate crime is a priority** - needs to be reflected in national policy and security plans ensuring that adequate priority and resources are given to the issues in related policy areas including that of law enforcement and judiciary. It would send a clear message to victims and potential victims. Both EU, regional and national level responsibility;
- **Holistic approach embedded in cultural change** – police, prosecutors and judges trained together, train the trainers approach, and involve civil society groups that know the reality of the situation on the ground. To ensure the victim can expect continued support throughout entire criminal proceedings. This must be supported also at the EU level, by institutions and agencies and supplemented by police, prosecution, courts and NGOs drafting protocols and following up by evaluating effectiveness and impact of such training. At the EU level use of existing tools should be fully made use of, for example coordination of training of Police through European Police College (CEPOL);
- **Early recognition of hate crime** – if not recognised at the beginning, too late. Recognising that it's not 'a specific area', but rather it will be linked with other crimes;
- **Neighbourhood/community based policing** – victims and potential victims should have a clear point of contact to support them through the criminal justice process. Recruiting police officers from minority background could also be a way of increasing trust, leading to improved reporting;
- **Necessity of implementing and funding effective training modules on hate crime even in times of economic crisis** – e.g. specific modules have been developed on domestic violence – why not hate crime?
- Member States could consider setting up **Advisory panels (involving civil society actors)** – to get the message to politicians, importance of police having capacity (and funding) to tackle the issue. Regular meetings btw law enforcement and NGOs – to inform discussion, so police know reality on the ground; Civil society must be included in the process – in a legal sense;
- **Checklist for police officers on how to recognise bias motives** -what to look for etc. group specific: criteria and indicators;
- **Control mechanisms** from higher level in police on whether hate crime being taken seriously within police;
- **Professional and coordinated education: develop and implement methods to assess and evaluate impact; quality control standards;** safeguards against institutional discrimination.

2. *Existing practices*

- **Denmark:** piloting a hate crime model – CEPOL will look at this in the context of the development of a common curriculum on hate crime;
- **United Kingdom:** Hate Crime Programme and response to hate crime in general. UK records over 43,000 hate crimes; well-developed programme, comprehensive system of data collection; community policing - reflected in strong policy of combatting hate crime;
- **Germany:** An example of a good practice of a strong relationship between police and migrants can be found in the city of Mannheim (Neckarstadt Quarter). The police officers stay in permanent contact with representatives of the Turkish minority and are present at community events (of all kinds). This model is perceived to be working well.

3. Other key messages

- Currently, there is systematic underreporting of victims to the police (e.g. see FRA findings from LGBT and anti-Semitism surveys). Key reasons for this include a belief that nothing would be done (almost 50% of respondents of antisemitism survey who did not report); or nothing could be done by police (almost 40% of respondents of antisemitism survey). Findings also indicate a lack of trust in police;
- Implementation of the EU Victims' Directive will be crucial; in the absence of a positive response to victims it's difficult to develop effective responses to victims of hate crime;
- Issue of equality and moving from police 'force' towards police 'services'; Frontline support from police is crucial; often will be the first contact the victim has following the crime (if they report);
- Liaison officers good – but important for all officers to understand hate crime – so may be better to have a point of contact, rather than one person dealing with all hate crime cases;
- Recruiting police officers from minority background – increase trust, lead to improved reporting. Need for better understanding within police of 'new forms' of hate crime; right now it seems that police in many MSs do not have the capacity or capability to deal with victims of hate crime appropriately;
- Looking at other types of crime – AML, other serious crimes etc. – have the training to investigation
- Interviewing techniques for police officers;
- Neighbourhood/community point of contact in areas where there are significant minority groups - but taking care to not instil fear in minority groups by giving them a sense that police are 'patrolling' – the police officer could be recruited from that minority group itself;
- Specific mention in entry training curricula that hate crime is message crime and targets the whole community-stressing why it is 'worse' than other forms of crime;
- Checklist for police officers on how to look out for bias motives - what to look for etc. group specific – victims must be identified at the very beginning;
- Control mechanisms from higher level in police on whether hate crime being taken seriously within police;
- Develop methods of validating the whole approach and training. At national level, national training institution could undertake this;
- Education – core to changing to peoples' perceptions, and in society;
- Including training as part of a much broader response to capacity building; one that changes the culture of how hate crime is dealt with. Spending time with minority groups at community level. Criminal justice should help people to deal with the victimisation and tragedy they face. Significant change won't come around by police training alone, however well intended – it must be embedded in policy. Without policies, relationships to community, strategies to collect data, measure, will come to nothing in the end
- Mapping what already exists – at international level – increasing knowledge of existing training schemes – also of legislation (CEPOL has undertaken a first mapping of law enforcement training in the EU (looking at 300 entities across the EU); e.g. of entry-level training, which can range from 3 months to about 3 years);
- Specialised structure – educating police in providing guidelines – building trust;
- Multidisciplinary approach. Involving all actors – in design of manuals etc.;
- Increase recognition and awareness of law enforcement and criminal justice practitioners of repeat victimisation;
- Needs to be a breakdown of data at the regional and local level in Member States, to be used in training
- Training evaluation is needed consisting of 4 Qs: 1) Quality of curriculum –how it is developed and validated, 2) quality of trainers and experts - how are experts selected and assessed. Access to experts of high quality with deep understanding of the matter may be an issue especially related to new types of hate crime; not all experts are good trainers; 3) Quality of learning environment; 4) quality of trainees –clearly defined, homogenous and relevant target group is important to achieve aims of training. A common curriculum of training on hate crime could be developed at EU level – CEPOL taking the lead on this in the context of the European Law Enforcement Training Scheme (LETS). Other EU institutions and agencies, including Eurojust, Eurostat, FRA, have a role to play, in addition to civil society bodies and public authorities;
- According to LETS, some responsibilities are at EU level (e.g. on fundamental rights; serious crime with a cross border element etc.) and some at MS level (e.g. entry training; bilateral training between neighbouring police services);
- Recognition of importance of treating people equally; changing processes, attitudes and behaviours that reflect the majority population, and considering minority groups; combatting unconscious prejudice or ignorance; banishing discriminatory attitudes and behaviour, especially within the police.

