EQUALITIES SUB-COMMITTEE - 30 NOVEMBER 2020

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 7 DECEMBER 2020

PART I – NOT DELEGATED

5. PREJUDUICE AND DISCRIMINATION CONSULTATION REPORT (CED)

1 Summary

- 1.1 Three Rivers Community Safety Partnership set an objective to investigate the experiences of our communities, to understand how people have been affected by prejudice and discrimination, the impact this has on an individual and the resulting community needs. The insight gleaned will guide work with partners, to tackle discrimination and prejudice.
- 1.2 This survey looked particularly at the 9 protected characteristics, but was also interested to understand any challenges or experiences of any other marginalised group.
- 1.3 This report provides a summary of the survey, outcomes and recommendations, with further details of the survey results available in the consultation report at appendix 1.
- 1.4 The on-line survey was **marketed** via:

Three Rivers District Council website and social media Partnership bulletin Inter-faith groups Herts Pride COVID support groups Local Councillors Schools Neighbourhood Watch 'OWL' Watford Mencap ASCEND DSPL9 Watford Afro Caribbean Association (WACA) Community Safety Partnership WD3 Unity Facebook group

2 Summary of Main Points

- 2.1 A 'Survey Monkey' on-line survey was launched on Tuesday 8 September and closed at midday on Tuesday 6 October 2020.
- 2.2 In total, 356 survey entries were completed.

2.3 <u>Demographics</u>

- 2.3.1 The demographic profile of those completing the survey is as follows:
- 2.3.2 55% female, 43% male, 1% non-binary
- 2.3.3 84% heterosexual, 5% gay/lesbian, 5% asexual.

- 2.3.4 72% white UK, 5% white European, 9% Indian, 3% black (African & Caribbean), 1% Middle Eastern and 1% Pakistani.
- 2.3.5 48% Christian, 32% no religion, 7% Hindu, 2% Jewish and 2% Muslim.
- 2.3.6 2011 Census information on ethnicity shows that responses have been received by a higher proportion of BAME communities than captured in the census. However, this does not take into consideration population changes since then.
- 2.3.7 This data should be reviewed following the 2021 census when available to understand whether respondents are proportionate to the population.

2.4 <u>Microaggressions</u>

- 2.4.1 Over half of survey respondents reported experiencing microaggressions in their local areas, within the last year, because of a protected characteristic. The key protected characteristics affected by microaggressions were ethnicity, age and gender.
- 2.4.2 Race/ethnicity brought forth the most experiences of microaggressions. Comments were focussed strongly on situations where BAME individuals felt unwelcome, unwanted and unseen. BAME respondents also outlined verbal abuse they had experienced and abuse on social media, incidents of racial profiling, physical assault (spitting), intimidation and the prevalence of white supremacist material being distributed in the local area.
- 2.4.3 The second most commented protected characteristic was gender female, where respondents outlined incidents of harassment and undermining
- 2.4.4 Also highlighted was disability & age (older people) with reports of verbal abuse and feeling excluded and sexual orientation with reports of verbal abuse.
- 2.4.5 This survey has identified the prevalence of microaggressions being experienced by individuals with a protected characteristic and the impact it has on them.

2.5 <u>Prejudice and Discrimination</u>

- 2.5.1 Within the last year, approaching a third (30%) of survey respondents had experienced prejudice and discrimination in their local area because of a protected characteristic. The top areas being: an experience in a social situation (20%) and as a consumer: using shops/services (11%)
- 2.5.2 The key protected characteristics affected by prejudice and discrimination were: ethnicity, age and gender.
- 2.5.3 Comments focussed on suspicion and exclusion directed towards BAME people.
- 2.5.4 For gender, there was an appearance judgement.
- 2.5.5 For a disabled person, it was a feeling of exclusion and others' annoyance at their disability.
- 2.5.6 There was also a comment from a white person, stating there was no racism in the area.
- 2.5.7 There was also a call to action, regarding effective education and cohesion.

2.6 <u>Hate Crime</u>

- 2.6.1 Hate crimes do not cover all protected characteristics. Within Hertfordshire, the following characteristics are considered under the "hate crime" umbrella. Race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability.
- 2.6.2 Within the last year, a tenth (11%) of survey respondents had experienced a hate crime in their local area because of a protected characteristic. The top area being: ethnicity
- 2.6.3 The characteristic affected by hate crime being ethnicity.
- 2.6.4 Although comments were not great in number here, the examples were powerful. Obscene language was witnessed and a recent attack on BAME people had created fear, a feeling they would never belong and a need for street lighting.

2.7 <u>Trauma</u>

- 2.7.1 In 2018 the Community Partnerships Team ran a workshop looking at Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE's), and the impact this can have on health and wellbeing in later life.
- 2.7.2 The impact of hate incidents can have a similar effect on an individual's long term health and wellbeing if exposed to repeat incidents in a similar way to bullying.
- 2.7.3 "Healing the harms" report, commissioned by Hertfordshire Police and Crime Commissioner and carried out by the University of Leicester, states that a victims ill health is not been caused by a single incident of hate crime, but the impact of multiple forms of discrimination over a long period of time.

3 Outcomes/Recommendations

3.1 Outcomes

- 3.1.1 Across all three areas microaggressions, prejudice and hate crime the key protected characteristics affected were ethnicity (race), age and gender (sex).
- 3.1.2 The comments in the survey show the continued need to work together (white and BAME people, different age groups and genders), to address inequality and strengthen empathy and thus, communities. This can be helped by working with the Police and other partners to refresh the local network of key links within local communities, including community faith leaders/representatives.
- 3.1.3 It would seem apparent that more community cohesion work is required to improve understanding, reduce ignorance and often unconscious bias, and thus reduce fear, together with building empathy regarding the challenges BAME people face. Some respondents gave consent for their experiences to be used in a campaign developed by YCH (previously YC Hertfordshire).
- 3.1.4 There was also a call to action, regarding effective education and cohesion. Equality and Diversity training in workplaces and schools should continue to be encouraged and refreshed.
- 3.1.5 ACE's training and awareness raising should continue to allow all Council staff and members to have a better understanding of the impact of trauma, and to better signpost residents to support available.

- 3.1.6 A need for awareness of individual unconscious bias is identified through this report due to the prevalence of microaggressions and comments around the non-existence of discrimination.
- 3.1.7 This survey has highlighted the need for understanding why discrimination continues and what steps can be taken to address this further. A presentation on the research undertaken could be provided at a future Equality sub-committee meeting.

4 Options and Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The recommendations in this report relate to the achievement of the following performance indicators "Hate Crime and Prevent Priority Project area":
- 4.1.1 Review, monitor and report community tensions
- 4.1.2 Monitor and adapt the Hate Crime Action Plan
- 4.1.3 Monitor and adapt the Prevent Action Plan
- 4.2 The impact of the recommends on this performance indicator are:
- 4.2.1 To support a partnership approach to the priority of Hate Crime.
- 4.2.2 To reduce the levels of experienced hate incidents through education and pro-active action.
- 4.2.3 To reduce the prevalence of discrimination experienced by those with protected characteristics and subsequently reduce the levels of trauma as a result of discrimination endured over long periods of time.

5 Policy/Budget Reference and Implications

5.1 The recommendations of this report are within the agreed budgets of the Community Partnerships Unit at Three Rivers District Council. Additional staff resource has been previously secured to develop community engagement work on a part time basis. Increased internal training may have cost implication and will need to be investigated.

6 Financial Implications

6.1 None specific.

7 Legal Implications

7.1 Taking a pro-active stance helps to demonstrate the compliance of all public bodies and voluntary sector bodies with the Public Sector Equality Duty.

8 Equal Opportunities Implications

8.1 Relevance Test

Has a relevance test been completed for Equality Impact?	Not applicable – no change to policy is recommended
--	--

Did the relevance test conclude a full impact assessment	No
was required?	

9 Staffing Implications

9.1 None specific.

10 Environmental Implications

10.1 None specific.

11 Community Safety Implications

- 11.1 Work on community cohesion would assist in reducing the fear of hate/crime incidents.
- 11.2 Working with local community groups would assist in identifying other issues faced by those communities and how these can be addressed in partnership.

12 Public Health implications

12.1 Working with local community groups and representatives may help identify health inequalities.

13 Customer Services Centre Implications

14.1 None arising.

14 Communications and Website Implications

14.1 The Partnership has promoted its hate crime messages to different target groups using social media. Work on education, cohesion and related events could be included on the webpages for the Community Safety Partnership on TRDC website. This would be the responsibility of the Community Liaison Officer (the previously agreed resource for equalities and hate crime).

15 Risk and Health & Safety Implications

- 15.1 The Council has agreed its risk management strategy which can be found on the website at http://www.threerivers.gov.uk. In addition, the risks of the proposals in the report have also been assessed against the Council's duties under Health and Safety legislation relating to employees, visitors and persons affected by our operations. The risk management implications of this report are detailed below.
- 15.2 The subject of this report is covered by the Community Partnerships service plan. Any risks resulting from this report will be included in the risk register and, if necessary, managed within this/these plan(s).

Nature of Consequence Risk	Suggested Control Measures	Response	Risk Rating
----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------	-------------

			(tolerate, treat terminate, transfer)	(combination of likelihood and impact)
The Community Safety Partnership fails to demonstrate clear actions to address hate crime	Partner agencies are referred to the Equality and Human Rights Commission for breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty	Agree Hate Crime Action Plan. Improve communicatio ns on work in relation to hate crime Consider publishing an equality information report for the Partnership	Treat	6
Three Rivers District Councils fails to challenge or tackle discrimination in relation to protected characteristics	Three Rivers District Council are referred to the Equality and Human Rights Commission for breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty	Use survey results and identify additional research to better understand discrimination Support and lead on projects where necessary subject to resource and budgets. Sub- committee to identify and resource areas of work.	Treat	6

15.3 The above risks are scored using the matrix below. The Council has determined its aversion to risk and is prepared to tolerate risks where the combination of impact and likelihood scores 6 or less.

Very Likely	Low	High	Very High	Very High
Like	4	8	12	16
ly	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	3	6	9	12
Likelihood	Low	Low	Medium	High
bod	2	4	6	8
.▼ Re	Low	Low	Low	Low
Remote	1	2	3	4
	Impact			
	Low► Unacceptable			acceptable

Impact Score	Likelihood Score
4 (Catastrophic)	4 (Very Likely (≥80%))
3 (Critical)	3 (Likely (21-79%))
2 (Significant)	2 (Unlikely (6-20%))
1 (Marginal)	1 (Remote (≤5%))

15.4 In the officers' opinion none of the new risks above, were they to come about, would seriously prejudice the achievement of the Strategic Plan and are therefore operational risks. The effectiveness of the management of operational risks is reviewed by the Audit Committee annually.

Description of the risk	Service Plan
The Community Safety Partnership fails to demonstrate clear actions to address hate crime	Community Partnerships
Three Rivers District Councils fails to tackle discrimination in relation to protected characteristics	Community Partnerships and Human Resources

The remainder are therefore operational risks. Progress against the treatment plans for strategic risks is reported to the Policy and Resources Committee quarterly. The effectiveness of all treatment plans are reviewed by the Audit Committee annually.

16 Recommendation

- 16.1 To undertake to increase communication with our communities through the Community Safety Partnership to maintain a better understanding of what their concerns and experiences of discrimination are.
- 16.2 To continue to gather information and views from community leaders and residents to inform the Community Safety Hate Crime Action Plan and the Equalities Sub-Committee.
- 16.3 That a refresh and relaunch of an awareness campaign of reporting hate crime and developing a cohesive community take place.
- 16.4 Develop a video campaign to share the people's experiences of discrimination to raise awareness of the different ways in which is can occur with YCH. (This could support the awareness campaign in 17.4)
- 16.4.1 To continue to promote awareness of trauma and support available.

Report prepared by: Rebecca Young, Acting Head of Community Partnerships Shivani Dave, Partnerships Manager Gordon Glenn, Performance and Projects Manager

Data Quality

Data sources:

Prejudice and Discrimination Consultation Results by Alison Mirpuri Partnerships and Consultation Officer, Appendix 1

2011 Census.

Data checked by:

Gordon Glenn

Data rating: Tick

1	Poor	
2	Sufficient	✓
3	High	

Background Papers

APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1, Prejudice and Discrimination Consultation Results