

# Real Change Challenges



The Real Change Challenge:

**Mate Crime:**

A Challenge for the Police,  
Safeguarding and Criminal  
Justice Agencies

# Contents

Foreword by Katharine Quarmby .....	1
Foreword by Paul Giannasi.....	3
Background .....	4
The challenges.....	8
Detailed challenge statements .....	12
Service specific actions.....	19
What ARC can do to help .....	20

First Published by ARC Ltd. 2013

Copyright © 2013 ARC

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means (electric or mechanical) including photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publishers.

Distributed in the UK by ARC. The formal responsibility for the contents of the publication rests with ARC.

# Foreword

I am pleased to be able to contribute to the Real Change Challenge, by the Association for Real Change. It is a mark of how much things have changed since I first started investigating disability hate and mate crime, in 2007, that such a guide can be written. It's thanks to ARC and many other organisations that the profile of this terrible crime has been raised – and that it is being challenged so effectively.

In June 2007, when I was news editor at the magazine, Disability Now, on our press day, we reported on the sentence being handed down on three people responsible for holding captive, and torturing a young man with epilepsy, Kevin Davies. The prosecutor told the court that Kevin had been “kept like a dog in a locked garden shed at night”<sup>i</sup>. Kevin had been burned, bruised and starved. His case was not treated as a disability hate crime, nor were the other cases I collected over the next few months, involving robbery, grooming, torture, rape and murder. Such crimes sickened me to the core and convinced me that there was a depth of hatred towards some disabled people in society that was largely unmarked by the judicial system.

As I started to look more deeply into the cases, I found that the motivation of the offenders was underpinned by our common history, and the fears and prejudices that have fuelled violence against disabled people for over 2000 years. Commonly held beliefs – that disabled people are a scourge on humanity, a freakish spectacle only good for amusement and mockery, that they deserve to be treated as slaves, that they are appropriate scapegoats for society's ills – even that they should not exist at all and should be destroyed - live on and thrive today. Other unpleasant attitudes, such as that of some politicians hinting, strongly, that many people on disability benefits are cheats and frauds, have added to a toxic mix. Our history, too, has bequeathed us a powerful legacy of hatred, fear, contempt. Without marking and recognising our history, and what it has bequeathed us, we have no chance of confronting disability hate crime and those who commit it.

Mate crime is a very pernicious form of hate crime, which seems to affect people with learning difficulties in particular and is long-lasting and very disturbing.

Indeed, when I analysed the deaths of 18 disabled victims of hate crime for my 2008 report for the charity Scope, *Getting Away with Murder*, 11 were killed by people they considered to be good friends. Only two out of the 18 were killed by strangers and the rest were killed by acquaintances. Two were even killed by self-styled carers<sup>ii</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/gloucestershire/6284184.stm>

<sup>ii</sup> Katharine Quarmby, *Getting Away with Murder*, (Scope, 2008), 39

Mate crime is an aspect of hate crime, not separate from it. However anecdotal evidence (and my report, Getting Away with Murder) shows that many people with a learning disability are befriended, and then exploited by others. Often they do not see it happening to them until it is too late. If they do not have good family/social networks to support them the risks are greater. The Safety Net projects, run by ARC, understands these risks and tries to reduce the incidents by working with people around ‘friend or foe?’ issues and raising awareness for families, supporters and front line staff.

And, having looked at the social isolation in which so many of the victims were living, I believe that the lack of true friendship is a key risk factor in disability hate crime, exposing victims to exploitation of the worst kind. I very much welcome the focus in this guide in promoting friendship as a key protective factor in keeping people safe from harassment.

In conclusion, so much valuable work has been done in the last few years to challenge disability hate and mate crime. But more needs to be done. This guide is a very welcome step along the way.

**Katharine Quarmby**

## Foreword

I have been involved in developing police hate crime policy since disability was first included nationally, in 2007. I have some reservations about the tag ‘Mate Crime’ being used in police policy or training. I share the view that disability hate crime is under-recognised, reported and recorded, but I am not convinced that introducing another nebulous, non-legal term is the answer, at least for law-enforcement agencies. All criminal justice agencies share a common definition of Disability Hate Crime and this forms the basis for our policy, guidance and data collection. One of our greatest tasks is to encourage better knowledge amongst staff who, on average, would only encounter a disability hate crime every 2.5 years, even if every such crime, as identified in the British Crime Survey had been reported to the police. I do not think we should further dilute that understanding.

I am happy to bow to ARC’s greater knowledge of what may help victims with a learning disability to understand the concept, but I believe this document has the ability to add to the challenge of improving the police and other professional responses if it were to be adopted by agencies.

ACPO and the College of Policing recently approved the new manual for hate crime and there is extensive advice in it about the nature of disability hate crimes including the types of abuse that ARC would refer to as ‘mate crime’. The manual advises on appropriate responses and the need to understand the unusual nature of such crimes, even amongst other hate crimes. The guidance includes a section on the use of the term ‘Mate Crime’, recognising that some NGO’s use the term. It states the importance of colleagues understanding what a victim means if they refer to ‘Mate Crime’, but it does not recommend a separate collection mechanism. The advice is that all matters referred to as ‘Mate Crime’ are likely to be recorded as disability hate crime.

ACPO has a single national hate crime web-facility and online reporting mechanism, where carers can act as advocates by assisting victims to report or even by reporting on their behalf: [www.report-it.org.uk](http://www.report-it.org.uk).

I do, of course, remain supportive of ARC’s efforts to increase the confidence of victims to report disability hate crime.

**Paul Giannasi**

*Police Superintendent,*

*Member of the ACPO Hate Crime Group*

## Background: People with learning disabilities and mate crime

Mate crimes happen when people with learning disabilities are befriended by someone who uses the relationship to exploit or abuse the person.

In July 2006 Steven Hoskin was brutally tortured and murdered in St Austell by a group of people who he took to be his friends. Steven’s mother said at the time:

**“ He was generous...he knew he had a learning disability...he tried to do as others do...he wanted friendships...”**

Mate crime murders have continued to happen at the rate of about one a year, most recently Gemma Hayter in Rugby. However, there are many everyday mate crimes which are affecting the quality of life for people living in the community.

The ARC Safety Net project ([www.arcuk.org.uk/safetynet](http://www.arcuk.org.uk/safetynet)) was set up in 2009 to research the issue of mate crime, raise awareness, deliver training, and develop resources and local protocols.

The project swiftly became aware of the extent of mate crime, with many ARC members sharing anecdotal evidence. We realised that for any kind of crime you could name, someone, somewhere, had turned it into a mate crime.

We have had stories of women with learning disabilities being pimped out by their ‘boyfriends’, people whose

accommodation has been turned into crack dens, and others who have been ‘befriended’ online and then financially and sexually abused.

A typical story was of a young man with Asperger’s who had, what he called, his ‘Tuesday Friends’. Tuesday, the day his benefits arrived, saw a particular group of people turn up at his flat, ‘help’ him to the cashpoint and then on to the pub where they ‘help’ him spend his money.

There are serious implications for service providers, not only to address the everyday, ‘petty’ examples of mate crime that so impact on people’s independence and confidence, but because there is evidence that unaddressed minor mate crimes are often repeated and escalate.

Steven Hoskin’s principal killer lived with him for a year before murdering him, and his Serious Case Review lists more than 40 missed opportunities for intervention.

The British Crime Survey estimates suggest that up to 98% of learning disability hate crime is unreported. Anecdotal evidence from the Safety Net project indicates that the figure for mate crime is even higher. This places an even greater responsibility on services. If people cannot, or will not, see the crimes to which they are subjected it is up to the people around them to do so and to take decisive action.

### Our Definition of Mate Crime

Mate Crime happens when someone ‘makes friends’ with a person and goes on to abuse or exploit that relationship. The founding intention of the relationship, from the point of view of the perpetrator, is likely to be criminal. The relationship is likely to be of some duration and, if unchecked, may lead to a pattern of repeat and worsening abuse.

### Mate Crime, Hate Crime and Safeguarding

There is no legal definition of mate crime. In many situations mate crime will be an example of disability hate crime. The Safety Net project has always told people with learning disabilities and their supporters to report mate crime as a hate crime to the Police as this tends to lead to a swifter and more effective response.



However, a mate crime is not always a hate crime. If you are in any doubt report it as a hate crime and let the Police and CPS make a decision.

If it is **not** a hate crime it **is** a Safeguarding issue, and must be passed to the Adult Safeguarding Team. It is up to your service to ensure this happens, whether the report comes from the victim, the Police or social care staff.

There are arguments about whether crimes of exploitation and abuse involving family members or care staff, etc. constitute mate crime. ARC has chosen to exclude these as we take the view that mate crime is an intentional relationship, and that these kinds of abuse are dealt with by other means. However we welcome the enhanced sentences given to the staff from Winterbourne View who were found guilty as these were treated as disability hate crimes.

## The Invisible Crime

Mate crime is an often ‘invisible hate crime’, with invisible acts being carried out by invisible perpetrators on invisible victims in invisible circumstances. For example:

**a) Mate crimes might have been invited**, or appear to have been invited, by the person with a learning disability, raising issues of mental capacity, consent and informed choice. There may even be positive pay-offs for the victim (attention, excitement, ‘friendship’, etc.), so the typical outcomes of hate crime – physical injury, distress, complaint – may not be manifest.

**b) Mate crimes are sometimes not criminal.** A typical mate crime might involve someone living on their own who has a group of friends they meet up with on Friday nights. Whilst this relationship may be genuinely one of friendship it is still exploitative if the person with a learning disability always supplies the venue, the beer, has their fridge raided, their phone used, and is consistently left with the clearing up.

**c) Mate crimes are likely to occur in private**, for example in people’s own homes, rather than the more public sphere of much hate crime. Increasingly this includes cyber crime.

**d) Mate crimes are likely to occur (though not exclusively) within long-term relationships.** These relationships may have started as, or may actually still be, genuine friendships. Even if they are not so they may appear to be to many observers. It is difficult for many people to conceive of these relationships containing an element of hate. However even hate crimes do not need to be motivated by hate to reach a conviction.

**e) Mate Crimes are unlikely to be disclosed by someone with a learning disability.** During the Safety Net project, we spoke to more than 300 service providers about Mate Crime and each was able to supply half a dozen different stories about mate crimes affecting people known to them. During the same period we have failed to meet more than a handful of people with learning disabilities who have told us it has happened to them. This may be for a number of reasons including not recognising the abuse for what it is, considering the relationship more important than the abuse that takes place within it, embarrassment/shame, and fear of retribution.

**f) Until recently mate crime has been unrecognised in hate crime materials**, educational resources, safeguarding procedures, etc.



# The Challenges: Why people with learning disabilities are particularly vulnerable to mate crime

- Given the right circumstances, we are all ‘vulnerable’.
- We all need friends.
- People are often living very isolated lives.
- Learned compliance.
- People still live sheltered lives.
- Most people with learning disabilities are outside the system.
- Social exclusion and poverty.
- Historical social attitudes towards disability.
- Warped notions of what is ‘normal.’

**The first thing to say is that, given the right circumstances, we are all ‘vulnerable’.** Disability Rights activists rightly fight shy of having themselves labelled as vulnerable. They prefer to use the phrase ‘situationally vulnerable’, which promotes the idea that we are all vulnerable in certain contexts. As Stephen Brookes (Disability Hate Crime Network) has stated, even a 6’ 6”, 20-stone rugby player is vulnerable if he is standing in front of a cashpoint, drunk on a Saturday night. They argue that by calling people vulnerable we switch the emphasis to blaming the victim rather than the perpetrator.

That said it is arguable that many people with learning disabilities find themselves situationally vulnerable more frequently than most of the population. The experience of the Safety Net Project suggests that people with learning disabilities are prone to mate crimes for a number of reasons. They are an obvious ‘soft touch’, highly visible and vulnerable in the community, and often have few support mechanisms. Like everyone else, people with learning disabilities need friendship, engagement and excitement. A number of environmental and social features combine to leave people with learning disabilities in very vulnerable situations and these are discussed below.

**We all need friends** and to find a place in a neighbourhood or other communities. Friendships are a basic human need, but

making good friendships is never easy. This can be especially true for people with learning disabilities who may have less control and fewer opportunities to create, maintain and develop friendships. Often people have little contact with others outside their living situation, and may well not have chosen their living companions. Most people who have a learning disability do not have the opportunities, experience or economic power to make friends the way that most people do - through work, extended education or a rich social life.

Research for the Valuing People Support Team<sup>1</sup> found that only 30% of people with learning disabilities have any friends at all. Other research<sup>2</sup> suggests that even when people have friends, one third have no contact with them. This may mean that four out of five people with learning disabilities are, to all intents and purposes, friendless. Given so few opportunities for relationships that bring warmth, mutual support and validation, then any connection is often viewed to be better than none.

People are desperate for friendships, and such desperation is easily exploited. This makes it more likely that any offer of ‘friendship’ will be accepted – “better to have horrible friends than no friends at all”.<sup>3</sup> It also means that people will be far less likely to end a friendship, even when it has become dysfunctional.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Health (2001): 20

<sup>2</sup> Emerson and Hatton (2008): 11

<sup>3</sup> Wallis (2010): 10

Michael Gilbert (who did not have a recognised learning disability, but was described in Court as ‘vulnerable’) was brutally tortured over a period of months, and finally murdered in 2009 by people whom he had once considered to be friends or even quasi-family. When one brother, Richard (found guilty of familial homicide), asked him why he put up with it, Michael had replied: “I love you lot. You are my family.”<sup>4</sup>

**People are often living very isolated lives**, increasingly without organised activities. This increases the risk of boredom, making an offer of engagement and excitement more likely to be accepted, regardless of the consequences. They are also less likely to have the experience and capacity for determining these consequences.

**Learned compliance.** Historically, people with learning disabilities learn what is expected of them and respond accordingly, so as to avoid punishing alternatives. Many people with learning disabilities are, as a result, highly suggestible and acquiescent. A story was related to the Safety Net project by a care worker about a quite able man with learning disabilities who felt he had become friends with a local junkie simply because he had been called “mate” by her. He was found trying to find money that the woman had asked for.

**People still live sheltered lives.** People with learning disabilities have often been very sheltered from normal community

life and are, therefore, lacking in experience and often naïve. For example, Steven Hoskin climbed the viaduct in St Austell to his death without struggle as he believed his murderers’ assertion that there were snipers in the undergrowth who would shoot him if he did not comply.

The Joint Committee on Human Rights (2008) found that people with learning disabilities may not know about their human rights, about what is criminal, or what constitutes abuse. An advocacy worker reported that in a discussion on the Human Rights Act the people with learning disabilities she was working with told her that the HRA applies to ‘normal people’, i.e. not people with learning disabilities.

This lack of knowledge can extend to a limited understanding of what real friendship is, and what it involves (for example reciprocity). This is likely to have been compounded by a lifetime of being taught that danger only comes from strangers, not ‘friends’.

In an age of social networking where the words ‘friend’ and ‘like’ are used in a flippant way the dangers are clear.

### **Most people with learning disabilities are outside the system**

Increasingly people with learning disabilities are living independently in the community with reduced support from services. This can lead to isolation and make people more vulnerable to offers

of ‘counterfeit friendship’. Additionally, perhaps only 15% of people with a learning disability are in receipt of any social care services. The remaining 85%, who may never have received a diagnosis, and who may be unaware that they have a learning disability, or unwilling to own the label, are arguably far more prone to mate crimes.

### **Social exclusion and poverty**

Disability Rights Commission (2005) research points out that people with learning disabilities are, “*likely to live in poverty . . . and are exceptionally socially excluded.*” These are both factors in an increased exposure to hate crime<sup>5</sup>, and mate crime.

### **Historical social attitudes towards**

**disability** have meant that people with learning disabilities have been seen as less than human. This has a twofold effect:

- i) it makes it easier for perpetrators to justify what they do, to themselves and others, as their victim ‘doesn’t really matter’;
- ii) the legacy of the historical attitude has left a subconscious attitude with some carers, and people with learning disabilities themselves, that such treatment of disabled people is inevitable, perhaps even deserved.

For example, the 17-year-old convicted of contributing to the death by beating of Brent Martin in Sunderland in 2007 said in Court, “*I am not going down for a muppet*”

(BBC 2008). These attitudes often mean that no action is taken or the victim themselves are blamed if they complain of abuse to their care workers, families, etc. (people being told to ‘ignore it’ or led to believe that they ‘asked for it’ or ‘had it coming’).

### **Warped notions of what is ‘normal’**

Bullying, harassment and abuse are so common for people with learning disabilities that it simply starts to be seen as part of what it means to have a learning disability. As Mencap<sup>6</sup> reported, “it becomes seen as ‘part of everyday life’.” A Social Worker said that people with learning disabilities known to her did not regard being spat at as abusive as it was an everyday occurrence.

**None of this is an argument against living in the community or ordinary life principles. Nor is this an argument against people forming relationships and trusting others. Where people play a contributory part in their communities, and form genuine friendships, incidents of mate crime are likely to diminish.**

**However, Safety Net’s findings are that social care services must be watchful on behalf of people who are potential targets, and support them in developing the necessary street wisdom and resources they will need. We also need to ensure that such crimes and abuses are identified, taken seriously, reported and ended.**

<sup>4</sup> Sturdy (2010)

<sup>5</sup> Sin et al (2009): 14 & 82

<sup>6</sup> Mencap (1999): 12

# Detailed Challenge Statements

**1 I am able to report crimes when they happen to me**



The Safety Net project has received many reports of mate crimes, but few of these come from people with learning disabilities themselves. The core issues could be summarised as:

### Victims may not wish to report.

- If they do report they are not believed, or are deemed to not be 'credible' witnesses.
- If they are believed, nothing is done.

- If anything is done it only makes matters worse.

### Capacity

People with learning disabilities would have to:

- know what a mate crime is, and could recognise that one had taken place,
- have knowledge of the range of actions they could take,

- have the capacity (in all senses) to take action.

### Retribution from the perpetrator(s)

For example, Police knew about the alleged abduction and beating by the people who would eventually kill and dismember him, but Michael Gilbert refused to press charges, telling detectives "it would make it worse for me in the long run". Additionally, people with learning disabilities often have unrealistic ideas about the punishment that perpetrators will receive and anticipate lengthy jail sentences for what are quite minor offences in the eyes of the law.

### Need for acceptance and validation

For some people with learning disabilities, their desperation for acceptance and validation compounds the issue. In a 2010 Channel 4 documentary ['Sticks & Stones'] a man with learning disabilities being harassed by local youths refused to complain to the Police, saying, "I don't want them to get criminal records. I want them to make something positive of their lives. Perhaps in time we could become friends."

### Emotional impact

Wallis (2010) talks about people's experiences being, "too painful to talk about", or people feeling ashamed and "reluctant to see themselves as weak or victims".

### Poor reporting mechanisms

People with learning disabilities are often reluctant to engage with the Police for

a number of reasons, including poor previous experience, and 'fear of the uniform' (in common with many people they have a subconscious fear that they have done something wrong). Current alternative reporting mechanisms (alternative reporting centres, and third party reporting) are under-developed and patchy. Many existing reporting forms are inaccessible to people with learning disabilities, either due to their language, format or location.

### Poor experience of the criminal justice system

Louise Wallis, who has considerable experience of working with people with learning disabilities who are the victims of sexual crime, sums up the experience of her clients as being, "At the police station they are frequently not believed or not considered credible. If they get to court, they will not understand the process, or much of the language used. Victims may be cross-examined by a hostile barrister who will do their best to confuse them, make much of their disability, and question their credibility, which can be incredibly humiliating and upsetting. Judges, Juries and Barristers often have a prejudiced view of people with learning disabilities. At a [recent] rape case . . . involving a victim with learning disabilities, the defendant was found not guilty because the jury said the victim's learning disability meant they didn't know whether to believe her. Sentences are too low."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Presentation to the Westminster Briefing 'Learning the right lessons: progress and next steps for disability hate crime' conference. (October 2010).

### Language

The language itself undermines the seriousness of offences. Using terms such as ‘bullying’ and ‘harassment’ even the term abuse rather than assault, torture and rape, for example, plays down the seriousness of such crimes, and marks them out as somehow different from the assaults that people without disabilities experience, even making them ‘*not crimes*’<sup>8</sup>. This carries the twin danger of making them less likely to be reported, and more likely to be treated as a private matter. Sherry<sup>9</sup> says that we need to, “*encourage more people to see ‘abuse’ as ‘hate crime’.*” For mate crime it would be an advance for many people with learning disabilities to even see what they are experiencing as abuse.

Organisations need to ensure that their Safeguarding procedures include Hate and Mate Crime and the need to report these to the police when required. Keeping people safe is sometimes not sufficient, reports of the people committing these acts need to be shared with the authorities.

**Reporting is the key to unlocking the whole issue. With so few reports the Police will not regard mate crime as a high priority, which in turn means it remains unlikely to be recognised and reported. A vicious circle.**



## Reactive

“If it’s not reported it’s like it doesn’t exist.”

**If you do nothing else, report it!**

If mate crime is not reported it can never be stopped, either for the individual, or for the community at large. We need widescale recognition that this is happening so that the necessary resources can be put in place to stop mate crime.

**The Police, Adult Safeguarding Teams, local authorities, self advocacy groups and third sector agencies** need to develop and support reporting strategies, ideally jointly. These would include reference to:

- Accessible reporting methods.
- Encouraging and supporting third party reporting centres.
- Briefing front line staff, PCSOs and beat officers to identify and report mate crimes.
- Supporting and extending local Safe Place schemes.
- Supporting local ‘Blue Light’ days with a stand on hate and mate crime.
- Ensuring PCSOs and beat officers visit local learning disability services, self advocacy groups and individuals in vulnerable situations.
- Inviting people with learning disabilities to PACT meetings, neighbourhood meetings in a targeted and accessible way.

<sup>8</sup> Sherry (2010): 75

<sup>9</sup> Sherry (2010): 119

## 2 I have access to people who are trained and skilled in identifying abuse and exploitation

Training required by people with a learning disability is more powerful if shared jointly with the staff supporting them, and even more so if it is jointly delivered by people with learning disabilities.

Frontline officers should be trained to recognise and act on signs of abuse. People are very unlikely to disclose mate crime even when they do realise it is happening to them. It is up to everyone in the community to watch for it and to take action, or support the person to do so.

Any of these indicators could suggest that someone is experiencing a mate crime or other form of abuse:

Any of these indicators could suggest that someone is experiencing a mate crime or other form of abuse:

- Changes in routine, behaviour, appearance, finances or household (e.g. new people visiting or staying over, lots of new ‘friends’, lots more noise or rubbish than there normally is).
- Unexplained injuries.
- Involvement in sexual acts which they have not agreed to.
- Loss of weight.

- Not taking care of themselves and looking dirty or scruffy.
- Bills not being paid.
- A ‘friend’ who does not respect, and bullies or undermines the person.
- A sudden lack of money, losing possessions or the changing of their will.
- The person ‘doing what they are told to’ by a ‘friend’.
- Showing signs of mental ill health.
- Not being with the usual networks of friends/family or missing weekly activities. Cutting themselves off from established networks and support.
- Goods or packages arriving at the person’s house (and then being collected by someone else).
- The house is a mess after lots of parties.
- Secretive internet or mobile phone use.

**Local Adult Safeguarding Team contact numbers, procedures and policies should be clear and accessible to everyone.**



## Prevention

### If you do nothing else, train your staff

All staff will have a variety of minimum training needs in:

- Mate Crime
- Learning Disability
- Achieving Best Evidence (ABE)
- Mental Capacity Act (MCA)

For **Mate Crime** we recommend the material in this publication and that available on the Safety Net website [see page 20].

For **Learning Disability** awareness we recommend you contact your local self advocacy group.

For **ABE** training would include:

- Assessing for special measures
- How to apply for special measures
- Eligibility criteria
- Available options
- How to take statements

For **MCA** training would include:

- The presumption of capacity
- How to conduct initial capacity assessments
- How mental capacity is decision specific
- How to support decision making
- The fluid nature of mental capacity
- Acting in someone's best interests
- Sources of help

## Service Specific actions

### The Police

#### A) Achieving Best Evidence (ABE)

ABE should be regarded as standard for all 'vulnerable victims', rather than restricted to so-called 'serious' crimes. Reported crimes are often the tip of the iceberg so far as mate crime is concerned.

#### B) Repeat victims

Have a robust system for identifying:

- repeat victims
- crime patterns that don't involve an address (e.g. on public transport) and that may be sporadic

#### C) Reasonable adjustments

Make reasonable adjustments for people with learning disabilities. Often this may mean simply allowing more time to develop a sympathetic relationship with them.

#### D) Diversity Requirement

Add a 'diversity requirement' to new officers' job descriptions to require them to attend meetings with self advocacy groups, undertake awareness training, etc. Superintendents' performance measures need to cover all hate crime.

#### E) Investigation

Mate crimes are complex and often repeat and escalating. They need to be investigated by experienced and

knowledgeable officers.

#### F) Closing Qualifiers

Hate crime and mate crime are not anti-social behaviour. The temptation to record it as such must be avoided.

## Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and Criminal Justice partners

We would expect prosecutors to follow the CPS guidance here:

[www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/best\\_evidence\\_in\\_criminal\\_proceedings.pdf](http://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/best_evidence_in_criminal_proceedings.pdf)

#### B) Repeat victims

The CPS must apply section 146 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, though we recognise the difficulties that sometimes exist in applying this to mate crimes. The capacity to take into account the past behaviour of perpetrators may assist.

Evidence based (so called 'victimless') prosecutions are more than possible in mate crime and should be pursued.

The CPS needs to continue its efforts to work with criminal justice system partners to tackle hate crime more effectively and help raise awareness of hate crime issues.

In conjunction with its criminal justice partners, the CPS needs to continue to improve its approach to prosecution and to supporting victims – all with the aim of ultimately raising confidence to report to police, third party reporting centres, etc.

We are encouraged that the CPS intend to roll out training on disability hate crime in 2014 and expect that training to include significant reference to mate crime. These ‘Navigator Workshop’ materials have been sent to CPS offices with the idea that, where possible, CPS can share these with local voluntary sector and other partners. These are focused on voluntary sector groups, and forms part of a wider CPS aim to liaise with partners to drive up awareness and confidence to report hate

crime to the Police or third party reporting centres.

## Safeguarding Adults

A) Safeguarding Adults **recording forms** should include a section for indicating possible hate or mate crimes to assist in better recording.

B) Adult Safeguarding teams should ensure that **policy and procedures**, and safeguarding training include reference to Disability Hate Crime and Mate Crime.

C) All possible hate and mate crimes should be tackled in **partnership** with the Police.

presentations, etc. This can be purchased from ARC for £5.00, to cover p&p.

### Training

**ARC Training Services** offer a range of courses to help with work in this area. All can be tailored to fit the needs of your service. Courses include:

#### ‘Friend or Fake?’

The Safety Net team has delivered a range of courses on mate crime to people with learning disabilities, social care staff and managers, families, police, local authority and further education staff, etc.

Course content varies but typically covers:

- What is mate crime?
- What makes people vulnerable?
- How can we identify mate crime?
- What can we do about it?

#### ‘Carer to Enabler’

This workshop is aimed at social care staff and covers how to modernise the workforce to make it more in tune with what people with learning disabilities expect from their staff in the 21st century.

The course covers:

- Understanding the difference between caring and enabling
- Explaining why it is important to enable people with disabilities to live independent and inclusive lives
- The government initiatives that call for an enabling approach to service provision
- Knowing the attitudes and approaches that support the role of the enabler
- Knowing how to apply an enabling approach to your own work with the individual(s) you support

<http://arcuk.org.uk/publications/moving-from-carer-to-enabler/>

#### ‘Friends & Neighbours’

A workshop designed to support and encourage people with learning disabilities to become valued members of their local communities.

The workshop was designed to be delivered to people with learning

disabilities, accompanied by staff and/or families.

The workshop covers:

- policy background for social inclusion
- what communities are and where they are
- what makes it easier to join communities, and what makes it harder
- practical ideas about how to join in with community life.

#### LD Trainers Inc.

As part of the Safety Net project, ARC supported a group of people with learning disabilities to gain a professional training award (City & Guilds 7300: Introduction to Training Skills). A team of these trainers in North Devon now operate as ‘Learning Disability Trainers Inc.’, and are available to co-tutor most of the above training anywhere in the country.

#### Contact Us

If you want to know more about Mate Crime or the Safety Net project contact:

**Rod Landman**

**Tel: 01237 441 786**

**Email: [rod.landman@arcuk.org.uk](mailto:rod.landman@arcuk.org.uk)**

#### Thanks

Many thanks to all the people who contributed their time and expertise to commenting on and improving this publication. Special thanks to David Grundy, Jane Gibney, Yvonne Furze and John Robinson

## What ARC can do to help

The ARC Safety Net website has lots more information on mate crime and hate crime, useful links and a host of free resources to download. Go to:

[www.arcuk.org.uk/safetynet](http://www.arcuk.org.uk/safetynet)

Our resources include the **‘Friend or Fake?’** booklet aimed at people with learning disabilities and those who support them:

<http://arcuk.org.uk/safetynet/files/2012/08/Friend-or-Fake-Booklet.pdf>

We have also produced a CD that contains many of the Safety Net resources,



# Real Change Challenges

[www.arcuk.org.uk/realchangechallenges](http://www.arcuk.org.uk/realchangechallenges)

#RCCmatecrime



The Association for **Real Change** , Marsden Street, Chesterfield, Derbyshire S40 1JY

Tel: 01246 555043 • [www.arcuk.org.uk](http://www.arcuk.org.uk)

Association for **Real Change** is a Registered Charity / Registered Charity No: 285575 / Scottish Charity No: SC039129