



**POLICE & CRIME
COMMISSIONER**
for Leicester,
Leicestershire & Rutland

Your Communities - Your Commissioner

Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel Annual Report

January 2026

Report Date	January 2026
Report Author	Bethan Greasley - Assurance Officer
Security Classification	Official

Purpose of Report

1. As an advisory body to the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), the Ethics and Transparency Panel is required to provide assurance to the Commissioner that ethics and integrity are embedded within Leicestershire Police and that the highest levels of professional standards and delivery of policing services to the public are being upheld, adding value beyond audit and scrutiny.
2. The Assurance Officer on behalf of the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel (HCSP) brings this report to outline for the Ethics and Transparency Panel (ETP) the key findings, notable practice, and areas for improvement found in the panel and how the HCSP panel are fulfilling their duty through the scrutiny of policies and procedure through the dip-sampling of hate crimes. The purpose of this report is to highlight the work of the panel for the period of November 2024 – December 2025, enabling the Ethics and Transparency Panel to identify recommendations for the PCC.
3. The report highlights key findings, examples of notable practice, and areas identified for improvement. The report also demonstrates how the HCSP has fulfilled its responsibilities through the scrutiny of policies and procedures, primarily via dip-sampling of hate crime cases.

Request of the Panel

1. In their role to identify areas for improvement with the handling of hate crimes, it is asked that on behalf of the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel the Ethics and Transparency Panel considers the contents of this report. The panel would specifically like to ask the ETP their opinion on the following questions;
 - a. Are the Ethics and Transparency Panel in agreement with the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel on the identified areas for improvement?
 - b. Would the Ethics and Transparency Panel be willing to present the recommendations outlined to the PCC?

Background

1. The HCSP was first introduced in July 2024. Hate crime remained a priority area for the Force and as such it was identified as a potential area for independent scrutiny on how the Police responded to hate crimes.
2. The panel's primary responsibility is to review closed and redacted cases of hate crime in full to determine whether or not the case has been handled appropriately by the responding officer and reviewing officer. The aim of the panel is to effect change by improving service and improving victim experience.
3. The HCSP is a voluntary community scrutiny panel, consisting of eight full time volunteers. The panel reflects the diversity of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and has several members with lived experience of hate crime. Additionally, an ETP member regularly attends and provides valuable feedback into the ETP process.
4. The format of the meeting includes reviewing closed and redacted cases of hate crime in full, and have been randomly selected, to determine whether or not the case has been handled appropriately by the responding officer and reviewing officer. Three cases are reviewed each meeting. However, it is important to note that due to timing issues, the full three cases are not always met. The records are redacted and reviewed in person supervised at a police site with an OPCC representative present

throughout the duration of the meeting along with Force representatives from the Hate Crime Team and the Crime Registrar.

Summary of findings

There are 4 categories used to code the handling of cases:

1. Appropriate and consistent with Police Policies,
2. Appropriate with observations,
3. Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police Policies,
4. Panel fails to reach a conclusion.

Three panels have been held so far in 2025 (January 2025, April 2025 and October 2025), 5 hate crime cases were reviewed and the results from these combined are as follows:

1 (Appropriate and consistent with Police policies)	2	40%
2 (Appropriate but with observations)	1	10%
3 (Inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies)	2	40%
4 (Panel fails to reach a conclusion)	0	0%

During the meetings, five cases were reviewed. Of these:

- Three cases were assessed as appropriate.
- One case was recorded as appropriate but included observations for improvement.
- Two cases were assessed as inappropriate and inconsistent with Police policies.

These findings indicate some issues in the handling of hate crimes. However, it is important to note that this review was based on a small sample size. For the reporting period of three months, there were approximately 670 recorded hate crimes. Reviewing only three cases represents a very limited sample in comparison to the overall volume. Therefore, while the findings highlight potential concerns, they cannot necessarily be considered fully representative of broader practices.

Areas of Concern and notable Practice

During the April meeting, significant concerns were raised regarding a hate crime case and its handling by Leicestershire Police. The main issue was that the victim was repeatedly misgendered in the crime report. This was particularly concerning to the lead member of the Ethics and Transparency Panel (ETP), who also sits on the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel (HCSP) and has a strong background in LGBTQ+ inclusion. Broader concerns were also raised about legislation guiding policing based on general public views, which the panel felt was outdated and could lead to dismissal of issues affecting the LGBTQ+ community.

The panel acknowledged that the Hate Crime Team had already identified the misgendering issue before the meeting and acted promptly by providing officer feedback. Their

transparency and proactive response were seen as positive indicators of commitment to learning and improvement.

During quarter two, the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel encountered attendance challenges. The scheduled meeting was cancelled due to the panel not meeting the required quorum, and a subsequent attempt to reschedule the meeting was also unsuccessful for the same reason. This did raise concerns about the volume of dip-sampling currently being undertaken. Additionally, in the last three meetings, the panel have not managed to review all three scheduled cases. The Chair noted in the previous annual report that discussions often divert into broader hate crime issues, which, while important, create timing challenges. The panel have expressed that these conversations are important and essential and have requested that the sample size is amended from 3 cases to 2 cases.

In the most recent HCSP meeting (October), two cases were reviewed: one was assessed as appropriate and consistent with police policies, while the other was deemed inappropriate. Notably, although the HCSP is still in its early stages and has reviewed only five cases to date, cases involving LGBTQ+ victims have consistently been assessed as not appropriate or not aligned with police policies.

For the ETP member sitting on the panel, there are two main areas of concern for consideration. Firstly, the feedback mechanism for Force staff, relating to the handling of hate crime cases, is inconsistent in terms of responses from Force staff. To date, it is more likely that the HCSP will be fed back Force staff responses when the HCSP members have been complimentary. Whereas there have been occasions, where Force staff have not responded to perhaps more negative feedback. Therefore, the HCSP do not know if it has been taken on board, or what will be done to ensure the situation is not repeated.

A consistent theme raised regarding the HCSP is the openness of the panel. This is commended by all panel members who sit on the panel, and this was raised in the previous annual report in regarding notable practice. The relationship between the panel members, the Force and the OPCC has been highlighted as one of a respect and has allowed for the panel to challenge and the Force have continued to show their transparency to this important topic. I believe the panel will only grow in this respect and allow for important conversations to happen and allow for change to occur to create better experiences for vulnerable victims.

The ETP member sitting on the HCSP has expressed the impressive manner that the meetings are carried out and this is consistently celebrated by the panel. It was identified that all individuals feel that the environment was open, supportive, and allowed for meaningful discussions, with the atmosphere is professional and yet honest and welcoming. It is the ETP's hope that this remains as the HCSP continues.

Chair's reflection

Since the panel formation almost two years ago, I have been pleased with how the members have come to provide robust constructive feedback on how Leicestershire Police report and investigate hate crime cases. Every panel member provides valuable contributions to every case that is discussed and brings their own unique perspective to the table. The panel members, along with those that represent the OPCC and also Leicestershire Police have developed a good working relationship and going forward this will strengthen so that together we can ensure that those individuals who are victims of hate crime can be assured that best practice is followed at all times.

Recommendations

- In light of the concerns raised through the HCSP, it is recommended that an audit be conducted focusing specifically on LGBTQ+ hate crimes. This will help determine whether the highlighted cases are isolated incidents or indicative of a broader pattern requiring further attention.
- It is recommended that there is targeted LGBTQ+ training. This may include LGBTQ+ awareness in new EDI training and strategy for frontline officers and supervisors. Input from the ETP member with expertise in LGBTQ+ inclusion is recommended.
- It is also recommended to introduce a standardised feedback protocol. It is suggested to introduce a formal feedback loop for HCSP-reviewed cases. A spreadsheet should track actions from meetings, evidence feedback provided to officers, and include officer responses. This will ensure accountability and demonstrate that feedback is acted upon.