

**CHAPS Expert Think Tank Seminar
Evaluation report**



**Supporting Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) victims of crime
@ Bankside House, London, 21st March 2005**

Everyone at the seminar has been invited by the Terrence Higgins Trust (Gay Men’s Sector Development Team). The aims of the seminar were to:

- [1] Provide a dedicated forum to develop national thinking and best practice on supporting LGB victims of crime, particularly in relation to:
 - [a] Domestic violence
 - [b] Sexual assault
 - [c] Homophobic hate crime
- [2] Provide a platform where police authority policy on supporting gay and bisexual victims of crime will influence the ability of other services to support LGB victims of crime
- [3] Endorsement of current best practice nationally or develop policies around what is considered best practice in supporting LGB victims of crime

N=34 people attended the seminar. N=24 returned the evaluation form before leaving (71% response rate; compared to mental health ETT at 61%, PEP ETT at 80% and Condoms ETT at 94%).

PART 1: BEFORE

Q.1 Which of the following roles do you carry out? (Tick as many as apply)

n=

- 4* Health promoter
- 2 Researcher
- 1 Police Authorities
- 6 Police Force
- 8* Organisation supporting victims of crime
- 2 LGB organisation
- 1 “charity”
- 1 CPS
- 1 “psuedo Government department”
- 1 “Staff association”
- 1 police training panel

* 2 people ticked *Health promoter* and *organisation supporting victims of crime*.

COMMENT: Range of job roles; more police than health promoters.

Q2. How much do you already know about support LGB victims of crime generally?

	LGB victims	Mental health	Condoms	PEP
Little or nothing	0%	12%	6%	0%
Some	38%	41%	18%	46%
Lots	38%	35%	71%	46%
Expert	25%	12%	6%	8%

COMMENT: Less naivete and more expertise among participants compared to previous Expert Think Tanks.

Q3. How feasible do you think it is to INCREASE police support to LGB victims of crime?

- 0% Not at all feasible
- 17% Fairly feasible
- 83% Very feasible

Q4. What, in your opinion, are the major obstacles to supporting LGB victims of crime? {no response for n=4}

- [1] Under reporting of homophobia crime to authorities. Mistrust of support organisations to meet needs of LGBT victims.
- [2] The beliefs of both the police and LGB community about how they will be perceived and the knowledge of police about lifestyle and culture of LGB community.
- [3] Just institutionalised homophobia in the police force. Fear of reporting crime and reports of crime being taken seriously.
- [6] Non-reporting. Acceptance that same sex offences happen.
- [7] Heterosexism, institutionalised homo/trans phobia. Resources.
- [8] Lack of joined-up thinking. Lack of resources / funds for existing support groups like GALOP / PACE / Broken Rainbow etc.
- [10] Sense that harassment is 'normal'.
- [11] Low levels of reporting due to fear of police not responding sensitively. Crimes not being reported as LGB crimes by police - therefore lower figures.
- [12] Knowledge by staff in organisations (Police, CPS, Local Authority) of issues impacting on LGBT people and communities.
- [13] Access to services and support. Awareness of what is [a] crime, and that help not tailored to LGB people is available.
- [14] Lack of training. Lack of support / drive from top-down in an organisation.
- [15] Lack of confidence in reporting. Lack of knowledge that homophobia is a crime. Treated appropriately in school.
- [16] Resources. Heterosexism.
- [17] Homophobia amongst police officers
- [19] Lack of reporting of incidents by victims. Victims expectations of poor service by police. Difficult for victims to access appropriate officers.

- [20] Few well-funded and resourced agencies. Lack of priority or hierarchy of equality - LGB "tag-on". No single equalities act.
- [21] Lack of awareness, training and understanding within agencies. Heterosexism - homo/transphobia.
- [22] The idea that it is about supporting people who identify as LGB rather than supporting anyone who experience homo-bi-or transphobia. I strongly believe responses to these crimes must focus on behaviour and not identity. What happened to transgender / transphobic crime?
- [23] Under-reporting - distrust in police.
- [24] Lack of information for LGBT people about support. Expectation of encountering homophobia.

Q5. Has your recent work involved supporting LGB victims of crime?

- 46% Yes, many actions
- 42% Yes, a few actions
- 12% No

Q6. What are you hoping to personally get out of today?

{no response for n=1}

- [2] An overview of what's going on and any useful information to move agenda forward.
- [3] Insight into work taking place around the country.
- [4] Contacts and understanding.
- [5] A better awareness of the issues faced by LGBT community in respect of reporting / supporting criminal prosecutions.
- [6] Contacts that can assist me and my colleagues.
- [7] Sharing of best practice - innovative thinking on moving forward in partnership.
- [8] Network and lobby for joined-up thinking.
- [9] Further consciousness raising and awareness raising on issues around the three areas of crime. Meet practitioners in the field. Hear about the current experiences / concerns NOW in LGBT communities. Take this all back to MPA. Identify ways the MPA can make its policy on supporting LGB victims of crime known.
- [10] Round out experience. Strategies to stop 'fire-fighting' approach.
- [11] Better knowledge of current issues. Sharing good practice. The way forward for the future.
- [12] Networking. Wider knowledge of initiatives taking place across the UK / share best practice.
- [13] Discover more about the needs of LGB victims and how these can be met. Discover more about the experience of LGB victims. Meet others and learn about good practice from others.
- [14] To see what is being offered elsewhere.
- [15] Networking. Focus my work. Send clear message to government.
- [16] Knowledge.
- [17] Better understanding and national perspectives.
- [18] Improved knowledge and general awareness that I can take back to the workforce.
- [19] Having recently changed role I need to look more at the policies around supporting

LGB victims of crime rather than the direct practitioner work I've done in the past.

- [20] A picture, however sketchy, of service provision, gaps, resources and best practice.
- [21] Varied.
- [22] A clearer idea of how organisations are supporting / want to support victims of homo-bi-transphobic crime.
- [23] Networking with colleagues. Hearing how to support LGBT victims of crime.
- [24] Ideas about how to improve Victim Support's service to LGBT people.
Opportunity to contribute my thoughts and experiences to the day.

PART 2: AFTER

Q7. How much attention do you feel each of the following areas has been given today?

	<i>The amount of attention given to this topic today was...</i>			
	% too much	% adequate amount	% too little	% not at all
Service for people suffering domestic violence	0%	96%	4%	0%
Services for people suffering sexual assault	5%	67%	28%	0%
Services for people suffering homophobic hate crime	4%	83%	13%	0%
Policing practices	9%	48%	43%	0%
What best practice is in supporting LGB victims of crime	0%	52%	44%	4%
How best to promote best practice	0%	48%	52%	0%

Q8. Do you know more about best practice in supporting LGB victims of crime generally?

	LGB victims	Mental health	Condoms			PEP
			<i>behavioural causes</i>	<i>needs</i>	<i>inter-ventions</i>	
No more than when I arrived	25%	47%	82%	59%	23%	17%
A little more	58%	35%	18%	41%	65%	67%
Much more	17%	18%	0%	0%	12%	17%

COMMENT: Overall more new learning than for previous two Think Tanks (but not compared to PEP).

Q9. Do you know more about best practice in supporting LGB victims of DOMESTIC VIOLENCE?

- 29% No more than when I arrived
- 42% A little more
- 29% Much more

Q10. Do you know more about best practice in supporting LGB victims of SEXUAL ASSAULT?

- 25% No more than when I arrived
- 50% A little more
- 25% Much more

Q11. Do you know more about best practice in supporting LGB victims of HOMOPHOBIC VIOLENCE?

- 38% No more than when I arrived
- 54% A little more
- 8% Much more

Q12. Has the seminar increased your ability to develop partnerships with other agencies to support LGB victims of crime?

- 9% No not at all
- 52% Yes, a little
- 39% Yes, a lot

Q13. Has the seminar increased your ability to adopt practices or policies to better serve LGB clients/service users?

- 27% No not at all
- 50% Yes, a little
- 23% Yes, a lot

Q14. How feasible do you think it is to increase police support to LGB victims of crime?

- 0% Not at all feasible
- 41% Fairly feasible
- 58% Very feasible

Q15. What, after today, do you now think are the major obstacles to supporting LGB victims of crime? {no response from n=6}

- [1] Not joined up working with ALL agencies, ie not just police and CPS. Working with victims and support for victims.
- [2] Time, experience, funding.
- [3] Gaps in service provision and planning and monitoring for LGB services.
- [6] Under-reporting. Negative attitudes towards Police.
- [7] Heterosexism, institutionalised homo/trans phobia. Resources.

- [8] Lack of resources. Lack of joined-up thinking - especially in London - 32 boroughs = 32 ways of doing things.
- [9] Lack of funding for specialist organisations. More positive stories of people that have had a successful outcome. Positive role models - institutional homophobia and heterosexism.
- [10] Having people and organisations in LGBT community for agencies to talk to. Massive under-representation of extent of crime.
- [14] Need best practices and policies - sources listed and made available.
- [15] Right-wing backlash - heterosexism.
- [17] Statutory agencies homophobia.
- [18] Lack of support services.
- [19] Expectations within the LGB community that the police don't care / are ineffective / are homophobic.
- [20] Hierarchy of equality. Heterosexism. No single equalities act.
- [21] Lack of awareness, training and understanding within agencies. Heterosexism - homo / transphobia.
- [22] Lack of funding and awareness about same-sex domestic violence, homo and transphobic hate crime and sexual assault / rape. Lack of strategic thinking in LGBT organisations (and funding).
- [23] Under-reporting.
- [24] Ensuring practice is implemented properly.

Q16. Looking back at what you said you were hoping to get out of today, how much was that satisfied?

	<i>LGB victims</i>	<i>Mental health</i>	<i>Condoms</i>	<i>PEP</i>
Worse than when I arrived	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not satisfied at all	0%	6%	12%	0%
Partly satisfied	62%	65%	71%	65%
Well satisfied	38%	30%	18%	35%

COMMENT: Overall satisfaction was higher than for the previous three Think Tanks.

Q17. If someone you know were invited to a future Expert Think Tank Seminar, would you recommend attending?

	<i>LGB victims</i>	<i>Mental health</i>	<i>Condoms</i>	<i>PEP</i>
Yes	96%	88%	94%	92%
No	0%	6%	0%	0%
Other	4%	6%	6%	8%

COMMENT: Recommendation rates for future ETTS was higher than for the previous three Think Tanks.

Q18. What would have made the event more likely to have met its aims?

{no response from n=10}

- [2] A broader national mix of services / providers.
- [4] More time.
- [6] Two days long!
- [8] More representation - where were GALOP? Local LGBT forum reps?
- [9] Larger audience?
- [10] Could have papers to read first and more discussion time.
- [13] More non-criminal justice sector reps - need follow up.
- [15] Having government decision makers, funders present.
- [18] More info on best practice that is realistic.
- [19] The presentation re. The needs of Gay male victims of sexual assault - would have been helpful if we'd been given ideas as to how to offer necessary support rather than only hearing about lack of funding and poor police response.
- [20] Attention from more CHAPS partners and other health promotion agencies.
- [22] To have top-level managers who are supportive eg. Police, probation, judiciary.
- [23] Top-level manager support especially police, probation, judiciary.
- [24] Less in the way of presentations, more time in small groups (but see Q19).

Q19. What other comments do you have about this event?

{no comment from n=5 and illegible for n=2}

- [1] Most victims do not report. Most reported crime (97%?) does not result in prosecution. LGBT victims must have support from when crime committed to increase confidence in reporting! + going to court!
- [2] Excellent subject matter - more around support sexual assault / rape. Well done David on holding your first ETTS.
- [3] This was an interesting and enjoyable day - I'm really glad I came. Difficult to fit it all in one day but David and the speakers did a very good job.
- [4] Very good networking opportunity.
- [5] No joining instructions received.
- [6] Will there be another one? If so when?
- [8] Great idea but preaching to the converted. FAR too male specific - understandable for THT but all the more reason to sort it out.
- [9] Clearly this was crime-based but wider involvement across government departments including education.
- [10] Great thanks. Good start time for out-of-towners. Thanks!
- [11] Good work - but we have a long way to go. Cheers.
- [13] Excellent thank you. Hope that there is follow-up.
- [14] Needed more than one day.
- [16] Good lunch.
- [18] Unfortunately, LSE did not know of conference. Working group should have divided people from same organisations.
- [19] Would have been helpful to have handouts from speakers. Good luck! Thanks.
- [20] It was needed and well facilitated - well done David!
- [22] More specific thinking about BME, disabilities, transgender etc LGBT.

[24] Very worthwhile, thank you !

Ford Hickson <Ford.Hickson@sigmaresearch.org.uk>

May 2005

[ends]