



Citizenship and
Immigration Canada

Citoyenneté et
Immigration Canada

Evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime

Evaluation Division

July 2010



Canada

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of Citizenship and Immigration Canada or the Government of Canada.

Ci4-61/2011E
978-1-100-18215-5
Ref. No.: ER201103.02E

Table of contents

List of acronyms.....	iii
Executive summary.....	v
Data Collection Strategy on Hate Motivated Crime — Management response	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Introduction and purpose of evaluation	1
1.2. Profile of the nationally standardized Data Collection Strategy on hate-motivated crime	1
1.2.1. Context and objectives.....	1
1.2.2. Delivery approach.....	2
1.2.3. Reporting of hate crime data.....	3
2. Methodology	5
2.1. Evaluation issues and questions.....	5
2.2. Data collection methods.....	5
2.2.1. Stakeholder interviews.....	5
2.2.2. Document review	6
2.2.3. Survey of police services	6
2.2.4. Administrative and financial data review.....	7
2.3. Limitations and considerations.....	7
3. Evaluation findings.....	9
3.1. Relevance	9
3.1.1. Alignment with departmental and federal priorities	9
3.1.2. Need for the Data Collection Strategy.....	11
3.2. Performance	13
3.2.1. Use of Uniform Crime Reporting 2.2 survey.....	13
3.2.2. Training and tools for police services.....	15
3.2.3. Data quality.....	18
3.2.4. Awareness of Hate Crime data	19
3.2.5. Use of Hate Crime data	20
3.3. Alternatives	22
3.3.1. Alternative design/delivery approaches	22
4. Overall conclusions and recommendations	24
Appendix A: Evaluation matrix for the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime.....	27
Appendix B: Detailed methodology	31
Appendix C: List of interviewees.....	33
Appendix D: Interview guides	35
Appendix E: List of documents reviewed	45
Appendix F: Survey of police services	48

List of tables and figures

Table 1-1:	Funding provided from CIC to CCJS for the delivery of the Data Collection Strategy (2005-2006 to 2009-2010).....	3
Table 2-1:	Summary of evaluation issues and questions	5
Table 2-2:	List of interviews by interview group.....	6
Table 2-3:	Number of survey recipients and responses, by type of police service	7
Table 3-1:	Number of police services using UCR2.2, by type of service (2006-2010).....	13
Table 3-2:	Percentage of the Canadian population represented by police-reported Hate Crime data.....	15
Table 3-3:	Number of police services/detachments and participants that received UCR2.2 training (2005-2006 to 2008-2009)	16
Table 3-4:	Total number of services/detachment trained versus number of services/detachments using UCR2.2 (2005-2006 to 2008-2009).....	17
Figure 3-1:	Percentage of police services using UCR2.2, by type of service (2006-2010).....	14

List of acronyms

CACP	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police
CAPAR	Canada's Action Plan Against Racism
CCJS	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GCS	Government Consulting Services
GoC	Government of Canada
GSS	General Social Survey
ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism
LOA	Letter of Agreement
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OGDs	Other Government Departments
OPP	Ontario Provincial Police
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PAA	Program Activity Architecture
POLIS	Police Information Statistics Committee
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
RNC	Royal Newfoundland Constabulary
STC	Statistics Canada
SQ	Sûreté du Québec
UCR	Uniform Crime Reporting Survey

Executive summary

Background and context

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (the Data Collection Strategy). This evaluation was undertaken by Government Consulting Services (GCS) for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) between January and March 2010. The evaluation was conducted to inform future management decisions related to the Data Collection Strategy and to feed into a horizontal evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR), of which the Data Collection Strategy is a part.

The Strategy falls within the mandate of CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, which undertakes activities that aim to strengthen cross-cultural understanding and reduce racism. The key objectives of the Data Collection Strategy are to:

- raise awareness of police to reliably identify and report hate-motivated crime in a manner that is consistent with national reporting standards;
- enhance police service preparedness to report incidents of hate-motivated crime;
- improve understanding of the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime and the response of the justice system; and
- enable monitoring of the impact of societal and legislative changes on this type of crime.

The Data Collection Strategy is delivered by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) at Statistics Canada (STC). CCJS has undertaken the following activities in support of the Strategy:

- developed standardized police-approved definitions related to hate-motivated crime;
- created training materials and delivered on-site training to police services;
- compiled and performed quality assurance on data on hate crime reported by police services across Canada;
- provided assistance and support to police services on hate crime reporting through telephone and e-mail; and
- developed reports on hate crime in Canada and made data and reports available to stakeholders on the STC website.

Methodology

The evaluation used multiple lines of evidence to ensure the reliability of reported results. The following research methods were used to gather data for the evaluation:

- interviews with 24 staff, managers and stakeholders;
- a document review;
- a review of administrative data; and
- a survey of 92 chiefs of police and other members of police services.

Evaluation findings

Relevance

The Data Collection Strategy is aligned with federal priorities and roles.

Overall, the evaluation found that the Data Collection Strategy demonstrates a high degree of relevancy both in the context of aligning with federal priorities related to social inclusion and crime and in light of Canada's international commitments to collect hate crime data. The federal government is also naturally placed to provide the pan-Canadian and cross-jurisdictional activities that are required of the Strategy.

Due to the recent transition of the Multiculturalism Branch from the Department of Canadian Heritage to CIC, it remains unclear how the Data Collection Strategy links to CIC's strategic outcomes.

Recommendation: CIC will need to ensure that the link between the Data Collection Strategy and CIC's strategic outcomes is clear in its updated Program Activity Architecture (PAA), which is currently under development.

Canada's demographics are changing and certain groups are at risk of being the victims of hate crimes.

Canadian society is experiencing increasing diversity, with growing populations of visible minorities, same-sex couples, and an increasingly varied religious composition. These social and demographic changes are risk factors for hate crimes. Further, evidence suggests there is continued intolerance in Canadian society against racial, sexual and religious minority groups.

There is overwhelming support for the National Data Collection Strategy.

Police services, academics, members of NGOs and other stakeholders consulted for the evaluation overwhelmingly supported the rationale for the Data Collection Strategy, suggesting that there is a need to have consistent data on hate crime across Canada.

Performance

The Data Collection Strategy has been successfully implemented, with a large majority of police services using the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey Version 2.2 (UCR2.2) and a large percentage of the population is represented by the data.

The number of police services using UCR2.2 (the records management systems that includes hate crime variables) has steadily increased over the past five years. The hate crime data have, as a result, become more national in scope and now represent 52% of the Canadian population, or 88% when combined with the supplemental survey. With the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) recently converting to UCR2.2, the representativeness of the data will further increase.

Current gaps in training coverage and the growing use of UCR2.2 will present training challenges.

The training provided by CCJS has not been able to keep up with the number of police services beginning to report hate crime using UCR2.2. Given the fact that nearly 800 new police services/detachments have recently converted to using UCR2.2, this gap is likely to grow. The information from the evaluation shows that training is perceived as important in ensuring the consistency and quality of hate crime reporting, thus the demonstrated gap in training coverage may be negatively affecting the data to date.

Recommendation: CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.

Training provided by CCJS is viewed as useful and of good quality and is key to ensuring that police services apply a standard definition of hate crime.

The training sessions and materials provided by the Strategy were seen by those who had received them as high quality and very useful and appear to be a critical component of the initiative. It was reported that the training provided police services with the knowledge and tools required to identify and report hate crime data and helped to improve the quality of the hate crime data, by ensuring that a common definition of hate crime is used. The use of a common definition ensures that hate crime data are reported consistently across the country.

The hate crime data need to be better marketed to stakeholders.

The hate crime statistics have been presented in three annual reports developed by CCJS. These reports, as well as data tables and conference presentations, have provided stakeholders with near-national information on hate crime, as well as the ability to compare rates of police-reported hate crime for different cities in Canada. CCJS has undertaken dissemination activities common to STC, and participated in a number of conferences and workshops that have publicized the Data Collection Strategy and its findings. Marketing to date by CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, has comprised presentations at the 2009 and 2010 Metropolis Conferences.

There appear to be gaps in awareness of the information produced by the Strategy, at least among those police services and stakeholders consulted for the evaluation. This is likely related to the fact that there have been only three years of data to report to-date. Note that although academics and those working in the criminal justice system are seen as the main target groups for the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy, it would appear that police services also view the information products as useful and beneficial to their work.

Recommendation: As coverage increases and more years of data are added, CIC should explore methods to increase awareness of the Strategy and subsequent usage, including to police services.

Those who are aware of the information are using it and say it has had an impact on their understanding of hate crime. As coverage increases and more years of data are available, the usefulness of the data is likely to increase.

It was a challenge to identify stakeholders for the evaluation, particularly academics, and those interviewed and surveyed do not represent all users of the information. However, of those who were interviewed and surveyed, many reported that the information increased their understanding of hate crime in Canada. While there are limited data on the usage of the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy, the available data suggest that the information is generally considered to be useful by police services and stakeholders who have consulted it. The evaluation identified few specific changes to policies, programs or services made as a result of the Strategy, although it may not be reasonable to expect such changes to be achieved as a result of the data.

Reasons why the information is not being used, as reported by interviewees, were related to a lack of confidence in the data (i.e., only three years of data are available, concerns of under-reporting of hate crime, and information products had not been sufficiently timely to be useful for their purposes). As more police services use UCR2.2 and as more years of data are available, the utility of the data will likely increase.

Alternatives

CCJS is the most appropriate delivery agent for the Data Collection Strategy.

There are no other sources of national, police-reported data on hate crime in Canada. There was wide support for CCJS delivering the Data Collection Strategy and no strong evidence of viable delivery alternatives. CCJS is perceived as the most objective, expert and credible organization to deliver the strategy and has the capacity and the positive pre-existing relationships with police services to effectively deliver the Strategy. The Data Collection Strategy is also well-situated with CCJS given that CCJS is already collecting national data on crime as part of its established role in Canada.

The Data Collection Strategy is providing value for the cost.

Given the amount of resources provided to CCJS for the Data Collection Strategy relative to its activities, the costs to CIC appear to be reasonable. Its delivery using an existing data collection system (UCR) has likely reduced the cost for implementation. The funding has also resulted in value to the Strategy in that it allows for the carrying-out of activities (e.g., administration of the supplemental survey, delivery of training to police services) which have contributed to the completeness and consistency of the hate crime data, and which otherwise may not have been undertaken.

Recommendation: As above.

CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.

Data Collection Strategy on Hate Motivated Crime — Management response

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implementation Date
I. Program relevance				
1. The Data Collection Strategy demonstrates a high degree of relevancy both in the context of aligning with federal priorities related to social inclusion and crime, and in light of Canada's international commitments to collect hate crime data.	Agreed	No action required.		
2. Due to the recent transition of the Multiculturalism Branch from the Department of Canadian Heritage to CIC, it remains unclear how the Data Collection Strategy links to CIC's strategic outcomes. Recommendation: CIC will need to ensure that the link between the Data Collection Strategy and CIC's strategic outcomes is clear in its updated Program Activity Architecture (PAA).	Upcoming updates to CIC's PAA reflect the transfer of the Multiculturalism Program from Canadian Heritage to CIC. One of CIC's strategic outcomes under the new PAA is that "Newcomers and citizens participate to their full potential in fostering an integrated society". Hate crimes have been identified as a barrier that might preclude the full participation of newcomers or citizens in a diverse society; the development of appropriate institutional responses to hate crime relies on the collection of accurate data.	Linkages between the Data Collection Strategy and CIC's strategic outcomes are reflected in CIC's new PAA and its accompanying PMF, which were approved by TBS on August 6th, 2010, and will be in effect as of FY 2011-2012.	CIC will be accountable to Treasury Board for its PAA commitments.	FY 2011-2012
II. Program design and implementation				
3. The Data Collection Strategy has been successfully implemented, with a large majority of police services using the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey Version 2.2 (UCR2.2) and a large percentage of the population being represented by the data. This trend in comprehensiveness will continue with the recent addition of the RCMP and OPP.	Agreed	No action required.		

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implementation Date
<p>4. Training provided by CCJS is viewed as useful and of good quality, and is key to ensuring that police services apply a standard definition of hate crime. However, current gaps in training coverage and the growing use of UCR2.2 will present training challenges.</p> <p>Recommendation: CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.</p>	<p>Agreed and this is a key element to the entire intervention in the Hate Motivated Crime domain.</p>	<p>Reinforce that the training is a main activity to be carried out under the LOA between CIC and StatCan CCJS. CIC will meet with CCJS in order to reinforce the message that gaps should be addressed and to discuss possible strategies to fill the identified gaps in training.</p>	<p>CMB</p>	<p>Q3/Q4 2010-11</p>
<p>III. Program Impact</p>				
<p>5. There appear to be gaps in the level of stakeholder awareness of the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation: As coverage increases and more years of data are added, CIC should explore methods to increase awareness of the Strategy and subsequent usage, including to police services.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>CCJS announces the release of the report to all police services through CPIC - sends it directly to a committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, our FPT Justice Liaison Officers, as well as an academic advisory group. CCJS also provides highlights directly to the media on release day through the Stats Can Daily.</p>	<p>CIC will include a web link as the CIC web strategy is developed.</p> <p>The Multiculturalism Program will develop a distribution list of key OGDs, universities, and other stakeholders to disseminate the report electronically in a timely manner.</p>	<p>CMB</p>	<p>Q3 2010-11</p>
<p>6. Those who are aware of the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy are using it and say it has had an impact on their understanding of hate crime.</p>	<p>Agreed - The information produced by the Data Collection Strategy has helped CIC to identify groups at risk and to expand its actions combating racism and discrimination. CIC is currently exploring interfaith and intercultural initiatives in order to address tensions between and within ethno-cultural communities.</p>	<p>No action required</p>		

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implementation Date
IV. Cost-effectiveness & alternatives				
7. There are no other sources of national, police-reported data on hate crime in Canada. There was wide support for CCJS delivering the Data Collection Strategy and no strong evidence of viable delivery alternatives.	Agreed	No action required.		
8. Given the amount of resources provided to CCJS for the Data Collection Strategy relative to its activities, the costs to CIC appear to be reasonable. Recommendation: As per #4 CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.	Agreed - The performance of the Data Collection Strategy is based on the awareness of hate crime data and their use. Training and tools development are also a key factor of the Data Collection Strategy's success.	As related to the finding #4, CIC will work with CCJS to review the allocation of expenses and activities carried out under the LOA to ensure that the training stays at least at current level in the future.	CMB	Q3 2010-11

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction and purpose of evaluation

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (the Data Collection Strategy). The data collection was undertaken by Government Consulting Services (GCS) for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) between January and March, 2010. The evaluation was conducted to inform future management decisions related to the Data Collection Strategy, and to feed into a horizontal evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR), of which the Strategy is a part.

The report is organized into four main sections.

- Section 1 presents a profile of the Data Collection Strategy;
- Section 2 presents the methodology for the evaluation and discusses methodological considerations;
- Section 3 presents the findings, organized by theme; and
- Section 4 presents the overall conclusions.

This report is accompanied by a supplemental document which contains the appendices cited throughout this report.

1.2. Profile of the nationally standardized Data Collection Strategy on hate-motivated crime

1.2.1. Context and objectives

The Data Collection Strategy was originally funded as part of CAPAR, beginning in 2004-2005.¹ CAPAR seeks to contribute to the elimination of racism and the achievement of equitable socio-economic outcomes for all Canadians by:

- strengthening social cohesion through anti-racism measures;
- enhancing the implementation of Canada's human rights and diversity frameworks; and
- demonstrating federal government leadership in eliminating racism.

Its goals are to help ensure that: all Canadians are included and have a role in Canadian society and the Canadian economy regardless of background, race or ethnicity; all barriers to full and active participation and opportunity are eliminated; and the justice system is equipped to respond to overt manifestations of racism in society. As part of CAPAR, several federal departments are involved in a series of initiatives and strategies that aim to contribute to the elimination of racism and the achievement of equitable socio-economic outcomes for all.

¹ Prior to CAPAR, Statistics Canada, through its Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, undertook preliminary activities related to hate crime data reporting. Beginning in 1999, a four-year project was undertaken by CCJS, funded through the federal Policy Research Initiative. This project examined sources of available hate crime data and undertook a pilot survey, in collaboration with 12 police services across Canada, to assess the feasibility of collecting nationally standardized hate crime data.

When launched under CAPAR, the Data Collection Strategy was managed by the Multiculturalism Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage. The Branch, and responsibility for the Initiative, was transferred to CIC in October 2008. The key objectives of the Data Collection Strategy are to:

- raise awareness of police to reliably identify and report hate-motivated crime in a manner that is consistent with national reporting standards;
- enhance police service preparedness to report incidents of hate-motivated crime;
- improve understanding of the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime and the response of the justice system; and
- enable monitoring of the impact of societal and legislative changes on this type of crime.

Hate-motivated crime (or “hate crime”) is defined by Statistics Canada (STC) and police services as “a criminal violation motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor.”²

1.2.2. Delivery approach

CIC has a Letter of Agreement (LOA) with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS), STC to undertake work under the Data Collection Strategy. The mandate of CCJS is to provide information to the justice community as well as the public on criminal and civil justice in Canada. Through the Data Collection Strategy, CCJS has undertaken the following major activities specifically related to hate-motivated crime:

- developed standardized police-approved definitions related to hate-motivated crime;
- created training materials and delivered on-site training to police services across Canada (training provides police services with information related to the benefits of collecting hate crime data, investigation indicators for police, and how to report data in a standardized manner, among other topics);
- compiled data on hate crime reported by police services and verified and performed quality control on the data, in collaboration with police services (following CCJS’s quality assurance protocols, data submissions are sent back to each police service for final sign-off);
- provided assistance and support to police services on hate crime reporting through telephone and e-mail; and
- developed reports on hate crime in Canada and made data and reports available to stakeholders on the STC website.

At CCJS, the Data Collection Strategy is primarily delivered by two staff members: a senior analyst, who undertakes and supervises data compilation, validation, and analysis; and a training officer, who delivers training and support to police services across Canada. Other CCJS resources provide additional management and delivery support as needed.

As per its responsibilities under its LOA, CCJS provides annual project reports to CIC, which specify all activities undertaken for the Strategy (e.g., number of training sessions provided, number of services participating). This information is, in turn, used by CIC as part of its reporting commitments for CAPAR.

² Statistic Canada. *UCR2.2 Training Manual*

CCJS was provided with operations and maintenance (O&M) funding from CIC to administer the Data Collection Strategy, in amounts set out in annual LOAs between the two organizations. Between 2005-2006 and 2009-2010, CIC provided CCJS with \$1.66 million for the Data Collection Strategy (Table 1-1).³ Information from CIC indicates that CCJS will continue to receive \$200,000 per year for the Strategy over the next five years from the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch budget.

Table 1-1: Funding provided from CIC to CCJS for the delivery of the Data Collection Strategy (2005-2006 to 2009-2010)

Fiscal Year	Amount
2005-2006	\$510,500
2006-2007	\$300,000
2007-2008	\$400,000
2008-2009	\$250,000
2009-2010	\$200,000
Total	\$1,660,500

1.2.3. Reporting of hate crime data

Police services participating in the Data Collection Strategy report hate crime data to CCJS through one of two methods:

Uniform Crime Reporting Survey, Version 2.2 (UCR2.2): is an annual survey that extracts administrative data from police services' existing electronic records management systems. UCR2.2 was an add-on to a system that was already in place to collect other crime statistics. The existing Uniform Crime Reporting Survey collects data on a wide range of criminal offences such as homicides, robberies, theft and fraud.⁴ Hate crime data can only be collected through UCR2.2, which also provides data related to cyber-crime, organized crime, and other variables submitted to CCJS as part of crime data reporting by police services.

Supplemental Survey: for those participating police services that report UCR2 data but who have not updated to the newer UCR2.2 version, data on hate crime were collected by CCJS in 2006, 2007, and 2008 from police services through a supplemental hate crime survey. These police services were asked to identify those criminal incidents that were motivated by hate and to manually provide CCJS with characteristics of each incident. CCJS then entered the data from paper-based supplemental surveys into an electronic database and performed quality verification checks on the data collected.

³ The Data Collection Strategy received \$575,127 from the CAPAR funding allocation in 2004-2005.

⁴ There are two versions of the UCR collection instrument in operation at different police services: the UCR Aggregate (UCR1.0) Survey and the UCR2 Incident-based Survey (UCR2 Survey). UCR1.0 collects summary data for nearly 100 separate criminal offences and has been in place since 1962. To collect more detailed information on each incident, victims and accused persons, the UCR2 Survey was developed in the mid-1980's. This alternative method of data collection in which a separate statistical record is created for each criminal incident is known as an "incident-based" reporting system. The first respondent reported incident-based data in 1988. A revised version of the UCR2 survey known as UCR2.1 was introduced in 1998. This survey introduced certain efficiencies for police services and lowered response burden by eliminating or simplifying UCR2 variables. Then, in 2004, another version named UCR 2.2 was introduced to take into account new violations/variables such as organized crime, cyber crime, hate crime and geocode information. Police services must upgrade to UCR2.2 to be able to report hate crime data through the UCR system.

The hate crime data provided through the UCR2.2 include information related to the type of incident, motivation (i.e., whether motivated by hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or other similar factor), and characteristics of the offender and victim (if applicable). The supplemental survey provides information on the incidents, but does not include data on the characteristics of the offender or victim, so is not as comprehensive.

2. Methodology

2.1. Evaluation issues and questions

The evaluation of the Data Collection Strategy examined issues related to relevance, performance, and alternatives. Table 2-1 details the evaluation issues and questions addressed in the evaluation (see Appendix A for the complete evaluation matrix, which also includes specific indicators and methodologies for each evaluation question).

Table 2-1: Summary of evaluation issues and questions

Evaluation issue	Evaluation question
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there a continued need for a nationally standardized Data Collection Strategy on hate-motivated crime?• Does the Data Collection Strategy continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities?• Is the Strategy consistent with federal roles and responsibilities?
Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do police services and other stakeholders understand the utility and necessity of collecting hate-motivated crime data?• Do police services have the training and tools necessary to identify and collect standardized hate-motivated crime data?• Is Statistics Canada collecting high-quality, nationally standardized hate-motivated crime data?• To what extent is nationally standardized hate-motivated crime data made available?• Do stakeholders have an understanding of the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime provided by Statistics Canada?• Have stakeholders applied their knowledge of hate-motivated crime to improve programs, policies and services?
Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is Statistics Canada the most suitable delivery mechanism for the data strategy?

2.2. Data collection methods

The evaluation of the Data Collection Strategy included the use of multiple lines of evidence and complementary research methods to help ensure the reliability of information and data collected. The following data collection methods were used to gather data for the evaluation:

- stakeholder interviews;
- document review;
- review of administrative data; and
- survey of police services.

Each of these methods is briefly described in the following section. Appendix B provides additional detail on these methods.

2.2.1. Stakeholder interviews

A total of 24 interviews were completed for the evaluation. Interviews were undertaken with four key stakeholder groups: CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch; CCJS; the Police Information Statistics Committee (POLIS); and other stakeholders, including non-governmental

organizations (NGOs), academics, other government departments (OGDs), and international representatives. The number of interviews completed for each interview group is illustrated in Table 2-2 (see Appendix C for a list of interviewees and Appendix D for the interview guides).

Table 2-2: List of interviews by interview group

Interview Group	Number of Interviews Conducted
CIC Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch	3
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics	2
Police Information Statistics Committee	9
Other Stakeholders	10
Total	24

2.2.2. Document review

Documentation was reviewed primarily to inform an assessment of the relevance of the Data Collection Strategy and to determine whether any feasible alternatives exist. (Appendix E contains a list of documents that were reviewed for the evaluation.) The following types of documentation were reviewed during the evaluation:

Corporate, accountability and political documents: included CIC’s Departmental Performance Reports and Reports on Plans and Priorities, agreements between CIC and CCJS, and Speeches from the Throne.

Materials produced by the Strategy: included CCJS annual project reports, presentations and training materials.

Hate Crime Reports and Academic Papers: included the CCJS annual hate crime reports and academic literature that provided information and perspectives on hate crime in Canada.

International Reports and Conventions: included documents related to Canada’s participation in any world conferences on racism and Canada’s response to international reporting commitments.

2.2.3. Survey of police services

A survey was administered to municipal, provincial and federal police services to gather information on whether they believe there is a need to have hate crime data collected in a standardized way, whether and how they find the data useful, and their perceptions of the training provided by CCJS. The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP) administered the survey on CIC’s behalf. The CACP has 428 active members from police services across Canada. The active membership list was cleaned to ensure that the survey was targeted to the appropriate population. The survey was pre-tested with selected POLIS interviewees that included federal, provincial, and municipal police services. (See Appendix F for the survey.)

The CACP e-mailed the survey to a total of 368 members.⁵ In a separate e-mail, 26 First Nations police services were sent the survey (using a distribution list located on the First Nations Chiefs of Police Association website). In total the survey was sent to 394 individuals (Table 2-3). In efforts to increase the survey coverage, the communiqué that accompanied the survey asked that the survey be forwarded to anyone else within the police service that might be able to respond. A total of 92 responses were received. Every effort was made to ensure wide coverage, however, a low number of

⁵ In some cases, the survey was sent to multiple individuals within one police service.

responses were received from certain types of services. Due to the approach used for survey administration (i.e., recipients were asked to forward the survey to others), a response rate for the survey cannot be calculated.

Table 2-3: Number of survey recipients and responses, by type of police service

Type of Police Service	Number of Recipients	Number of Responses
Municipal	248	77
First Nation	26	6
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	78	4
Ontario Provincial Police	11	4
Sûreté du Québec	18	
Royal Newfoundland Constabulary	5	0
Military Police	8	1
Total	394	92

2.2.4. Administrative and financial data review

A review of administrative data was completed to establish the level of activities/outputs of the Strategy. These data included: the number of training and workshops delivered, the results of training feedback forms, the number of presentations or conferences attended, and the number of police services using UCR2.2. This information was extracted from the annual CCJS project reports and the annual CAPAR reporting template.

Financial information from the Data Collection Strategy was also examined to determine the total costs of the initiative.

2.3. Limitations and considerations

There are several methodological limitations and considerations that should be noted. In light of these considerations, the evaluation was designed to use multiple lines of evidence (e.g., interviews, survey, administrative data, documentation) to strengthen the reliability and validity of the evaluation results.

The sample for the survey of police services did not include all police services across Canada.

No complete contact list of all police services and detachments across Canada was identified during the evaluation. While effort was undertaken by the evaluation team to include wide coverage of police services in the survey sample, not all police services were surveyed, as not all services were either active members of CACP or included in the list of First Nations police services. Furthermore, as the e-mail communiqué encouraged police services to forward the survey invitation to other relevant members of their police service, and as survey responses could not be tracked by specific police service, the coverage across police services represented by survey respondents is not known. Survey respondents were most likely to be employed at municipal police services, and relatively few respondents were employed at RCMP detachments or with provincial police services. As a result, the survey of police services is not representative of the universe of police services across Canada.

Survey and interview respondents had varying degrees of familiarity with the Data Collection Strategy and may not have represented all stakeholders making use of the information produced by the initiative.

The evaluation aimed to obtain input from a wide range of stakeholders through both the survey of police services and interviews with academics, NGOs and OGDs. However, survey and interview respondents demonstrated varying degrees of familiarity with the Data Collection Strategy and responses reflected this range of knowledge. While effort was expended to obtain the input from the most suitable representatives, it is not known whether respondents represented those most knowledgeable about the Data Collection Strategy at their organization. This was perhaps an issue at larger police services, for example, where there may be multiple staff members (including research analysts) familiar with the available crime statistics in Canada. The survey respondent, who in many cases was the Chief of Police, may not have been the main user of the hate crime information products.

Identifying academic researchers and other stakeholders who had made use of the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy proved to be a challenge. While effort was made to identify and interview relevant academics, government policy makers and staff of non-governmental organizations, it is possible that some were missed. Since no lists of those who had accessed the information products, or received CCJS training, were available to the evaluation team, it is not known whether there were major beneficiaries of the Data Collection Strategy who were not consulted for the evaluation.

3. Evaluation findings

This section presents the findings of the evaluation, organized by the three major evaluation areas (relevance, performance and alternatives) and by major identified themes.

3.1. Relevance

3.1.1. Alignment with departmental and federal priorities

***Finding:** The Data Collection Strategy was explicitly aligned with federal government priorities at the time of its implementation. When situated within Canadian Heritage, the Data Collection Strategy was linked to departmental strategic outcomes. No similar linkage has yet been made with CIC, where it is currently housed, although the department's Program Activity Architecture (PAA) is being revised to reflect the mandate of the Multiculturalism Program. The role of the federal government in managing and delivering the Data Collection Strategy is appropriate, as national coordination is a key component of the initiative.*

Alignment with federal priorities

Documentation reviewed for the evaluation provides strong evidence that the Data Collection Strategy was well-aligned with federal government priorities to address gaps in hate crime information. In June 2003, the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration recommended that the Government of Canada (GoC) monitor hate crimes and report the findings to Parliament.⁶ The Speech from the Throne that followed in October 2004 stated that the GoC was committed to being a “steadfast advocate of inclusion” and would take measures to “strengthen Canada's ability to combat racism, hate-speech and hate crimes”.⁷ Further, CAPAR (2005) recognized the need to collect nationally standardized hate crime data and specifically stated that the Multiculturalism Program, in collaboration with CCJS, was implementing a “nationally standardized data-collection strategy on hate-motivated crime and a training and assistance program for police to support collection and reporting”.⁸

The Data Collection Strategy can be seen to fit within the current Government’s more recent stated commitment to further social inclusion and harmony. The 2010 Speech from the Throne identified “Strengthening a United Canada in a Changing World” as part of the GoC’s “broader agenda”, and noted that “[t]o be Canadian is to show the world that people drawn from every nation can live in harmony”.⁹

The Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch representatives interviewed for the evaluation also suggested that the Data Collection Strategy is a priority for the GoC and indicated that it supports GoC priorities related to inclusion and law and order.

⁶ House of Commons Canada. Settlement and Integration: A Sense of Belonging “Feeling at Home” – Report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, June 2003. Accessed online at:

cmte.parl.gc.ca/Content/HOC/committee/372/cimm/reports/rp1032308/cimmrp05/cimmrp05-e.pdf.

⁷ Government of Canada. Speech from the Throne, October 5, 2004. Accessed online at: dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/SO1-1-2004-1E.pdf.

⁸ Government of Canada. Canada’s Action Plan Against Racism. Accessed online at: dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/CH34-7-2005E.pdf Page 49.

⁹ Government of Canada. Speech from the Throne. March 3, 2010. Accessed online at: www.speech.gc.ca/grfx/docs/sft-ddt-2010_e.pdf

Alignment with departmental strategic outcomes and priorities

The Data Collection Strategy was aligned with one of Canadian Heritage's strategic outcome as listed in its 2008-2009 Report on Plans and Priorities: "Canada is an inclusive society built on intercultural understanding and citizen participation."¹⁰ The department's Multiculturalism Branch, which had responsibility for the Data Collection Strategy, was transferred to CIC in October 2008. Interviewees from the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch at CIC suggested that the Strategy is aligned with CIC's departmental outcomes related to integration and social cohesion. However, CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch is not yet linked to CIC's strategic outcomes in the department's PAA, although this is currently in progress. It is worth noting that CIC now has responsibility for the *Multiculturalism Act*, which requires all federal institutions to develop policies, programs and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada, and specifically includes integration issues for both new and established Canadians.

The Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism has also directly spoken out against anti-Semitism and other forms of hate in recent speeches. The Minister recently referred to the statistics on anti-Semitic hate crime produced by the Data Collection Strategy in speeches to the Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Anti-Semitism (February 8, 2010) and at a Conference of Ministers of Education Center for Dialogue and Prayer during the 65th Anniversary of the Liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau in Oswiecim, Poland (January 27, 2010).¹¹

Alignment with federal roles and responsibilities

Managing and delivering the Data Collection Strategy is an appropriate role for the federal government. As mentioned by CIC interviewees, the federal government is best placed to manage the Data Collection Strategy, as the initiative requires coordination and collaboration with numerous types of organizations and levels of government (including municipal, provincial, federal, and First Nations police services) across all ten provinces and three territories. The federal government is naturally placed to compile data and work with police services from across these multiple jurisdictions.

The federal government is also well-placed to respond to Canada's international commitments. Canada is a signatory to the United Nations' International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ICERD), and, as per Article 9 of the Convention, submits periodic reports on its implementation of the convention, which includes reporting on such matters as hate crimes.¹²

Canada is also a participating state of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), whose Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) works with members to combat intolerance and discrimination, including through collecting hate crime data. ODIHR publishes reports on hate crime statistics compiled from its member states.¹³

¹⁰ Department of Canadian Heritage. Report on Plans and Priorities. 2008-2009.

¹¹ Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Speeches 2010. Accessed online at: www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2010/index.asp

¹² International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Seventieth Session February 19 to 9 March 2007. Consideration of Reports Submitted by Statesparties Under Article 9 of the Convention.

¹³ Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region – Incidents and Responses – Annual Report 2008. November 2009.

3.1.2. Need for the Data Collection Strategy

***Finding:** The evaluation found that there is a continued need for the Data Collection Strategy. Monitoring hate crime is important in the context of Canada's increasing racial, religious and sexual diversity. Police services and other stakeholders were overwhelmingly supportive of the Strategy and it supports Canada's international reporting commitments.*

Context and prevalence of hate crime in Canada

According to research on hate crime, those individuals most at risk of being victimized by hate and bias activity include: racial and ethnic minority groups or individuals; religious minorities; and gays and lesbians.¹⁴

Research also shows that that Canada's population is becoming increasingly diverse, with its racial, cultural, religious, linguistic and demographic compositions continuously changing. Canada is home to more than 200 ethnic groups, with 16% of its population identifying as a visible minority. Information from the Census (referenced in the CCJS 2009 Hate Crime Report) showed that Canada's visible minority population grew 27% from 2001 to 2006, five times faster than the population as a whole. The country is also experiencing increasing visibility of gays and lesbians, as demonstrated through increasing numbers of same-sex couples, which increased by 33% over the same period. Further, the religious composition of the country is also changing, with some of the largest increases between 1991 and 2001 seen in Muslim, Hindu, Sikh and Buddhist denominations.¹⁵

There is evidence to suggest that within the context of this growing diversity, there are signs of intolerance. For example, the Ethnic Diversity Survey (2002) found that nearly one-half of Blacks and one-third of South Asians and Chinese respondents reported having been the victim of discrimination and unfair treatment in the previous five years.¹⁶ A 2003 Ekos survey found that 46% of Aboriginal people living off-reserve stated that they had been a victim of racism or discrimination over the previous two years because of their origin.¹⁷

There were 1,036 hate-motivated crimes reported by Canadian police in 2008, the most recent year for which data had been released by CCJS at the time of the evaluation. This number was up from 765 incidents in 2007 and 892 in 2006, the first year that near-national statistics on hate crimes were available. Note that this increase may be due, in part, to heightened public awareness of these types of incidents as well as improved reporting practices by police. The vast majority of hate crimes reported in 2008 were motivated by race (55%), religion (26%) or sexual orientation (16%). A little less than one-half of hate-motivated crimes were mischief offences such as graffiti and about 5% were violent offences. While less than 1% of crimes are motivated by hate, research suggests that hate crimes can have a resounding effect on larger communities, and on Canada as a whole.¹⁸ Perry (2009) states that in addition to the impacts on the victims themselves, hate crimes can also be

¹⁴ Shaw, Margaret and Olivier Barchachat. Preventing Hate Crimes: International Strategies and Practice, April 2002.

¹⁵ Statistics Canada. Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada. Juristat Article by Phil Walsh and Mia Dauvergne, May 2009, vol. 29, no. 2.

¹⁶ Government of Canada. Canada's Action Plan Against Racism. 2005.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Statistics Canada. Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada, 2008. Juristat Article by Mia Dauvergne, Summer 2010, vol. 30, no. 2.

perceived as a warning to all members of the victim's community and hate crime can result in a collective fear within the victim's cultural group or community.¹⁹

Information gathered from interviews and the survey is consistent with this research. Almost one-half of interviewees, and 59% of survey respondents, indicated that hate crime was prevalent in Canada. Survey respondents also generally indicated that the prevalence of hate crime in recent years had remained unchanged (41%) or had increased (23%).

Stakeholder views on need for nationally standardized Hate Crime data

Police services and other stakeholders consulted for the evaluation overwhelmingly supported the rationale for collecting nationally standardized hate crime data. Overall, 96% agreed that hate-motivated crime was an important issue. In addition, 97% agreed that there is a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime in Canada, primarily because the data are useful in informing the work undertaken by police services (91%) and for comparing hate-motivated crime statistics from their own area with those of other areas, and with Canada overall (92%).

Those interviewed for the evaluation were all of the opinion that the Data Collection Strategy is needed, primarily because there is a general need for data on the prevalence of hate crime, there is a need for consistency in hate crime data across Canada, and because nationally standardized data is needed to inform policy decisions.

International commitments

International bodies have also emphasized the need to collect and report hate-motivated crime statistics. During its assessment for the period of June 2001 to spring 2005, ICERD's Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination noted the absence in Canada of general statistical information on hate crimes, disaggregated by ethnic and racial group, at that time.²⁰ OSCE has called for countries to adopt data collection procedures that are rigorous and standardized.²¹ This is consistent with the declaration that followed the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (Durban, South Africa, 2001), which urged member states to collect and report, at the national and local levels, statistical data to assess regularly the situation of individuals and groups of individuals who are victims of racism and related intolerance.²²

Canada will also be a signatory to the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism, which states that governments should provide publicly accessible statistics on hate crimes, and police services should ensure that anti-Semitic incidents are routine components of crime reporting.²³ The London Declaration emerged from the London Conference on Combating Anti-Semitism (2009),

¹⁹ Perry, Barbara. Counting – and Countering – Hate Crime. Paper Presented at OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, October 5, 2009, Warsaw Poland. Accessed online at: www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2009/10/40235_en.pdf

²⁰ International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Seventieth Session February 19 to 9 March 2007. Consideration of Reports Submitted by Statesparties Under Article 9 of the Convention.

²¹ Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region – Incidents and Responses – Annual Report 2008. November 2009.

²² World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance – Declaration. 2001.

²³ London Declaration on Combating Antisemitism. Communities and Local Government website, Government of the United Kingdom. Accessed online at: www.communities.gov.uk/documents/corporate/pdf/1151284.pdf.

hosted by the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Anti-Semitism and the United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Collecting nationally standardized hate crime data is also consistent with practices outside Canada. Other countries have begun to collect and report nationally standardized hate crime data, although this is not consistently the case even across Europe and North America. In the United States, hate-motivated crime data collected by individual law enforcement agencies is compiled and presented in the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Report, but only approximately 20% of relevant police agencies were in compliance with this initiative in 2008.²⁴ Canada was, in fact, a leader in this practice. The Vienna Hate Crime Conference (November 2006) urged countries to follow the Canadian model of hate crime data collection.

3.2. Performance

3.2.1. Use of Uniform Crime Reporting 2.2 survey

***Finding:** The number of police services reporting hate crime data using UCR2.2 has been increasing each year. Hate crime data are now representative of a large percentage of the Canadian population and are increasingly more comprehensive, as more services switch from using the supplemental survey to UCR2.2.*

Use of the Uniform Crime Reporting survey, version 2.2

Information provided by STC shows that, while the numbers vary slightly from year to year, as of January 2010, there were 1,198 separate police detachments, comprising 201 different police services in Canada. Since the Data Collection Strategy began, the number of those services/detachments that have converted to UCR2.2 has significantly increased (Table 3-1).

Table 3-1: Number of police services using UCR2.2, by type of service (2006-2010)

Type of Police Service	January 2006	January 2007	January 2008	January 2009	January 2010
Municipal services	28	32	70	76	136
Royal Canadian Mounted Police detachments	23	52	151	179	703
Ontario Provincial Police detachments	0	0	0	3	198
Sûreté du Québec detachments	0	0	94	96	95
Royal Newfoundland Constabulary detachments	0	3	3	3	3
Total	51	87	318	357	1,135

Source: Statistics Canada, Respondent Library.

In the first year that the Strategy received funding under CAPAR (2005-2006), a total of 51 police services/detachments were reporting hate crime data using UCR2.2. This included 28 municipal police services and 23 RCMP detachments in British Columbia. Since that time, the number of municipal police services using UCR2.2 has climbed steadily, with a total of 136 (of 197) services using UCR2.2 as of January 2010 (Table 3-1).²⁵ Similarly, the number of RCMP detachments using

²⁴ Perry, Barbara. Counting – and Countering – Hate Crime. Paper Presented at OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, October 5, 2009, Warsaw Poland. Accessed online at: www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2009/10/40235_en.pdf.


²⁵ The information on the number of polices services over time has been provided by STC. Note that these figures are estimates only.

UCR2.2 has steadily increased over time; however, the majority of detachments did not convert to UCR2.2 until 2010 (all 703 RCMP detachments are using UCR2.2 as of January 2010).

Canada’s three provincial police forces have now also converted to UCR2.2. All three Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) detachments began using UCR2.2 in 2006. The Sûreté du Québec (SQ) began participation in 2007 and currently 95 of its 96 detachments are using UCR2.2. While the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) saw a few detachments convert to UCR2.2 in 2008 (i.e., 3), virtually all of the detachments (198 of 199) converted as of January 2010.

Therefore, as of January 2010, a total of 1,135 separate detachments (95% of all detachments) were using UCR2.2 (Figure 3-1). There are no First Nations police services currently using UCR2.2, although information from STC indicates that one will begin participation this year. Note that STC does not necessarily expect to have full participation of all Canadian police services, recognizing that not all will have the capacity (e.g., technical, financial) to convert to UCR2.2. This is consistent with information provided by interviewees, who also noted these capacity barriers. As a result, full participation in UCR2.2 will not be possible within the current resources available to police services.

Figure 3-1: Percentage of police services using UCR2.2, by type of service (2006-2010)



Population coverage

As discussed, in the first year of the Data Collection Strategy (2005), a total of 51 police services were reporting hate crime data using UCR2.2 (Table 3-2). For that year, STC calculated that the data were representative of 16% of the Canadian population. As more services/detachments have begun using UCR2.2, the percentage of the Canadian population represented by the data has also increased, up to 52% in 2008. With the introduction of the supplemental survey, in 2006, the percentage of the Canadian population represented by the hate crime data increased to 87%, and to 88% by 2008.

Table 3-2: Percentage of the Canadian population represented by police-reported Hate Crime data

Year	Number of Services/Detachments Using UCR2.2	Population Coverage from UCR2.2 (%)	Population Coverage from Supplemental Survey (%)	Combined coverage (%) ²⁶
2005	51	16	--	16
2006	87	21	66	87
2007	318	48	39	87
2008	357	52	35	88
2009 ²⁷	1,135	--	--	--

Over time, the percentage of the Canadian population represented by UCR2.2 has increased, while the percentage of the Canadian population represented by the supplemental survey has decreased, thus suggesting that more services have switched from using the supplemental survey to UCR2.2. This has had an impact on the overall comprehensiveness of the data, as the information gathered through UCR2.2 is more detailed than that gathered via the supplemental survey, as described in Section 1.2 (Profile of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime). Due to the number of new services using UCR 2.2 as of March 2010, the percentage of the population covered by UCR2.2 reporting is expected to further increase.

3.2.2. Training and tools for police services

***Finding:** Training and tools have been provided to police services and are viewed as useful by those who have received training. Training is viewed as important to ensure consistency in the application of the definition and the subsequent identification of hate crimes. The number of services using UCR2.2 exceeds the number of services being trained and given the recent increase in the number of services using UCR2.2, this training gap will likely grow, which can affect the consistency of the data reported by police services.*

UCR2.2 training and tools

CCJS has provided a number of training options for police services. It has developed a formal training course for UCR2.2 as well as a training manual for participants. This training course and related manual is available to any services/detachments that are interested. The manual is made available in various formats (e.g., hardcopy, electronic) and is accessible via CCJS or its extranet site. Between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009, a total of 156 police services/detachments, totalling 681 participants, received UCR2.2 training from CCJS (Table 3-3). More recently, CCJS has begun to deliver regional training workshops in order to reach a broader number of participants. CCJS also aims to train those who can subsequently offer training within their own police service.

In addition to the formal training offered, CCJS provides police services with phone assistance as needed and has been working to develop an e-learning training module(s).

²⁶ Percentages may not add up due to rounding.

²⁷ Population coverage figures are not yet available for 2009-2010.

Table 3-3: Number of police services/detachments and participants that received UCR2.2 training (2005-2006 to 2008-2009)

Year	Number of Services/Detachments Trained	Number of Participants Trained
2005-2006	19	135
2006-2007	23	156
2007-2008	45	170
2008-2009	69	220
Total	156	681

Need for training to support hate crime reporting

Interviewed POLIS members were overwhelmingly (8 out of 9 members interviewed) in agreement that there was a need for the Data Collection Strategy to provide training sessions and materials to police services on hate crime data collection and reporting. POLIS members suggested training was important to ensure consistency/reliability in the data (3 of 5), to raise the levels of awareness/knowledge of police officers on hate crime reporting (2 of 5), and because police services did not have resources to do the training themselves (1 of 5). The two CCJS interviewees similarly agreed that training was important to ensure the consistency/reliability of data. The importance of training was specifically linked to ensuring that police services had a common definition and understanding of hate crime.

These findings were consistent with the findings from the survey of police services. All relevant survey respondents (25 of 25) were in agreement that it is important for police services to receive training from CCJS prior to collecting and reporting data on hate crime in their area. Among those survey respondents who were familiar with the training provided by CCJS, the majority (16 of 19 respondents, or 84%) indicated that the training sessions improved the quality of the data reported by police services on hate-motivated crime. This information suggests that training is an important component of the implementation of the Data Collection Strategy.

Satisfaction with training

Information from the evaluation shows a high level of satisfaction with the UCR2.2 training provided by CCJS. Training feedback forms, administered to training participants by CCJS in 2005-2006, indicated that participants were extremely satisfied with the training and no areas for improvement were identified.

Evaluation interviewees and survey respondents also rated the quality of the training and tools very high. Three of four POLIS interviewees who were able to comment on training, suggested that the training was very good (the other noted that it was not being targeted to the right people but did not comment on the quality of the training itself). One-third (33%) of survey respondents indicated that their police service had received training and/or training materials from CCJS. These respondents rated the training and tools positively, suggesting that the sessions were useful (94%) and that the training materials were useful (95%). Respondents also reported that the sessions improved the quality of the data reported by their police services (84%) and that the training provided them with the knowledge and information needed to collect and report on hate-motivated crime. This suggests that there are important benefits associated with the training being provided to police services.

Gaps in training coverage

As indicated in the section above, CCJS has provided on-site training to many police services/detachments (i.e., 156 over a four-year period). This is a significant amount of training, given that it has all been delivered by one individual at CCJS.

The evaluation found, however, that the training being provided has not been commensurate with the number of services/detachments using UCR2.2. In fact, over time the gap between the number of services/detachments using UCR2.2 and the number of services/detachments trained by CCJS (Table 3-4) has remained significant. In 2005-2006, approximately 37% of services using UCR2.2 received training while in 2008-2009, approximately 44% of services using UCR2.2 received training.

Table 3-4: Total number of services/detachment trained versus number of services/detachments using UCR2.2 (2005-2006 to 2008-2009)

Year	Number of services/detachments using UCR2.2	Total number of services/detachments trained	Percent services/detachments trained
2005-2006	51	19	37.3%
2006-2007	87	42	48.3%
2007-2008	318	87	27.4%
2008-2009	357	156	43.7%

It should be noted that it is not possible to determine to what extent police services may be conducting training within their own police service following receipt of the UCR2.2 training (e.g., an RCMP participant conducting training in other detachments). In addition, CCJS offers alternative methods of training (e.g., manuals are available on-line) and it is unknown to what extent police services may be accessing these other methods for their own use. Therefore, it is possible that more services have been trained than these numbers indicate. Nonetheless, there likely still remains a large gap in the training and there is the potential that the training gap will continue to grow. As discussed in Section 3.2.1 (Use of Uniform Crime Reporting 2.2 Survey), in 2009-2010, 778 police services/detachments began using UCR2.2 for the first time. This rise in numbers will present challenges with respect to training and training has been identified as an important element to ensure consistency in the application of the definition of hate crimes.

One other issue was raised by the evaluation with respect to training coverage. While few interviewees and survey respondents identified areas for improvement with training, there was information to suggest that the training is not necessarily always targeting the appropriate people. One interviewee and three survey respondents (of 6 who suggested improvements) indicated that the training had not been provided to the right people (e.g., it was provided to subject matter experts in hate crimes but not to the majority of staff who respond to calls). Given that police officers are directly involved in identifying and reporting hate crime, it would be important to reach this group with training to ensure that all officers have a common understanding of the definition of hate crime and thus are reporting hate crime in a consistent fashion.

3.2.3. Data quality

***Finding:** CCJS has a systematic process in place to validate and confirm data on hate crime submitted by police services. The submitted data have become more complete as more police services have started reporting hate crime—increasing the geographic coverage of the data—and as more police services using the supplemental survey have moved to the more detailed UCR2.2 Survey. Under-reporting of hate crime by police officers has affected the usefulness of the data and training is seen as a means to help address this issue.*

Overall, the quality of hate crime data has been improving since the Data Collection Strategy was initiated. As discussed in Section 3.2.1 (Use of Uniform Crime Reporting Survey, Version 2.2), the geographical coverage of the UCR2.2 data has improved continuously since the Strategy began. In addition, the amount of information available on hate crime incidents has improved over time as more police services have moved from the supplemental survey to the UCR2.2 Survey.

The quality of this data is further enhanced by the fact that CCJS has a systematic data verification process in place. The data reported by police services are subjected to validation checks, which include, for example, flagging unknown responses for follow-up and ensuring that some crimes (such as public incitement of hatred and advocating genocide) are consistently scored as hate crimes. CCJS works with police services to address any inconsistencies or errors in the data. All validated data submissions are sent back to each police service for their sign-off and consent for public release.

While the scope, breadth and accuracy/consistency of hate crime data are good, under-reporting of hate crime remains an issue affecting the overall quality of the data. Under-reporting of hate crime is not unique to Canada and has been raised internationally as an issue in academic literature on hate crime.²⁸ Although the rate at which hate crime is currently under-reported is not known, findings from the 2004 GSS showed that only 40% of hate crimes were reported by victims to police, according to surveyed Canadians self-reporting as victims of hate crime.²⁹ Victims do not always report hate crimes to police for a number of reasons that may include fear or not wanting to identify themselves as a member of an identified group. In addition, some police officers may not recognize or choose to report a crime as a hate crime.³⁰

Nearly one-half (8 of 18) of POLIS members and other stakeholders from academia and NGOs raised the issue of under-reporting of hate crime during interviews. When asked if the data could be improved, most interviewees (12 of 19) provided suggestions for improvements and these were often related to the need to help address the issue of under-reporting by officers. POLIS members interviewed discussed the lack of consistent reporting of hate crimes by police, and that, although the reporting was improving over time, there were still gaps. As one member of a police service noted: “there is still a perception among some [police officers] that, like how domestic abuse was once considered a family issue, hate crimes are issues to be dealt with by the community and not by police.”

²⁸ Perry, Barbara. Counting – and Countering – Hate Crime. Paper Presented at OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, October 5, 2009, Warsaw Poland. Accessed online at: www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2009/10/40235_en.pdf.

²⁹ Statistics Canada. Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada, 2008. Juristat Article by Mia Dauvergne, Summer 2010, vol. 30, no. 2.

³⁰ Perry, Barbara. Counting – and Countering – Hate Crime. Paper Presented at OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, October 5, 2009, Warsaw Poland. Accessed online at: www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2009/10/40235_en.pdf.

As a result of under-reporting by victims and police, some stakeholders are sceptical about the numbers of police-reported hate crimes at present. This has affected the degree to which the data are seen as useful or informative. A few stakeholders interviewed indicated that, as a result of under-reporting, they did not have sufficient confidence in the data to draw conclusions about hate crime rates. As one member of a police service who had consulted the data noted, as a result of under-reporting “we do not know if what is reported is reflective of reality.” An academic researching hate crime similarly noted that “the data is just not there yet to tell us [the prevalence of hate crime] with complete confidence.”

Training undertaken by CCJS on hate crime reporting is seen as a means to help address under-reporting by police. The training provides information to help police officers recognize the signs of hate crime and promotes the benefits of reporting hate crime. As discussed in section 3.2.2 (Training and Tools for Police Services), interviewees and survey respondents believe that CCJS training was important to improve the consistency of police reporting and can effectively work to help diminish reporting gaps.

3.2.4. Awareness of Hate Crime data

***Finding:** CCJS has made the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy available through the Statistics Canada website and has publicized the data and its findings through participation in conferences and other events. Awareness of the information appears to be inconsistent.*

Information from the Data Collection Strategy is made available primarily through the STC website, where an annual report on hate crime in Canada, the main information product, can be accessed by the public free of charge. In addition, statistical tables are available on the extranet site, and custom tabulations can be requested from STC at a cost. CCJS has also provided the annual hate crime reports directly to its contacts at POLIS and to other stakeholders who have an interest in the field through a distribution list it has developed. Finally, CCJS participated in 16 domestic and international conferences between 2006-2007 and 2008-2009 related to its work on hate crime collection and reporting. At these conferences, CCJS promotes the hate crime reports. CIC also conducted outreach to stakeholders at two Metropolis conferences in 2009 and 2010). Despite the promotional activities, target groups appear to vary in their level of awareness of the information.

While only three annual reports have been produced to date, the extent to which this information has been accessed has increased with each release. According to STC’s web traffic data, the 2006 report was downloaded 280 times, whereas the 2007 report was downloaded 1,400 times, which suggests an increased level of interest in the data.³¹ Also, stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation demonstrated a fairly high level of awareness of the information products, with 15 of 19 stakeholders indicating they were aware of the products. It should be noted that the evaluators encountered difficulty with contacting academics that were aware of the Strategy and thus able to provide information on their awareness of the data it produced.

Police services surveyed were not very familiar with the data, with only 37% of respondents indicating that they were familiar with the information produced by STC on hate-motivated crime. Even among those who indicated that their police service reported hate crime data to CCJS, only 43% said they were familiar with the information products.

³¹ The 2008 report has just recently been released; therefore statistics on web traffic are not available.

Of all those who were familiar with the information, the most commonly identified sources were the analytical reports (79%). Fewer were familiar with data tables and custom data requests (59%) or conference presentations (32%).

It should be noted that academics and those working in criminal justice are seen by CIC as the main target groups for the data, therefore it perhaps was not reasonable to expect the police services surveyed to be widely familiar with the data.

3.2.5. Use of Hate Crime data

***Finding:** The available data suggest that the information is generally considered to be useful by police services and stakeholders who have consulted it. Police services are using data as an analytical tool to inform their work, while CIC has used the data to inform its messaging, communications and policy work. Stakeholders reported that the data have increased their understanding of hate crime, although the data are not likely yet being used to its full potential. The use of the data will likely improve as more years of data are available.*

The expected outcomes of the Strategy include, in the intermediate term, that stakeholders have an understanding of the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime in Canada, and, in the long-term, that stakeholders use their knowledge of hate-motivated crime to improve programs, policies and services, and to monitor the impacts of changes on this type of crime.

The extent to which these outcomes are being achieved was examined through interviews and the survey of police services. There are two major limitations to be considered. First, as discussed in Section 2.3 (Limitations and Considerations), the evaluation did not have access to a list of recipients of the information products produced by CCJS on hate crime. The interviews and survey of police services provided valuable sources of information on usage, but were not comprehensive. As such, the true extent of usage of the hate crime data could not be accurately gauged. Second, there have been only three annual reports on hate crime in Canada produced to date. As more years of information become available and trends over time in hate crime can be identified and studied, it is reasonable to assume that use of the information will also increase.

Improved understanding of Hate Crime

Among those police service survey respondents who were familiar with the information products produced by STC on hate-motivated crime, most (64%) agreed that the information had increased their understanding of hate-motivated crime. Just over one-half of the interviewees who had consulted the hate crime data (6 of 10) were positive on the extent to which they believed the data had improved their understanding of hate-motivated crime (i.e., rated the extent as a three or four, on a four-point scale). Four interviewees were negative in this respect (i.e., rated the extent as one or two on a four-point scale). These respondents explained that they lacked complete confidence in the data, were waiting for more years of data in order to identify trends, or that the information products had not been sufficiently timely to be useful for their purposes.

Use of data to improve programs, policies, services and to monitor the impact of changes on this type of crime

The evaluation identified few specific examples of changes to policies, programs or services that had been made as a result of the hate crime data. One interviewee noted that police services had adopted the standard, national definition of hate crime as a result of the Strategy. One respondent to the survey indicated that a unit specifically dedicated to hate-motivated crime had been developed as a result of their police service's participation in the initiative.

According to the program theory, the Data Collection Strategy is expected to result, in the long-term, in stakeholders “using their knowledge of hate-motivated crime to improve programs, policies and services”. However, the nature of knowledge transfer and mobilization is inherently complex and it may have been difficult for survey and interview respondents to directly link the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy to specific changes to policy, programs or services. However, it is generally considered sufficient evidence of utility if respondents indicate that information has increased their knowledge in a particular area or if they have used the data to inform policy and program development. Further, with only three years of data available, it is too early to expect the data to impact directly on changes to policies, programs and services

Information from the interviews and survey showed that the information is being used to various extents and that different stakeholders are using the data for different purposes. Police service survey respondents who said they were familiar with the information products were asked if, to their knowledge, the information products had been put to use in their police service. About one-half of these respondents (47%) said it had been put to use. Among all survey respondents, then, 17% indicated that the information produced by STC had been put to use.

When asked how information had been used, more than half of survey respondents (9 of 16) indicated that the information had been used for analytical purposes. Examples included that the information had been used for a report to the Chief of Police, that it had informed the police service on trends in crime in the area, and that comparisons of hate crime rates had been made between areas. Two respondents indicated that the information had been used to make (unspecified) changes to programs or practices, while two others indicated the information had helped to inform the allocation of resources. Others mentioned that the information had informed police work, had been used for presentations and promotional work, and had been used to inform hate crime investigative training.

Most interviewed POLIS members and other stakeholders (11 of 13) indicated that they consulted the hate crime data. Many of these stakeholders indicated that they had consulted the information for information / research / reporting purposes (9 of 13) and to compare the rates of hate crime in their area with other areas (4 of 13). One member of POLIS indicated that the data produced had resulted in their police service undertaking more outreach in the gay and lesbian community.

Respondents from CIC mentioned that the information had been used to inform the Minister of CIC on hate crime issues and in ministerial communications, particularly related to anti-Semitism (including in the lead-up to the signing of the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism). This was evidenced in specific references to the Data Collection Strategy statistics on anti-Semitic hate crime made by the Minister in recent speeches. CIC respondents also indicated that the data were used to inform policy work. In particular, the information was used to lead discussions with provincial/territorial partners and other participants in roundtable discussions on racism.

3.3. Alternatives

3.3.1. Alternative design/delivery approaches

***Finding:** The Data Collection Strategy's data are the only available national source of police-reported hate crime statistics, although STC's General Social Survey (GSS) compiles and reports on hate crime victimization. The evaluation found that Statistics Canada is a well-regarded delivery agent for the Data Collection Strategy and most stakeholders were supportive of its role in the initiative. Further, CCJS has demonstrated that it can meet its reporting and delivery requirements.*

Other sources of Hate Crime data

The Data Collection Strategy is the only annual source of pan-Canadian police-reported hate-motivated crime data. It is one of two sources of hate crime statistics for Canada. STC also undertakes a regular survey of victimization through its GSS. The GSS is undertaken every five years and is based on personal accounts of hate crime, rather than hate crimes coming to the attention of police officers.³² The GSS data and the police-reported hate crime data complement, rather than duplicate each other, as they examine data on hate crime from two different perspectives, using different approaches.

There are few other sources of related information and none are as comprehensive as the Strategy. The B'nai Brith, for example, collects and reports its own data on anti-Semitic hate crimes, based on incidents that are reported directly to the organization. Further, as noted by interviewees, other available sources are not subject to the same level of verification as that provided through STC.

Alternative delivery organizations

No credible alternatives to STC for delivering the Data Collection Strategy were identified in the evaluation. As previously discussed, while other organizations collect hate crime data related to specific communities (e.g., B'nai Brith related to the Jewish community), and some police services have long been collecting and reporting hate crime data for their own areas, there were no other organizations compiling, validating, and reporting comprehensive, national police-reported hate crime. In addition, CCJS provides the only training to support a nationally standardized approach to police-reporting of hate crime.

Responsibility for the Data Collection Strategy is also well-situated with CCJS given that CCJS is already collecting national data on crime as part of its established role in the government of Canada. The hate crime data from the UCR2.2 Survey form part of the larger data management system, which also includes basic crime data and new variables related to crime types such as organized crime, cyber-crime and others. CCJS's current function as the centre for national crime statistics of all kinds complements the additional training, analysis, support and reporting undertaken through the Strategy.

There was strong support for STC's role in the strategy by those interviewed. Interviewees were overwhelmingly supportive (19 of 21) of STC being responsible for delivering the program. A potential alternative mentioned by two interviewees was for the initiative to be delivered by community organizations. However, many interviewees noted that STC is the most objective, expert and credible organization to deliver the strategy. A few interviewees also noted that STC has the

³² The most recent survey was undertaken in 2009, with the data expected for release in the Fall 2010.

capacity and the positive pre-existing relationships with police services to effectively deliver the Strategy.

According to interviews with members of CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, STC has also demonstrated that it can consistently meet its reporting and delivery commitments. The evaluation confirmed that CCJS submitted complete annual reporting of activities and outputs as part of its reporting requirements. For each fiscal year from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009, CCJS submitted year-end status reports to CIC as per the agreement between the two organizations and also submitted to the CAPAR Secretariat, the annual report required of all CAPAR-funded initiatives. Furthermore, CCJS has completed expected activities within the resources provided by CIC for the Data Collection Strategy.

Cost of current delivery

As discussed in Section 1.2.2 (*Delivery Approach*), CCJS received \$1.66 million for the Data Collection Strategy over a five-year period. This is an average annual cost of \$332,100.

Note that the LOAs in place between CIC and STC do not require CCJS to provide any reporting of its actual costs to deliver the Strategy, and as such, that information was not available for the evaluation. It is therefore not known to what extent the amount of funding provided has been appropriate relative to the actual costs required to deliver the Strategy. However, based on the information gathered from the evaluation, the costs to CIC appear to be reasonable given the level of activities and outputs undertaken by CCJS. Also, given the fact that UCR2.2 is an existing data collection system, there are no costs associated with the actual collection of the hate crime data, which makes the Data Collection Strategy more cost-effective.. Further, information provided by CCJS indicates that the funding provided for the Strategy allows for the administration of the supplemental survey, analysis of the data collected, and the delivery of training to police services. The supplemental survey and the training in particular have contributed to the completeness and consistency of the hate crime data, and may have not otherwise been undertaken.

4. Overall conclusions and recommendations

The following section provides a summary of the overall conclusions of the evaluation, which are organized by evaluation issue.

Relevance

The Data Collection Strategy is aligned with federal priorities and roles.

Overall, the evaluation found that the Data Collection Strategy demonstrates a high degree of relevancy both in the context of aligning with federal priorities related to social inclusion and crime and in light of Canada's international commitments to collect hate crime data. The federal government is also naturally placed to provide the pan-Canadian and cross-jurisdictional activities that are required of the Strategy.

Due to the recent transition of the Multiculturalism Branch from the Department of Canadian Heritage to CIC, it remains unclear how the Data Collection Strategy links to CIC's strategic outcomes.

Recommendation: CIC will need to ensure that the link between the Data Collection Strategy and CIC's strategic outcomes is clear in its updated Program Activity Architecture (PAA), which is currently under development.

Canada's demographics are changing and certain groups are at risk of being the victims of hate crimes.

Canadian society is experiencing increasing diversity, with growing populations of visible minorities, same-sex couples, and an increasingly varied religious composition. These social and demographic changes are risk factors for hate crimes. Further, evidence suggests there is continued intolerance in Canadian society against racial, sexual and religious minority groups.

There is overwhelming support for the National Data Collection Strategy.

Police services, academics, members of NGOs and other stakeholders consulted for the evaluation overwhelmingly supported the rationale for the Data Collection Strategy, suggesting that there is a need to have consistent data on hate crime across Canada.

Performance

The Data Collection Strategy has been successfully implemented, with a large majority of police services using the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey Version 2.2 (UCR2.2) and a large percentage of the population is represented by the data.

The number of police services using UCR2.2 has steadily increased over the past five years. The hate crime data have, as a result, become more national in scope and now represent 52% of the Canadian population, or 88% when combined with the supplemental survey. With the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) recently converting to UCR2.2, the representativeness of the data will further increase.

Current gaps in training coverage and the growing use of UCR2.2 will present training challenges and may affect the consistency of the data being reported.

The training provided by CCJS has not been able to keep up with the number of police services beginning to report hate crime using UCR2.2. Given the fact that nearly 800 new police services/detachments have recently converted to using UCR2.2, this gap is likely to grow. The information from the evaluation shows that training is perceived as important in ensuring the

consistency and quality of hate crime reporting, thus the demonstrated gap in training coverage may be negatively affecting the data to date.

Recommendation: CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.

Training provided by CCJS is viewed as useful and of good quality and is key to ensuring that police services apply a standard definition of hate crime.

The training sessions and materials provided by the Strategy were seen by those familiar with them as high quality and very useful and appear to be a critical component of the initiative. It was reported that the training provided police services with the knowledge and tools required to identify and report hate crime data and helped to improve the quality of the hate crime data, by ensuring that a common definition of hate crime is used. The use of a common definition ensures that hate crime data are reported consistently across the country.

The hate crime data need to be better marketed to stakeholders.

The hate crime statistics have been presented in three annual reports developed by CCJS. These reports, as well as data tables and conference presentations, have provided stakeholders with near-national information on hate crime, as well as the ability to compare rates of police-reported hate crime for different cities in Canada. CCJS has undertaken dissemination activities common to STC, and participated in a number of conferences and workshops that have publicized the Data Collection Strategy and its findings. Marketing to date by CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, has comprised presentations at the 2009 and 2010 Metropolis Conferences.

There appear to be gaps in awareness of the information produced by the Strategy, at least among those police services and stakeholders consulted for the evaluation. This is likely related to the fact that there have only been three years of data to report to-date. Note that although academics and those working in the criminal justice system are seen as the main target groups for the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy, it would appear that police services also view the information products as useful and beneficial to their work.

Recommendation: As coverage increases and more years of data are added, CIC should explore methods to increase awareness of the Strategy and subsequent usage, including to police services.

Those who are aware of the information are using it and say it has had an impact on their understanding of hate crime.

It was a challenge to identify stakeholders for the evaluation, particularly academics, and those interviewed and surveyed do not represent all users of the information. However, of those that were interviewed and surveyed, many reported that the information increased their understanding of hate crime in Canada. While there are limited data on the usage of the information produced by the Data Collection Strategy, the available data suggest that the information is generally considered to be useful by police services and stakeholders that have consulted it. The evaluation identified few specific changes to policies, programs or services made as a result of the Strategy, although it may not be reasonable to expect such changes to be achieved as a result of the data.

Reasons why the information is not being used, as reported by interviewees, were related to a lack of confidence in the data (i.e., only three years of data are available, concerns of under-reporting of hate crime, and information products had not been sufficiently timely to be useful for their

purposes). As more police services use UCR2.2 and as more years of data are available, the utility of the data will increase.

Alternatives

CCJS is the most appropriate delivery agent for the Data Collection Strategy.

There are no other sources of national, police-reported data on hate crime in Canada. There was wide support for CCJS delivering the Data Collection Strategy and no strong evidence of viable delivery alternatives. CCJS is perceived as the most objective, expert and credible organization to deliver the strategy and has the capacity and the positive pre-existing relationships with police services to effectively deliver the Strategy. The Data Collection Strategy is also well-situated with CCJS given that CCJS is already collecting national data on crime as part of its established role in Canada, that is, through the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey.

The Data Collection Strategy is providing value for the cost.

Given the amount of resources provided to CCJS for the Data Collection Strategy relative to its activities, the costs to CIC appear to be reasonable. Its delivery using an existing data collection system has reduced the cost of implementation. The funding has also resulted in value in that it allows for the carrying-out of activities (e.g., administration of the supplemental survey, delivery of training to police services) which have contributed to the completeness and consistency of the hate crime data, and which otherwise may not have been undertaken.

Recommendation: As above.

CIC should work with CCJS to ensure that current gaps in training coverage do not affect the consistency of the data being reported.

Appendix A: Evaluation matrix for the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies						
		Interviews				Doc Review	Survey of Police Services	Admin Data
		CIC/Multi Program Reps	CCIS Program Reps	Sample of Other Stakeholders (Int'l, Comm Groups, Academics, OGDs)	POLIS ³³			
1.0 Relevance								
1.1 Is there a continued need for a nationally standardized data collection strategy on hate-motivated crime?	1.1.1 Prevalence of hate-motivated crime in Canada over time.			•	•	•		
	1.1.2 Perceptions of program stakeholders with respect to continued information needs.	•	•	•	•		•	
	1.1.3 Number of report downloads.							•
1.2 Does the initiative continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities?	1.2.1 Degree of alignment with departmental strategic outcomes/priorities (Multiculturalism/CIC).	•					•	
	1.2.2 Degree of alignment with Government of Canada priorities.	•	•	•			•	
1.3 Is the program consistent with federal roles and responsibilities?	1.3.1 Alignment with legislative and federal obligations.	•					•	
2.0 Performance								
2.1 Were federal partners and stakeholders successfully engaged in the development and implementation of CAPAR?	2.1.1 Perception of police services and stakeholders with respect to the utility and necessity of hate crime data collection.	•	•	•	•		•	
	2.1.2 Number of training sessions and presentations provided.							•
2.2 Do police services have the training and tools necessary to identify and collect standardized hate-motivated crime data?	2.2.1 Extent of training provided to police services.							•
	2.2.2 Extent of training tools, training materials, and on-site assistance available to police services.							•

³³ Police Information Statistics Committee

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies						
		Interviews				Doc Review	Survey of Police Services	Admin Data
		CIC/Multi Program Reps	CCIS Program Reps	Sample of Other Stakeholders (Int'l, Comm Groups, Academics, OGDs)	POLIS ³³			
	2.2.3 Police services' perceptions regarding training and tools.				•		•	•
2.3 Is Statistics Canada collecting high-quality, nationally standardized hate-motivated crime data?	2.3.1 Proportion of Canadian police services reporting on hate-motivated crime data.							•
	2.3.2 Nature and extent of data quality verification.		•					
	2.3.3 Reasons why police services are not reporting hate-motivated crime data.		•		•		•	
2.4 To what extent is nationally standardized hate-motivated crime data made available?	2.4.1 Type and extent of information dissemination (conferences, statistical tables and analytical reports, website, etc.).	•	•	•	•			•
	2.4.2 Stakeholder perceptions of data availability.			•	•		•	
2.5 Do stakeholders have an understanding of the nature and extent of hate-motivated crime provided by Statistics Canada?	2.5.1 Type and extent of information dissemination (conferences, pdf downloads from website, etc.).							•
	2.5.2 Stakeholder perceptions.			•	•		•	
2.6 Have stakeholders applied their knowledge of hate-motivated crime to improve programs, policies and services?	2.6.1 Number and examples of changes to programs/policies/ services reported by stakeholders.	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies						
		Interviews				Doc Review	Survey of Police Services	Admin Data
		CIC/Multi Program Reps	CCIS Program Reps	Sample of Other Stakeholders (Int'l, Comm Groups, Academics, OGDs)	POLIS ³³			
3.0 Alternatives								
3.1 Is Statistics Canada the most suitable delivery mechanism for the data strategy?	3.1.1 Evidence of alternatives for collection of hate-motivated crime in Canada.	•	•	•	•	•	•	
	3.1.2 Evidence that Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics is meeting reporting and delivery requirements.	•				•		
	3.1.3 Cost of current approach.					•		•
	3.1.4 Perception of stakeholders regarding alternative approaches, including cost implications (implementation of strategy by RCMP, police services, provinces).	•	•	•	•		•	

Appendix B: Detailed methodology

The following section provides additional detail with respect to the interview and survey methodologies.

Interviews

A total of 24 interviews were completed for the evaluation. Interviews were undertaken with four key stakeholder groups, including:

CIC Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch: Interviews were conducted with representatives of the Branch who are involved in the Data Collection Strategy, including senior management. This group was interviewed primarily to gather information on relevance (i.e., alignment of the Strategy objectives and departmental priorities) and alternatives (i.e., whether there are any other feasible delivery options), and were also asked about use of the information produced by the Strategy.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics: Interviews were conducted with the representatives of CCJS who are directly involved in the Data Collection strategy, including senior management. The primary purpose of these interviews was to gather information on alternatives (i.e., whether there are any other feasible delivery options) and performance, particularly with respect to the outputs being generated by the Strategy and data validation issues.

Police Information Statistics Committee: The mandate of this committee is to develop, improve and deliver accurate statistical and analytical information to the Canadian public, police and government. It has extensive representation from the largest police agencies across Canada, as well as members from Public Safety Canada and Justice Canada, and interacts on a regular basis with CCJS. A sample of committee members was interviewed to gather perspectives on the necessity and utility of the Data Collection Strategy. The sample of POLIS interviewees was selected in conjunction with CIC to ensure that all types of police services were represented (i.e., federal, provincial, municipal) and that a wide geographic distribution was attained (i.e., interviewees were located in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and Halifax).

Other Stakeholders: Other stakeholders interviewed included non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academics, other government departments (OGDs), and international representatives. These stakeholders were either working in the field of anti-racism, conducting research in related areas, or were working in areas where crime statistics may be used to help inform policy and practice. An initial list of stakeholders was developed in conjunction with CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, and interviewees were also asked to provide names of any other potential users of the information with whom they were familiar. This interview group was expected to provide input on the need for, and utility of, the Data Collection Strategy, including specific uses for the hate crime data.

Survey of police services

The survey of police services was administered between February 22, 2010 and March 18, 2010. A reminder e-mail was sent to the survey population mid-way through survey administration.

The majority of survey respondents were working in municipal police services (84%), however, responses were also received from First Nations police services (7%), provincial police services

(4%), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) (4%) and Military Police (1%). Responses were received from those in a number of different job positions, with most being chiefs or deputy chiefs of police (36%), sergeants or staff sergeants (15%) inspectors (11%), or constables (8%). The remainder of the responses were received from superintendants, lieutenants/lieutenant colonels, directors, and others, including several related to data management /analytical capacities (such as statisticians, analysts, and record managers). Of those who said their police service reported hate-motivated crime data to STC, the majority use UCR2.2 (76%), while 11% use the supplemental survey on hate-motivated crime (the remainder did not know or specify).

Appendix C: List of interviewees

CIC Multi program representatives	
<p>Umit Kiziltan A/Director General Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada Ottawa, ON</p>	<p>Mary Farrell Manager, Policy, Partnerships & Engagement Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada</p>
<p>Elizabeth MacDonald Senior Policy Analyst Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada</p>	
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics	
<p>John Turner Chief Policing Services Statistics Canada Ottawa, ON</p>	<p>Mia Dauvergne Senior Analyst Policing Services Statistics Canada Ottawa, ON</p>
<p>Warren Silver Policing Services Statistic Canada Ottawa, ON</p>	
Other Government Departments	
<p>Marilou Reeve Counsel Youth Justice, Strategic Initiatives and Law Reform Justice Canada Ottawa, ON</p>	<p>Howard Duncan Executive Head Metropolis Project Citizenship and Immigration Canada Ottawa, ON</p>
<p>Dan Roy Policy, Bias-Free Diversity File (and Hate Crimes) RCMP Ottawa, ON</p>	<p>Jordan Saucier Policy Analyst, National Crime Prevention Services RCMP Ottawa, ON</p>
Other Stakeholders	
International Representatives	
<p>LaReine Passey Senior Policy and Reports Officer Human Right Program Canadian Heritage Gatineau, QC</p>	<p>Mary Pierre-Wade Desk Officer, OSCE Human Dimension Defence and Security Relations Division Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada Ottawa, ON</p>

Community Groups	
Ruth Klein National Director B'nai Brith Canada Toronto, ON	Anita Bomburg B'nai Brith Canada Toronto, ON
Ayman Al-Yassini Executive Director Canadian Race Relations Foundation Toronto, ON	Estella Muyinda Executive Director National Anti-Racism Council of Canada Toront, ON
Academics	
Valery Pruegger Research, Social Planner University of Calgary / City of Calgary Calgary, AB	Barbara Perry Professor, Associate Dean, Faculty of Criminology, Justice and Policy Studies University of Ontario Institute of Technology Oshawa, ON
Police Information Statistics Committee POLIS	
Tracesandra McDonald RCMP Ottawa, ON	Paul Fug�re S�ret� du Qu�bec Montr�al, QC
Bill Moore Superintendent Halifax Regional Police Halifax, NS	John Dehass Inspector Vancouver Police Vancouver, BC
Austin Lawrence Chief, Research, Research and National Coordination, Organized Crime Division, Public Safety Canada Ottawa, ON	Debi Perry Calgary Police Calgary, AB
Corrine Scott Superintendent Winnipeg Police Winnipeg, MB	Kristine Kijewski Director, Corporate Services Toronto Police Toronto, ON
Randy Mar Director, Planning, performance analytics Ottawa Police Ottawa, ON	David Pepper Director of Community Development Ottawa Police Ottawa, ON
Charlene Clarke Ottawa Police Ottawa, ON	

Appendix D: Interview guides

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS)

Introduction

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct an evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who are involved in the program or who may be affected by its activities / outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the program's relevance and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions will not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Interview questions

Background

1. Can you briefly describe your involvement with the Data Collection Strategy?

Relevance

2. Is there a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crimes? Why or why not?
 - a) How is this data useful to you / your organization
3. Is there a need for the Data Collection Strategy to provide training sessions and training materials to police services on hate crimes data collection and reporting?
4. How does the Data Collection Strategy align with the priorities of the Government of Canada?

Performance

5. What data quality verification is conducted on the data being reported by police services?
 - a) Are there any issues with data quality?
6. What are the reasons that some police services are not collecting or reporting hate-motivated crime data (i.e., for what reasons are some police services not currently participating in the Data Collection Strategy)?

7. What types of information products are disseminated to stakeholders (e.g., data tables, reports)?
 - a) At what frequency is this information disseminated (e.g., monthly, yearly)?
 - b) What means are used to disseminate information (e.g., conferences, website)?
8. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to any policies, programs, or services as a result of the nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime? If so, can you provide specific examples?
9. Are there any ways in which data could be improved to be more useful in the future? Please explain your answer.
10. Are there other sources of hate-motivated crime information that you are aware of and use? What are these other sources?
11. Are there other ways in which this information could be collected and made available to stakeholders (i.e., another organization, level of government)?
 - a) If so, what would be the cost implications of this other approach

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

CIC Multiculturalism program

Introduction

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct an evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who are involved in the program or who may be affected by its activities / outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the program's relevance and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions will not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Interview questions

Background

1. Can you briefly describe your involvement with the Data Collection Strategy?

Relevance

2. Is there a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crimes? Why or why not?
 - a) How is this data useful to you / your organization?
3. How does the Data Collection Strategy align with CIC's departmental outcomes and priorities?
4. How does the Data Collection Strategy align with the priorities of the Government of Canada?
5. Is the federal government's role in this program appropriate (i.e., does it respond to federal legislative or other obligations)?
6. What types of information products are disseminated to stakeholders (e.g., data tables, reports)?
 - a) At what frequency is this information disseminated (e.g., monthly, yearly)?
 - b) What means are used to disseminate information (e.g., conferences, website)?
7. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to any policies, programs, or services as a result of the nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime? If so, can you provide specific examples?

8. Are there any ways in which data could be improved to be more useful in the future? Please explain your answer.
9. To what extent is CCJS meet its reporting and delivery requirements?
 - a) Are any improvements required in this regard?
10. Are there other sources of hate-motivated crime information that you are aware of and use? What are these other sources?
11. Are there other ways in which this information could be collected and made available to stakeholders (i.e., another organization, level of government)?
 - a) If so, what would be the cost implications of this other approach?

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

Police Information Statistics Committee (POLIS)

Introduction

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct an evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who are involved in the program or who may be affected by its activities / outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the program's relevance and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions will not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Interview questions

Background

1. Can you briefly describe your involvement with the Data Collection Strategy?

Relevance

2. In your view, how prevalent is hate-motivated crime in Canada? What have the trends been over time (e.g., is hate-motivated crime becoming more or less prevalent)? On what are basing this?
3. Is there a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crimes? Why or why not?
 - a) How is this data useful to you / your organization?
4. Is there a need for the Data Collection Strategy to provide training sessions and training materials to police services on hate crimes data collection and reporting?

Performance

5. What training is available to police services with respect to identifying and collecting hate motivated crime (this could include courses, tools, training materials, on-site assistance)?
 - a) Is the available training on collecting hate crimes data adequate?
 - b) What further or additional training is required, if any?
6. What are the reasons that some police services are not collecting or reporting hate-motivated crime data (i.e., for what reasons are some police services not currently participating in the Data Collection Strategy)?
7. Is nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime available to you?

- a) If yes:
- i. Through what means is this data made available?
 - ii. Have you consulted or referred to this data? If yes, for what purpose(s)? If not, why not?
 - iii. Using the following rating scale, please indicate to what extent this data has improved your understanding of hate-motivated crime. Please explain your response.

No extent		Great extent	
1	2	3	4

- b) If no:
- i. Would it be useful if this data was made available to you? If so, what specific types of data would be useful to you?
8. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to any policies, programs, or services as a result of the nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime? If so, can you provide specific examples?
 9. Are there any ways in which data could be improved to be more useful in the future? Please explain your answer.
 10. Are there other sources of hate-motivated crime information that you are aware of and use? What are these other sources?
 11. Are there other ways in which this information could be collected and made available to stakeholders (i.e., another organization, level of government)?
 - a) If so, what would be the cost implications of this other approach?

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

Stakeholders - Other Government Departments (OGDs)

Introduction

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct an evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who are involved in the program or who may be affected by its activities / outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the program's relevance and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions will not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Interview questions

Background

1. How familiar are you with Data Collection Strategy?

Relevance

2. In your view, how prevalent is hate-motivated crime in Canada? What have the trends been over time (e.g., is hate-motivated crime becoming more or less prevalent)? On what are basing this?
3. Is there a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crimes? Why or why not?
 - a) How is this data useful to you / your organization?
4. How does the Data Collection Strategy align with the priorities of the Government of Canada?

Performance

5. Is nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime available to you?
 - a) If yes:
 - i. Through what means is this data made available?
 - ii. Have you consulted or referred to this data? If yes, for what purpose(s)? If not, why not?
 - iii. Using the following rating scale, please indicate to what extent this data has improved your understanding of hate-motivated crime. Please explain your response.

No extent		Great extent	
1	2	3	4

- b) If no:
- i. Would it be useful if this data was made available to you? If so, what specific types of data would be useful to you?
6. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to any policies, programs, or services as a result of the nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime? If so, can you provide specific examples?
 7. Are there any ways in which data could be improved to be more useful in the future? Please explain your answer.
 8. Are there other sources of hate-motivated crime information that you are aware of and use? What are these other sources?
 9. Are there other ways in which this information could be collected and made available to stakeholders (i.e., another organization, level of government)?
 - a) If so, what would be the cost implications of this other approach?

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

Other Stakeholders

Introduction

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct an evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who are involved in the program or who may be affected by its activities / outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the program's relevance and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions will not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Interview questions

Background

1. How familiar are you with Data Collection Strategy?

Relevance

2. In your view, how prevalent is hate-motivated crime in Canada? What have the trends been over time (e.g., is hate-motivated crime becoming more or less prevalent)? On what are basing this?
3. Is there a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crimes? Why or why not?
 - a) How is this data useful to you / your organization?

Performance

4. Is nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime available to you?
 - a) If yes:
 - i. Through what means is this data made available?
 - ii. Have you consulted or referred to this data? If yes, for what purpose(s)? If not, why not?
 - iii. Using the following rating scale, please indicate to what extent this data has improved your understanding of hate-motivated crime. Please explain your response.

No extent		Great extent	
1	2	3	4

- b) If no:
 - i. Would it be useful if this data was made available to you? If so, what specific types of data would be useful to you?

5. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to any policies, programs, or services as a result of the nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime? If so, can you provide specific examples?
6. Are there any ways in which data could be improved to be more useful in the future? Please explain your answer.
7. Are there other sources of hate-motivated crime information that you are aware of and use? What are these other sources?
8. Are there other ways in which this information could be collected and made available to stakeholders (i.e., another organization, level of government)?
 - a) If so, what would be the cost implications of this other approach?

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

Appendix E: List of documents reviewed

Corporate, accountability and political documents

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Annual Report of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* 2008-2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Reports on Plans and Priorities 2009-2010, 2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Speeches, 2010.

Government of Canada. Canada's Action Plan Against Racism, 2005.

Government of Canada. Government Response to the Report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration - Settlement and Integration: A Sense of Belonging--"Feeling at Home", 2003.

Government of Canada. Settlement and Integration: A Sense of Belonging "Feeling at Home" - Report Of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, 2003.

Government of Canada. Speech from the Throne, 2004.

Government of Canada. Speech from the Throne, 2010.

Heritage Canada. Canada's Action Plan against Racism, 2005.

Heritage Canada. Heritage Canada Program Activity Architecture, April 2009.

Heritage Canada. Reports on Plans and Priorities 2007-2008, 2007.

Heritage Canada. Reports on Plans and Priorities 2008-2009, 2008.

House of Commons Canada. Settlement and Integration: A Sense of Belonging "Feeling at Home" – Report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, June 2003.

Statistics Canada and Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Letter of Agreement between Statistics Canada and Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008-2010.

Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage. Memorandum of Understanding between the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage, 2005-2006.

Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage. Memorandum of Understanding between the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage, 2006-2007.

Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage. Memorandum of Understanding between the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage, 2007-2008.

Program materials

Statistics Canada. A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism: 2007-08 Reporting Template.

Statistics Canada. A Canada For All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism: 2008-09 Reporting Template.

Statistics Canada. Annual Report Information Template and Performance Measures for the Data Collection on Hate Crimes Initiative, 2005-2006.

Statistics Canada. Annual Report Information Template and Performance Measures for the Data Collection on Hate Crimes Initiative 2006-2007, 2007.

Statistics Canada. Hate Motivated Crime – UCR 2.2 (part 2) (Training Material), n.d.

Statistics Canada. Instructor Manual – Hate Motivated Crime – Classroom Based Training (Training Material), March 2005.

Statistics Canada. Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime: Final Project Report 2005-2006 Submitted by Statistics Canada to the Department of Canadian Heritage, 2006.

Statistics Canada. Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime: Final Project Report Submitted by Statistics Canada to the Department of Canadian Heritage 2006-2007, 2007.

Statistics Canada. Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime: Year-End Status Report 2007-2008, 2008.

Statistics Canada. Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime: Year-End Status Report 2008-2009, 2009.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) Hate Crime reports

Statistics Canada. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series: Hate Crime in Canada, No. 17, 2006.

Statistics Canada. Hate Crime Study: Summary Results of Consultations, 2002.

Statistics Canada. Hate Crime in Canada: An Overview of Issues and Data Sources, 2001.

Statistics Canada. Hate Crime in Canada, Vol. 24, no 4., May 2004.

Statistics Canada. Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada, 2007, Vol. 29, No. 2, May 2009.

Academic papers

Cam, Stewart. Combating Hate and Bias, Crime and Incidents in Alberta, Alberta Hate and Bias Crime and Incidents Committee, July 2007, 45p.

Perry, Barbara. Counting – and Countering – Hate Crime, City of Calgary, 2008.

Pruegger, Valerie. Alberta Hate/Bias Crime Report, City of Calgary, June 2009, 48p.

Pruegger, Valerie. Overview of Standards for Hate/Bias Crime Reporting and Investigation, City of Calgary, May 2008, 17p.

Shaw, Margaret and Olivier Barchechat. Preventing Hate Crimes: International Strategies and Practice, April 2002.

International reports

Government of the United Kingdom. London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region - Incidents and Responses, 2009.

United Nations, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). Report submitted by Canada under Article 9 of the Convention, 2007.

World Conference Against Racism. World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, 2001.

World Conference Against Racism. Outcome document of the Durban Review Conference, 2009.

Appendix F: Survey of police services

We thank you for taking the time to complete the survey.

Please note that the responses you provide will not be attributed to you or to your police service, and survey results will be reported in aggregate form only.

Hate-Motivated crime in Canada

The following questions ask your opinion on the issue of hate-motivated crime in Canada.

Note that Statistics Canada defines hate-motivated crime as:

“a criminal violation motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor.”

1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a) Hate-motivated crime is an important issue.	1	2	3	4	D/K
b) Hate-motivated crime is prevalent in my area.	1	2	3	4	D/K
c) Hate-motivated crime is prevalent in Canada.	1	2	3	4	D/K

2. How would you characterize the prevalence of hate-motivated crime in Canada?
[SELECT ONE RESPONSE]

- Hate-motivated crime has become more prevalent in recent years.
- Hate-motivated crime has become less prevalent in recent years.
- The prevalence of hate-motivated crime has not changed significantly in recent years.
- Don't Know

The Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime

The Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (hereafter referred to as the Strategy) aims to standardize the way in which police services across Canada collect and report on hate-motivated crime. The Strategy is managed by Citizenship and Immigration Canada and is undertaken with the assistance of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) of Statistics Canada.

Under the Strategy, Statistics Canada provides training to police services on the definitions and processes for standardized reporting of hate-motivated crime, as well as ongoing assistance with reporting procedures. Police services regularly submit their standardized hate-motivated crime

data to Statistics Canada via the UCR 2.2 survey or the hate crime supplemental survey. Reports are then produced each year showing the rates of different types of hate-motivated crime in areas across Canada.

3. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a) There is a need for nationally standardized data on hate-motivated crime in Canada.	1	2	3	4	D/K
b) Nationally standardized hate-motivated crime data is useful in informing the work undertaken by police services.	1	2	3	4	D/K
c) It is useful for police services to be able to compare hate-motivated crime statistics from their own area with those of other areas, and with Canada overall.	1	2	3	4	D/K

4. How familiar are you with the Strategy?

Not at all familiar	Not very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar
1	2	3	4

5. Does your police service collect and report hate-motivated crime data to Statistics Canada?

- Yes [GO TO Q7]
- No [GO TO Q6]
- Don't Know [GO TO Q12]

6. For what reason(s) does your police service not report hate-motivated crime to Statistics Canada? We need to make this response mandatory; otherwise, it does not skip #7.

[THOSE WHO ANSWERED Q6 GO TO Q12]

7. What survey does your police service use to report hate-motivated crime data to Statistics Canada?

- Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR2.2)
- Supplemental survey on hate-motivated crime
- Don't Know

Training

8. Has your police service received any training and/or training materials on collecting hate-motivated crime data from Statistics Canada? This could have included, for example, on-site or teleconference training sessions and/or receiving training materials or other tools such as training manuals and PowerPoint slides.

- Yes [GO TO Q9]
 No [GO TO Q12]
 Don't Know [GO TO Q12]

The following questions ask your opinion on the training and/or training materials provided by Statistics Canada.

9. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a) The training sessions provided by Statistics Canada were useful.	1	2	3	4	D/K
b) The training sessions improved the quality of the data reported by our police service on hate-motivated crime.	1	2	3	4	D/K
c) It is important that police services receive training from Statistics Canada prior to collecting and reporting data on hate crime in their area.	1	2	3	4	D/K
d) The training materials we received as part of the Statistics Canada training were useful	1	2	3	4	D/K
e) My police service has the knowledge and information needed to effectively collect and report data on hate-motivated crime	1	2	3	4	D/K

10. To your knowledge, are there any knowledge or training gaps at your police service with respect to collecting hate-motivated crime data?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

[IF Q10=YES, GO TO Q11, OTHERS GO TO Q12]

11. Please describe any knowledge or training gaps with respect to collecting hate-motivated crime data.

Information use

12. Are you familiar with the information products produced by Statistics Canada on hate-motivated crime in Canada, such as analytical reports or data tables?

- Yes [GO TO Q13]
- No [GO TO Q21]
- Don't Know [GO TO Q21]

13. Which of the following types of information products produced by Statistics Canada are you familiar with? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

- Data tables, custom data requests
- Analytical report(s)
- Conference presentation(s)
- Other, please specify: _____

14. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a) The information products produced by the Strategy have increased my knowledge of hate-motivated crime.	1	2	3	4	D/K

15. To your knowledge, have the information products produced by Statistics Canada been put to use by yourself or anyone else in your police service?

- Yes [GO TO Q16]
- No [GO TO Q18]
- Don't Know [GO TO Q19]

16. Please describe the purpose(s) for which the information was used. (For example, analytical purposes, changes to programs or policies?)

17. Please describe the most significant impact(s), if any, of the usage of this information (e.g., targeted outreach, policy changes).

[THOSE WHO ANSWERED Q17 GO TO Q19]

18. For what reason(s) has the information produced by Statistics Canada not been used?
[SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

- Not aware of how to access information
- Information is not relevant to the work of my police service
- Information has not been timely enough
- My police service area is not included in the information produced
- Hate-motivated crime is not an issue in my area
- Other, please specify: _____

19. Overall, how important has the information/data produced by Statistics Canada been to your police service?

Not at all important	Not very important	Important	Very important	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	D/K

20. Do you have any suggestions on how the information produced by Statistics Canada could be improved / made more useful?

Alternative approaches

21. Are you aware of any other information sources, other than those produced by Statistics Canada, that provide information on hate-motivated crime?

- Yes [GO TO Q22]
- No [GO TO Q23]
- Don't Know [GO TO Q23]

22. Can you describe these other sources of information for hate-motivated crime?

23. Are there alternate approaches that could be used to more effectively collect and report on nationally standardized hate-motivated crime? This could include the data collection by Statistics Canada being undertaken in a different way or by a different organization.

- Yes [GO TO Q22]
- No [GO TO Q23]
- Don't Know [GO TO Q23]

24. What alternate approach could be used?

Profile information

25. Does your police service currently have a unit specifically dedicated to hate-motivated crime (i.e., a hate crime unit)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

[IF Q25=YES AND Q5=YES (REPORT DATA TO STRATEGY) GO TO Q26. ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q27]

26. Was this unit developed as a result of your police service's participation in hate-motivated data collection by Statistics Canada?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

27. Please indicate your current job title.

[SELECT ONE OPTION]

- Chief of Police
- Deputy Chief
- Superintendent
- Staff Sergeant
- Director
- Inspector
- Sergeant
- Captain
- Chief Constable

- Constable
- Lieutenant Colonel
- Colonel
- Other, please specify: _____

28. Please indicate in which type of police service you work.

[SELECT ONE OPTION]

- Municipal police service
- First Nations police service
- Provincial police service (e.g. Ontario Provincial Police, Sûreté du Québec)
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)
- Military Police
- Other, please specify: _____

29. Please indicate the location of your police service / your detachment.

- Newfoundland and Labrador
- Prince Edward Island
- Nova Scotia
- New Brunswick
- Quebec
- Ontario
- Manitoba
- Saskatchewan
- Alberta
- British Columbia
- Nunavut
- Northwest Territories
- Yukon

30. Which of the following best characterizes the community in which your police service is located?

- Rural or small town (less than 10,000 people)
- Small city (between 10,000 and 100,000 residents)
- City (more than 100,000 residents)

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.
