**BERMUDA VITAL CONVERSATIONS**

The Bermuda Community Foundation (the “foundation”) introduced Vital Signs® as an important step in identifying resident’s priorities related to their quality of life in Bermuda and the issues most important to them. The Vital Signs® programme has become a standard of excellence among community foundations around the world. It provides a methodology that evaluates community vitality and wellbeing and plays an important role in informing the allocation of resources. The reporting and prioritisation process is tailor-made to suit each jurisdiction’s needs.

In Bermuda, we conducted research on the community’s priorities, determined standardised outcomes based on that information and then sought further input from field experts in order to prioritise funding needs. This last step is carried out through convenings, known as “Vital Conversations”.

The foundation is hosting the Vital Conversation Series to further refine the valuable information gathered from the community. In this phase, local stakeholders convene to access public opinion, local, and international data for each of the Vital Signs® areas and prioritize the top outcomes that will guide the foundation’s funding strategy.

**THE FINDINGS**

The 2017 Bermuda Vital Signs Report revealed Safety and Security as one of seven priorities contributing to the quality of life in Bermuda. The majority (70%) of residents feel that Bermuda is a safe place to live. Whereas, a slight majority (52%) reported that Bermuda fares well in terms of the occurrence of crime and violence. By international standards, Bermuda is a relatively safe society – and increasingly so, as the crime rate has maintained a long-term downward trend.

There has been an overall decrease in crime in Bermuda since 2011. After a one-time rise in the number of offences in 2015, the overall downward trend in crime continued, with 3,202 offences in 2017, compared to 3,576 in 2016, a year-over-year decline of 10%. According to the Bermuda Police Service 2017 Crime Statistics Report, 2017 marked the lowest number of criminal offences recorded since 2000.

Feelings of safety in one’s community can affect overall quality of life, and can be influenced by several factors like age and gender. Threats of violence were more commonly reported by residents between the ages of 18 and 39 years and among women. Additionally, threats were higher among widowed, divorced, or separated seniors compared with residents overall (17% vs. 10%). (Bermuda Health Council, 2013).

In 2017, the majority of offences were property crimes (2,144 offences), while there were also 645 offences against people, and 413 community crimes such as firearms and other weapons offences (Analysis Unit, 2017). Despite an overall decrease in crime, there was an increase in certain crimes in 2017 including sexual assaults, firearms and weapons, disorders, criminal damage, theft of property, and fraud/deception.

Concerns have run high in Bermuda about gang-related criminal activity and violence since the early 2000s, even though the current level of such activity may not warrant heightened concern, likely related to the implementation of the Gang and Violence Reduction Strategy by the Bermuda Police Service in 2010. (Bermuda Police Service, 2016). According to OSAC, the majority of the gun violence and drug activity in Bermuda stemmed from organised gang crime (Overseas Safety Advisory Council, 2012). The 2018 OSAC report noted that while gangs participated in illegal drug sales, conflict between gangs was not generally motivated by the drug trade, (Overseas Safety Advisory Council, 2018). Drugs entering Bermuda are primarily for local consumption, in contrast to many Caribbean Islands where drug shipments typically stop-over en-route to the US (Overseas Safety Advisory Council, 2012).

Overall, crime statistics have decreased over time and safety is an important factor influencing the quality of life for Bermuda residents. Building a strong sense of safety and security is central to creating a strong, vibrant and livable community.
On February 28, 2019 the tenth in the series of Vital Conversations was convened with sector experts to examine the public opinion data from the Vital Signs® Report as well as relevant local and international data. The Bermuda Community Foundation selected a list of outcomes and indicators for the group to examine and prioritise. The result of this collaborative prioritisation effort yielded the following key outcomes and indicators that the foundation, and potentially other funders, can use to guide its funding decisions through 2021.

**WHAT PEOPLE THINK**

**HOW IS BERMUDA PERFORMING?**

- **Crime & Violence**
  - Low Performance: 16%
  - Average: 32%
  - High Performance: 51%

- **Safety**
  - Low Performance: 6%
  - Average: 24%
  - High Performance: 70%

**HOW IS BERMUDA PERFORMING?**

- **Female**
  - Low Performance: 7%
  - Average: 26%
  - High Performance: 67%

- **Male**
  - Low Performance: 4%
  - Average: 21%
  - High Performance: 74%

**JUST THE FACTS**

**FIREFARM INCIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRIME RATE**

- **10%**
- Decrease in the level of crime in Bermuda from 2016-2017

**ROAD ACCIDENTS**

- **11%**
- Decline in road accidents in Bermuda from 2016-2017

**SERVICE CALLS**

- **48%**
- Decline in number of police calls for service in Bermuda from 2016-2017

**BERMUDA POLICE SERVICE**

- **63%**
- of residents are satisfied with the Bermuda Police Service (2012)
## VITAL CONVERSATIONS PRIORITISED OUTCOMES & INDICATORS

### SAFETY & SECURITY

#### Strong and safe communities

- Improved public experience of safety
- Reduction in levels of crime, harassment and disorder

#### Reduced crime

- Reduced overall level of crime
- Reduced acquisitive crime ([i.e., shoplifting, burglary, theft and robbery](#))
- Reduced arson
- Reduced assault with injury
- Reduced crime linked with alcohol
- Reduced domestic violence
- Reduced drug-related (Class A) crime rate
- Reduced hate crime
- Reduced knife crime
- Reduced overall level of crime
- Reduced violent crime

**Key Outcome Category | Specific Outcome | Indicator(s)***
--- | --- | ---
We are pleased to make more detailed outcome and indicators reporting available to BCF fund holders. Special terms and conditions apply. Contact info@bcf.bm

- • Availability and use of training on self-defense
- • Availability and use of training to combat extremism
- • Presence of Neighbourhood Watch Schemes
- • Reported confidence in the safety of the local community
- • Self-reported levels of worry about being a victim of crime (including burglary, car crime, violent crime, terrorism)
- • Level of anti-social behaviour in communities
- • Levels of gang prevalence, gang activity
- • National/local rates of crime
- • Number of NEETs in gangs [Not in Education, Employment or Training]
- • Number of severe crimes committed
- • Rate of harassment, stalking or bullying (on the grounds of e.g. race, sex, disability, sexual orientation, age)
- • Rate of reoffending
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of acquisitive crime in the last 12 months
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of arson in the last 12 months
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been injured as a result of violent crime in the last 12 months
- • Recorded rate of ‘violence with injury’
- • Proportion of people reporting to have driven a vehicle under the influence of alcohol in the last 12 months
- • Proportion of people under the influence of alcohol when performing a criminal offence in the last 12 months
- • Police recorded incidents of criminal damage
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of vandalism in the last 12 months.
- • Police recorded domestic homicide rate
- • Police recorded domestic violence rate
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of domestic violence in the last 12 months
- • Proportion of victims of domestic violence reporting to be victims of repeat incidents of domestic violence
- • Proportion of 16 to 59 year olds reporting use of drugs in the last 12 months
- • Rate of drug related offending (Class A)
- • Police recorded rate of ‘hate crime’
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of ‘hate crime’ during set reference period
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of racially motivated crime in the last 12 months
- • Number of admissions to [hospital](#) involving wounds suffered as the result of assault with a sharp object
- • Proportion of people reporting to have experienced knife crime in the last 12 months
- • Recorded rate of ‘violence with sharp instrument’
- • Police recorded crime rate
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of crime in the last 12 months
- • Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of violent crime in the last 12 months
- • Recorded rate of violent crime
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced harassment and bullying</th>
<th>Reduced reoffending</th>
<th>Improved public perception of safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in level of sexual harassment</td>
<td>Reduced likelihood of reoffending</td>
<td>Reduced fear of burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced prevalence of bullying in schools</td>
<td>Reduced overall reoffending rate</td>
<td>Reduced fear of car crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced prevalence of workplace bullying</td>
<td>Reduced reoffending amongst young people</td>
<td>Reduced fear of crime in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reduced harassment and bullying**
  - Proportion of people reporting to have been a victim of sexual harassment in the last 12 months
  - Number of school pupils reporting to have been a victim of bullying
  - Number of people reporting to have been harassed or bullied at work

- **Reduced reoffending**
  - Score on Offenders Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS) (a static actuarial risk assessment instrument, predicting criminal recidivism by adult offenders)
  - Proven reoffending rate for drug misusing offenders
  - Proven reoffending rate for those released from custody
  - Proven reoffending rate for those starting a court order
  - Rate of proven reoffending
  - Proven reoffending rate amongst juvenile offenders

- **Improved public perception of safety**
  - Self-reported level of worry about being a victim of burglary
  - Self-reported level of worry about being a victim of car crime
  - Self-reported level of worry about being a victim of crime
  - Self-reported level of worry about being a victim of terrorism
  - Self-reported level of worry about being physically attacked by a stranger
  - Self-reported level of worry about being raped

**Key Outcome Category**

We are pleased to make more detailed outcome and indicators reporting available to BCF fund holders. Special terms and conditions apply. Contact info@bcf.bm
WHAT THE EXPERTS SAID

The Vital Signs Conversation on Safety and Housing was primarily attended by representatives from the non-profit/charity sector (80%) and the remainder from the government/QUANGO sector (20%). Participants reported that both the group process of prioritizing the outcomes and the resulting conversation were beneficial. Ninety percent (90%) of participants reported that the conversation caused them to examine their own organizational goals and outcomes. One participant reiterated this point by connecting the outcomes with their own organizational efforts and the need to evaluate their impact, “It made me more aware of the importance of obtaining various statistics from stakeholders to see the impact that we are making on the community.” There was value placed on the collaborative effort by the group. One participant stated, “getting the different perspectives of how and why these areas have an impact from different segments of society revealed common causes”

and another stated, “I think this process showed me what outcomes are being measured world-wide and also it shows what other professionals in the room believe to be a priority.”

Another positive outcome of the exercise was that participants were able to connect the importance of the outcomes with funding strategies. “The rankings on the topics of priority should clearly show where funding and resources must be placed. The collective interaction helped in changing the views of individuals.” The majority (64%) of participants were very confident that the prioritized outcomes, if achieved, would improve the quality of life in Bermuda. The remainder were equally split with 18% having moderate confidence and 18% reporting that they were extremely confident in the impact the outcomes could have on quality of life. One participant stated, “I believe that if we can begin to address the top three to four outcomes [on list of prioritised outcomes], we should see a change in culture and the quality of life for Bermudians.”

As the group debated the merits of each outcome, they came to the realization that, if achieved, some of the outcomes would resolve many other ancillary issues represented by other outcomes. A combination of the robust dialogue and various expert perspectives, provided a good backdrop for this group coming to the understanding of the interdependent nature of the outcomes. One participant stated, “the topics are intertwined. If you have impact on one outcome it influences another outcome. Perhaps the two keys are reduced crime and strong and safe communities. All the other outcomes fuel the achievement of these two. Drugs, alcohol, and re-offending have to be dealt with in order to get to the top outcomes.” They were also aware of the need for specific data to inform future efforts to reduce crime on the island. One participant stated, “To achieve better results we need better information. What crimes are happening where? What tips are being received on what types of crimes? What crimes are being solved? What cases hang open indefinitely? Where are the concentrations of specific crimes? What crimes are reported and what actions are taken?” This could be a clarion call for the police and government to provide community level data more frequently so that organisations in the third sector could be more responsive in their programming.

The group also discussed the need to examine and involve the schools and the criminal justice system in efforts to reduce crime and create safer communities. One participant expressed a concern with the increase in bullying and the relationship to gang behavior in schools, “When visiting the schools and even preschools, there is a lot of bullying evident. Gang prevention programs in schools would help reduce certain crimes in the long run. We need data from social services to know how effective these efforts have been.” Again, this group valued data as a means of making evidence-based decisions on programming. There were also many concerns expressed regarding the “pipeline” from schools to the correctional system. If certain behaviors could be curtailed at an early age in schools and replaced by pro-social behaviors, then it would follow that...
there would be a reduction in anti-social and criminal behaviors later in life. One participant commented, “Safer communities help reduce crime and help break the cycle of crime. Once the option of a lifestyle of crime is removed from a young life they could be more likely to focus on education resulting in better careers, finances and life choices. This then starts a positive cycle in the community which can expand outward and improve the lives of those around them.” There were also specific ideas about focused attention on at-risk youth and young juvenile offenders. One group member stated, “Working groups including community members, the police, Attorney General’s office, Legal Aid, and Child and Family Services, need to design and create policies. Some examples would be, increasing restorative justice practices and programs targeted to at-risk youth in all levels of the education system. Also, we need coordinated service approaches for young people identified as at-risk and a restructuring of our alternative education system.”

Group members were also focused on day to day life at the community level and how negative behaviors are sometime overlooked. Comments included, “Many people who are ‘community leaders’ do not check gang related behavior because they don’t want to offend or rustle feathers or cause conflict. We must tell people directly what behaviors are unacceptable and be clear about it. Negative behavior has been incorporated into our culture so that it is now acceptable. Also, everyone is trying to protect themselves,” and “Home life is important to everything. If my home/family allows me to sell drugs, bring in illegal items, or perpetrate violence then I will think it is fine in the community.” Such comments suggest the need for more agency amongst community members to help curb unwanted behaviors in their own neighborhoods. One member succinctly stated, “Strong and safe communities happen with community members stand up and say ‘Hey this is not OK for you to do in my neighborhood!’ Another participant reminded the group that the size and closeness of communities on the island also served to curtail such agency, “When you ask community members how crime effects them, they do not have a response because they know the perpetrator and have seen them grow up in the community.”

Finally, some participants believed that community members may live up to the “reputation” of their community/neighborhood akin to a self-fulfilling prophecy. A participant stated, “the perception of where people live impacts what they think is normal in their environment. Improvements to a neighborhood may help people have higher expectations and perhaps different behaviors. People think and behave according to the perceptions of their area. If we work together to change the quality of life, you will see [individuals have] an improved perception of themselves.” This sentiment would suggest that certain neighborhoods were presumed to be crime-ridden. Environment certainly impacts behavior but this logic would not explain the occurrence of crimes that occur in neighborhoods that do not carry such stigma.
WHO NEEDED TO BE IN THE ROOM

Representatives of key government entities, policy influencers and makers, nonprofits, vendors and service providers in the relevant field were invited to participate in the convening. They were also encouraged to nominate additional participants we may not have considered. The purpose was to ensure that the convening outcome would reflect input from those with the greatest experience and knowledge of the topic under review. This would include senior civil servants, nonprofit executives, industry leaders and community experts in their respective fields. At the convening, participants were asked to step aside from their individual affiliations and participate in the discussions as policy influencers, programme and service providers, researchers and other professionals for the benefit of Bermuda.

WHO WAS THERE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC Adrian Haynes</td>
<td>Police Constable (Community Officer)</td>
<td>Bermuda Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Arthur Dill</td>
<td>Police Constable (Community Officer)</td>
<td>Bermuda Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Tucker</td>
<td>Clinician</td>
<td>Gina Spence Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Woods</td>
<td>Outreach and Prevention Manager</td>
<td>Ministry of National Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Spence, PhD</td>
<td>CEO/Founder</td>
<td>Gina Spence Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Jean Louis</td>
<td>Police Constable (Community Officer)</td>
<td>Bermuda Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Jackson*</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mirrors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Krishna Singh</td>
<td>Police Constable (Community Officer)</td>
<td>Bermuda Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha L. Burrows</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Crime Stoppers Bermuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Peter Philpott</td>
<td>School Resource Officer</td>
<td>Community Action Team – Crime Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Van de Weg</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Crime Stoppers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudie Ottolini</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Crime Stoppers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Vernon Wears</td>
<td>Community Police officer</td>
<td>Bermuda Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zina Woolridge*</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Department of Court Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regrets = Confirmed but not in attendance

The Vital Signs Convenings are facilitated with the support of the BCF Vital Signs team: Research Coordinator, Dr. Tamara Gathright Fritz of Strategic Evaluation Consulting; BCF Managing Director, Dr. Myra Virgil; BCF Programme Associate, Michelle Grant; and BCF Intern Mercedes Pringle.

AN EVOLVING PROCESS

We strive to inform these convenings with high-level field and content area expertise. We ask participants to use their knowledge to inform this work at a national level. We appreciate the participation of the attendees of this convening. Also considered for participation, and therefore, potential community resources on this issue are: