



**Management Reviews of**  
**Serious Incidents**  
**Inspection**

**August 2005**

## GLOSSARY

ACO	Assistant chief officer
ACR	Automatic conditional release
CPO	Community punishment order
CPRO	Community punishment and rehabilitation order
CRO	Community rehabilitation order
DCO	Deputy chief officer
DCR	Discretionary conditional release
DTTO	Drug treatment and testing order
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
ICCP	Intensive Control and Change Programme
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MAPPP	Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel
NPD Licence	Non parole date licence
NPD	National Probation Directorate
PC	Probation Circular
PPU	Public Protection Unit
SSSO	Suspended sentence supervision order
YOI	Young Offender Institution

## BACKGROUND

Management reviews were prepared by probation areas under PC 71/1998 which has been superseded by PC 54/2003. PC 71/1998 section 4.1 stated that:

*'The purpose of a management review is to enable the local service to make an objective assessment of their involvement in the case, both in terms of the management of the individual case and the procedure the service has in place. It is not the purpose of the management review to allocate blame but to assess what has occurred so that any lessons are learned by individual services and, where appropriate the service as a whole.'*

The early findings of this inspection informed the development of the process set out in PC 54/2003. It should be noted that under this circular a serious incident is now referred to as a serious further offence and a management review is now a full review.

The Public Protection and Licensed Release Unit will be reviewing PC 54/2003 in the autumn of 2005. The Joint Thematic Inspection on Public Protection, which is taking place in the Autumn/Winter of 2005, will include an inspection of a small number of full review reports and associated offender case files. The information in this report concerning the time taken for a probation area to complete a report, and for the NPD to respond, will be used as a baseline in the forthcoming Joint Thematic Inspection on Public Protection.

## SUMMARY

**Serious Incidents:** in the majority of cases it was not clear what factors or triggers were present at the time the serious incidents took place. Where information was available alcohol/drugs, arguments/disagreements and domestic violence were significant. Most serious incidents (80%) took place in the first nine months of the commencement of an order or licence.

**Offender Characteristics:** the majority of offenders who committed serious incidents received a custodial sentence. They were male, between the ages of 21 and 35, had six or more previous offences, acted alone and knew the victim. There was a strong link between a previous history of violence and the commission of a violent serious incident. This was not the case with a sexual further offence, where most offenders did not have a history of known previous sexual offending. This was also noted in the report prepared by Geraldine Gavin of the London Probation Area.

**Victim Issues:** 25 out of 88 victims had previously been subjected to domestic violence from the offender; 33 out of 52 children were a direct victim.

**Management Issues:** out of a sample size of 292 management reviews, only 26 (9%) had been subject to MAPP; the majority were assessed as low or medium risk. Failings in the management of the cases could be attributed to the line manager, case manager or shortcomings in local systems. In over a third of management reviews there was no evidence that the NPD had responded to the recommendations. In most cases a standard letter was sent asking the area to confirm when the recommendations would be implemented. Occasionally an area was asked for further information or clarification about an issue in the main body of the management review or about the recommendations.

**Supervision Issues:** the majority of management reviews were written on offenders assessed as low or medium risk of harm. In addition, just over half the cases were assessed as low or medium likelihood of reoffending. Adequate risk assessments and reviews were an area of concern, along with adherence to national standards and appropriate record keeping.

### Recommendation

- A standard methodology or good practice guidelines for the investigation of serious incidents (now known as serious further offences) should be in place including appropriate specialist training for investigating officers.

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the inspection was to:

- collate the NPD's response to management reviews
- identify any common factors relating to the offender, the victim, the management of the case and any conclusions
- assess the overall quality of management reviews
- identify learning points which would inform practice and the new arrangements for serious incidents and management reviews.

### **The inspection of management reviews took place on two occasions**

1. On the 30 September 2003 a total of 232 management reviews were inspected, prepared on serious incidents that had taken place between 1 April 2002 and 31 March 2003. The inspection team on this occasion consisted of inspectors from HMI Probation; ACOs from several probation areas and an ACO from the PPU (see Appendix I).
2. On the second occasion it was decided to inspect a sample of 100 management reviews prepared on serious incidents that had taken place between 1 April 2003 and the 31 March 2004. However, it was of concern that, due to an administrative error, the 158 management reviews that had been noted as received by the PPU only 79 hard copies could be found. It was decided to inspect all 79. After withdrawing those management reviews that were not within the time frame, the final numbers that were inspected by two HM Inspectors between December 2004 and March 2005 was 60.

A questionnaire was used on both occasions (Appendix II). The creation of the questionnaire was influenced by:

- an analysis of serious incidents reported to have occurred between January and July 1997 by Carol Hedderman and Julie Vennard, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, which was attached to PC 71/1998
- an unpublished paper by Andy Wills (2001), Senior Probation Officer, Essex Probation Area, based on 163 management reviews from serious incidents that took place in 2000 and a sample of 46 out of 153 management reviews from serious incidents that took place in 2001 in England and Wales
- HMI Probation reading of 200 serious incident notifications in 2001/2002 for the report *Protecting children from potentially dangerous people – An Inter-Agency Inspection of Children's Safeguards* published in 2002
- an analysis of 90 management reviews from the London Probation Area for the period January 2002 to July 2003 prepared by Geraldine Gavin, Director of Community Protection, London Probation Area, August 2003

- consultation with inspection staff and the PPU and any recent relevant research.

The grand total of management reviews that were inspected was 292.

The information from the questionnaire has been grouped under headings: Serious Incidents, Offender Characteristics and Victim Issues, with the data expressed as findings. Under the headings Management Issues and Supervision Issues, the data has been divided further under sub-headings of findings, strengths and areas for improvement.

Percentages in brackets refer to the results of the analysis of serious incidents reported to have occurred between January and July 1997 by Carol Hedderman and Julie Vennard.

### **Serious Incidents (now known as Serious Further Offences)**

- Factors or triggers that were present shortly before the serious incident took place were in 20% of cases alcohol/drugs, 8% of cases an argument or disagreement, 8% of cases domestic violence and in 6% of cases mental health issues. In over half of cases the management review was not clear about what the factors or triggers were.
- 80% (70%) of serious incidents took place within the first nine months of the order or licence period. The figures were broken down as follows: first week 3% (2%), first month 13% (9%), between two and nine months 64%, over nine months 20%.

### **Offender Characteristics**

- In 77% of cases offenders who were sentenced for the serious incident received a custodial sentence. In 21% of cases the charge was either reduced, the case withdrawn or the offender was found not guilty. In only a minority of cases did the offender receive a community sentence.
- The majority of offenders were aged between 21 and 35. 15% of offenders were aged under 21 and 17% were aged between 36 and 44. There were very few offenders aged 45 or over.
- The majority of offenders were male.
- Race and ethnicity information was not available in nearly three-quarters of all management reviews. In 86 cases, where such information was available, 49 cases were White, 18 cases Black, nine cases Asian and ten cases were mixed race or other.
- In 58% of cases the offenders had more than six previous offences, 16% had between three and six and 14% had under three offences. It was not clear in 11% of cases whether the offender had any previous offences.

- Where the serious incident was a sexual offence, 61 offenders had no previous sexual offending history compared to 29 who did.
- Where the serious incident was a violent offence, 49 offenders had no previous history of violence compared to 170 who did.
- Over half the offenders were subject to community orders, with 37% subject to various licences.
- In 37% (44%) of cases the alleged serious incident was murder or attempted murder, 29% (27%) of cases the alleged offence was rape. A very small percentage of alleged offences were arson. The proportion of the alleged offences mentioned are similar to the serious incidents that took place between January and July 1997.
- In 64% (57%) of cases the offender acted alone.
- Of 154 management reviews where the relationship between the offender and victim was clear, in 120 cases the victim was known to the offender. A third of victims were a friend or acquaintance and another third of victims were a partner. A fifth of victims were a family member.
- Factors that contributed to the offender being assessed as high risk of harm were:
  - a conviction for a violent or sexual offence 32%
  - alcohol/ drugs 24%
  - attitudes and beliefs 12%
  - mental illness, domestic violence, personal relationships and anger management related problems were equally mentioned in 8% of cases.

### **Victim Issues**

- In 25 cases out of 88, there was evidence that the victim of the serious incident had previously been subjected to domestic violence from the offender. In the London Probation Area report one in five management reviews featured domestic violence.
- The gender of the victim was characterised by 40% male and 60% female.
- The overwhelming majority of reports did not include information on the ethnicity of the victim.
- At the time of the offence, 42% of the victims were under the age of 16 years, 20% were aged between 16 to 21, 18% between 22 to 45 and 21% were aged 45 years and over.
- In 33 cases a child had been a direct victim of the offence.

## MANAGEMENT ISSUES

### Findings

- Of the total sample size 26 cases or 9% had been subject to MAPPA. However, in 15 cases it was not clear whether the offender was subject to MAPPA or not.
- Of those subject to MAPPA, it was clear in 25 cases that 11 were managed at MAPPA Level 2 and 14 at Level 3.
- In the majority of reviews there had been no involvement from either the NPD or the PPU, except in four cases where their involvement was viewed as helpful.
- A number of the management reviews recommended further action to be taken; for example, 24% suggested further training for staff and 55% identified a need for change in policy and procedure. In no cases were disciplinary proceedings recommended.

### Strengths

- Where there was evidence of senior management involvement, the quality of their contribution had been sufficient in 75% of the cases.
- In 72% of the cases we concurred with the findings of the review.

### Areas for Improvement

- Under PC 71/1998 the NPD/PPU should be informed of a serious incident within 48 hours. Only 60 (27%) out of the 224 valid cases, where dates were available achieved this. 36% of notifications to the NPD arrived between one and three weeks after the alleged offence. Table 1 below shows the full results. 'Missing data no dates recorded' refers to the fact that in many cases dates were not recorded in the appropriate box on a form used by administrative staff in the PPU.

Table 1

<b>Time from alleged offence to arrival of notification at NPD</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 week	60	27%
1 - 3 weeks	80	36%
4 - 6 weeks	29	13%
7 - 14 weeks	29	13%
15 - 52 weeks	23	10%
Over a year	3	1%
Valid Total	224	
Missing data - no dates recorded	68	
Sample	292	

- PC 71/1998 did not stipulate a period of time for the submission of a management review from the point the serious incident had taken place. The circular stated that the management review should be produced as soon as possible after the notification of the serious incident. There was an expectation that one should commence even if the offender was pleading not guilty or the charge was subsequently reduced. However, it was acknowledged that a management review may not be available until the case had completed the trial process or once disciplinary action against staff had come to an end. Table 2 shows that just over half of the management reviews were received within 19 weeks of the initial notification to the NPD.

Table 2

<b>Time from notification to receipt of management review</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 9 weeks	38	15%
10 - 19 weeks	108	42%
20 - 29 weeks	68	26%
30 - 52 weeks	35	14%
Over a year	9	3%
Valid Total	258	
Missing data - no dates recorded	34	
Sample	292	

- PC 71/1998 did not state how quickly the PPU should have responded on receipt of the management review. In 85% of management reviews the PPU responded within 20 weeks. Table 3 below shows the details for all management reviews where dates were available.

Table 3

<b>Time from management review and response from PPU</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 5 weeks	23	12%
5 - 10 weeks	51	26%
11 - 20 weeks	92	47%
21 - 52 weeks	26	13%
Over a year	3	2%
Valid Total	195	
Missing data - no dates recorded	97	
Sample	292	

- The line manager had failed to follow local procedures in 18% of the cases.
- Where system failings were apparent, 19% of these could be attributed to inadequate policies and procedures in the area. Shortcomings were also identified during the transfer process of cases in 12% of reports inspected.

The overall results are shown in table 4 below and are compared with the results from the 1997 study. Generally there has been a deterioration in the results.

Table 4

	2002/2003 2003/2004		1997	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Management Review assessments of line manager shortcomings and system failings</b>				
Cases where line manager had failed	62	41%	25	33%
Line manager acted correctly throughout	90	59%	52	67%
No comment in review	140		30	
<b>System failings</b>				
No failures in system	163	61%	33	40%
No failures in system	104	39%	50	60%
No comment in review	25		24	

- The quality of middle management involvement was assessed as inadequate or poor in 33% of the cases inspected.

Table 5 compares the results with a study of management reviews prepared in 2001. However, the figures should be viewed with some caution as the option 'Case could not be placed in any category' was not available in the inspection. Even so, the percentage of unpredictable serious incidents has gone up and, perhaps more worrying, the percentage of management reviews which found that risk factors had been present, but their significance was not recognised or acted on, increased from 24% to 30%.

Table 5

Category of case	2002/2003 2003/2004 %	2001 %
Serious incident unpredictable	53%	35%
Risk foreseen and action taken to reduce harm	16%	13%
Unrecognised high risk	31%	24%
Case could not be placed in any one category	0%	28%

- Just over a third of the reviews were of insufficient quality in format, content and depth.
- In 42% of cases there was no evidence that the NPD had responded to the recommendations in the reviews. In over half of the cases a letter had been sent asking for the probation area to confirm when the recommendations would be implemented, requesting further information or clarification about other issues.
- In 58% of cases, where the NPD had responded to the recommendations of the review, we found they had acted appropriately in just over two-thirds.

## SUPERVISION ISSUES

### Findings

- At the commencement of supervision 77% of the cases had been assessed as low or medium risk of harm. This compares to a figure of 63% of cases from a sample of 46 management reviews received by April 2002. Furthermore, in 2001, 163 management reviews were examined and only in approximately a quarter of cases was there a clear indication that the risk of harm had been assessed as high. In other words, over a period of four years, an examination of a total of 501 management reviews indicated that around a quarter of the offenders who allegedly committed a serious incident were identified as high risk of harm and about three-quarters were low or medium risk of harm. In the London Probation Area report a similar proportion was reported (77% cases were low or medium risk of harm and 22% high risk of harm).
- Prior to the serious incident occurring 76% of the offenders had been assessed as low or medium risk of harm.
- At the commencement of supervision 51% of the cases had been assessed as low or medium likelihood of reoffending.

### *Areas for improvement*

- Where changes in risk had been identified, in only 41% of cases had the risk been managed sufficiently.
- In only 66% of cases had the offender been supervised in accordance with the area's public protection policies and procedures.
- National standards in relation to the timeliness and preparation of supervision plans were complied with in only 64% (54%) of the cases; adequate frequency of appointments and appropriate enforcement action had been achieved in 79% (84%) and 72% of cases respectively.
- Where case manager shortcomings had been identified, some significant results emerged:  
case managers failed to:
  - accurately assess risk 15%
  - develop a risk management plan 6%
  - follow national standards 21%
  - Keep proper records 11%
  - Follow local procedures 10%.

The overall results are shown in table 6 below compared to the results of the 1997 study.

Table 6

	2002/2003 2003/2004		1997	
	N	%	n	%
<b>Management review assessments of case manager/supervisor shortcomings</b>				
Case manager/supervisor failed to act correctly	185	66%	42	44%
Case manager/supervisor acted correctly	96	44%	54	56%
No comment in review	11		11	

- In only 61% of cases had adequate risk assessments and reviews taken place.
- Where diversity issues were relevant to the case, 50% of management reviews identified and commented upon them.

## APPENDIX I

### Inspection team 2003 management reviews

Jim Aherne	ACO, Gwent
Di Askwith	HM Inspector
Janet Chaplin	ACO, South Wales
Pip Coker	ACO, Norfolk
Jill Cotgrove	ACO, Avon & Somerset
Krystina Findley	ACO, Leicestershire & Rutland
Sue Hall	DCO, West Yorkshire
Kam Kaur	HM Inspector
Karen Page	HM Inspector
Nigel Scarff	HM Inspector
Jo Thompson	ACO, PPU

## APPENDIX II

### HM INSPECTORATE OF PROBATION Inspection of Management Reviews



Instructions for the completion of this questionnaire.

All forms in this sample should be based on those reviewed between April 2002 and March 2003.

If a Management Review is not in this sample, please do not fill in this form and instead draw this to the attention of the lead inspector at the file read.

*Please complete this form in **black ink**.*

**For questions with several options, please shade one answer unless otherwise instructed.**

Please make no other comments or marks on the form, except where expressly requested.

*For those questions that have multiple choice answers, please shade in the circle relating to the appropriate response, as follows:*

Male  Female

*If you make a mistake, please cross through the incorrect response, and then shade in the correct response, as follows:*

Male  Female

Any questions relating to the questionnaire please contact Nigel Scarff, HM Inspector.

Tel 020 7035 2217, mobile 07766 422290, e-mail [nigel.scarff@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:nigel.scarff@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) HM Inspectorate of Probation, Home Office, Second Floor, Ashley House, 2 Monck Street, London SW1P 2BQ.

(HMIP  
use only)

**Background Information**

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 1.  | Probation Area                              |  |
| 2.  | Name of offender                            |  |
| 3.  | Date the alleged offence took place         |  |
| 4.  | Date of notification received at NPD        |  |
| 5.  | Date Management Review received at NPD      |  |
| 6.  | Date NPD/PPU responded                      |  |
| 7.  | Date of final court appearance              |  |
| 8.  | Result of final court appearance            | Convicted:<br>Community service <input type="radio"/><br>Custodial sentence <input type="radio"/><br>Original charge reduced <input type="radio"/><br>Found not guilty <input type="radio"/><br>Case withdrawn <input type="radio"/> |
| 9.  | Age of offender at the time of the incident | Under 21 <input type="radio"/><br>21-25 <input type="radio"/><br>26-35 <input type="radio"/><br>36-44 <input type="radio"/><br>45+ <input type="radio"/>   |
| 10. | Gender                                      | Male <input type="radio"/><br>Female <input type="radio"/>   |

- |            |  |  |                                     |                       |
|------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>11.</b> | Race and Ethnicity                                       | W1   | White: British                      | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | W2   | White: Irish                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | W9   | White: Other                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | M1   | Mixed: White and Black Caribbean    | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | M2   | Mixed: White and Black African      | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | M3   | Mixed: White and Asian              | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | M9   | Mixed: Other                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | A1   | Asian or British Asian: Indian      | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | A2   | Asian or British Asian: Pakistani   | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | A3   | Asian or British Asian: Bangladeshi | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | A9   | Asian or British Asian: Other       | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | B1   | Black or Black British: Caribbean   | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | B2   | Black or Black British: African     | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | B9   | Black or Black British: Other       | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | O1   | Chinese                             | <input type="radio"/> |
|            |  | O9   | Other Ethnic Group                  | <input type="radio"/> |
| NS         | Not Stated/Refused                                       | <input type="radio"/>                            |                                     |                       |
| <b>12.</b> | Number of previous offences (including current offence?) | More than 6                                      | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | Between 3 and 6                                  | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | Less than 3                                      | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | Not clear  | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
| <b>13.</b> | Is the present offence a sexual offence?                 | Yes, and with previous sexual offending history  | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | Yes, with no sexual offending history            | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | No   | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
| <b>14.</b> | Is the present offence a violent offence?                | Yes, and with previous violent offending history | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | Yes, with no violent offending history           | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |
|            |  | No   | <input type="radio"/>               |                       |

15. What type of Order/Licence is the offender on?
- CRO
  - CPRO
  - CPO
  - DTTO
  - SSSO
  - ICCP
  - YOI
  - ACR Licence
  - DCR Licence
  - NPD Licence
  - Extended Licence
  - HDC Licence
  - Life Licence
16. Was the case subject to any of the following transfer processes:
- a. From a foreign jurisdiction  
(Either outside or inside the UK)
- Yes
  - No
  - Not Clear
- b. Between Probation Areas
- Yes
  - No
  - Not Clear
- c. Between offices or units within the same Probation Area
- Yes
  - No
  - Not Clear
- d. Between officers or staff in the same office or unit
- Yes
  - No
  - Not Clear

*Details of the Serious Incident*

17. The alleged offence
- |  |   |                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|
|  | Murder  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Attempted Murder  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Arson where there is intent to endanger life  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Manslaughter  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Rape  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Any other serious violent or sexual offence, armed robbery with a firearm, assault with a deadly weapon, or hostage taking    | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Any other offence which has attracted significant media interest or thought likely to raise wider issues of national interest | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Other (please state)  | <input type="radio"/> |
- 
18. Circumstances of the offence
- a. Did the offender act alone?
- |  |                |                       |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|
|  | Yes            | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | No             | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | No Information | <input type="radio"/> |
- b. Was the victim known to the offender?
- |  |                |                       |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|
|  | Yes            | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | No             | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | No Information | <input type="radio"/> |
- c. If the victim was known to the offender, what was the relationship of the victim to the offender?
- |  |                      |                       |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
|  | Family member        | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Friend/acquaintance  | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Partner              | <input type="radio"/> |
|  | Other (please state) | <input type="radio"/> |
-

**Victim Characteristics**

*Please skip this section if there is no information on the victim available and go to question 22.*

- |                       |  |  |                       |
|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| <b>19.</b>            | Is there evidence that the victim of the new offence had previously been subjected to domestic violence from the offender? | Yes                                    | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | No                                     | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | Not Clear                              | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | Not Applicable                         | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>20.</b>            | Victim Gender  | Male                                   | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | Female                                 | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>21.</b>            | Victim Race and Ethnicity  | W1 White: British                      | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | W2 White: Irish                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | W9 White: Other                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | M1 Mixed: White and Black Caribbean    | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | M2 Mixed: White and Black African      | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | M3 Mixed: White and Asian              | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | M9 Mixed: Other                        | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | A1 Asian or British Asian: Indian      | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | A2 Asian or British Asian: Pakistani   | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | A3 Asian or British Asian: Bangladeshi | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | A9 Asian or British Asian: Other       | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | B1 Black or Black British: Caribbean   | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | B2 Black or Black British: African     | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | B9 Black or Black British: Other       | <input type="radio"/> |
| O1 Chinese            | <input type="radio"/>  |  |                       |
| O9 Other Ethnic Group | <input type="radio"/>  |  |                       |
| NS Not Stated/Refused | <input type="radio"/>  |  |                       |
| <b>22.</b>            | Age of victim at the time of the offence   | Under 16                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | 16 to 18                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | 19 to 21                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | 22 to 25                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | 26 to 35                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | 36 to 45                               | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | Over 45                                | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>23.</b>            | If the victim was a child, were they a direct victim?  | Yes                                    | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | No, indirect victim                    | <input type="radio"/> |
|                       |  | N/A                                    | <input type="radio"/> |

**Serious Incident**

- |     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 24. | Did any of the following factors contribute to or trigger the serious incident? (Please shade all those which apply)<br><i>Factors referred to here are those that precipitated the new offence at the time or within 24 hours of the offence taking place.</i> | Alcohol/Drugs<br>Mental Health<br>Argument/Disagreement<br>Domestic Violence history<br>Not Clear<br>Other, please state below | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/> |
|     |   |  |  |
| 25. | When did the serious incident take place in relation to the commencement of the current order or licence?   | 1 <sup>st</sup> week<br>1 <sup>st</sup> month<br>2 - 9 months<br>over 9 months   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>   |
| 26. | What level of risk of harm was the offender judged to have posed at the commencement of supervision?  | Very High<br>High<br>Medium<br>Low   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>   |
| 27. | What level of risk of harm was the offender judged to have posed before the serious incident took place?  | Very High<br>High<br>Medium<br>Low   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>   |
| 28. | If there were any changes in risk of harm identified, how well were these managed?  | Excellently<br>Sufficiently<br>Not sufficiently<br>Poorly<br>N/A   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>                          |
| 29. | What was the assessment of the likelihood of reoffending at the commencement of supervision?  | Very High<br>High<br>Medium<br>Low   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>   |
| 30. | Was the offender supervised in accordance with the area's public protection policies and procedures?  | Yes<br>No<br>Not Clear   | <input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/><br><input type="radio"/>  |



35. Where any of the following identified as a shortcoming or failure? (Please shade all that apply)
- a.** Case manager/supervisor failed to:
- Accurately assess risk
  - Develop a risk management plan (under MAPPA if applicable)
  - Follow some aspects of national standards
  - Consult their line manager about supervision difficulties
  - Keep proper records
  - Follow local procedures
  - Slow to follow up failures to attend
  - Contact other agencies
  - Case Manager/Supervisor acted correctly throughout
  - No comment on Case Manager/Supervisor in management review
- b.** Line manager failed to:
- Provide adequate support
  - Monitor records
  - Follow local procedures
  - Line manager acted correctly throughout
  - No comment on line manager in Management review
- c.** System failings
- MAPPA
  - Inadequate policies and procedures
  - More training needed
  - Better liaison between agencies needed
  - Poor Community Punishment/Case Manager liaison
  - Other agencies failed to supply information
  - Transfer process
  - No failure identified
  - No comment

36. Did the management review indicate any middle management involvement with the case, and if so how well did the involvement contribute to the management of the case?
- Excellent
- Adequate
- Inadequate
- Poor
- No middle management involvement with the case
37. Did the management review indicate any senior management involvement with the case, and if so how well did the involvement contribute to the management of the case?
- Excellent
- Adequate
- Inadequate
- Poor
- No senior management involvement with the case
38. If there were any diversity issues, were these identified and commented on in the review?
- Yes
- No
- Not clear
- N/A
39. Do you agree with any diversity assessment?
- Yes
- No
- N/A
40. After reading the Management Review where would you place the case from the following categories?
- Serious incident largely unpredictable and/or where there was a high random element
- High risk of harm known/previously identified. High risk foreseen and action taken to reduce harm.
- Unrecognised high risk: risk factors were present, but their significance was not recognised or acted on
41. Was NPD or PPU involved with the serious incident and if so was the involvement viewed as helpful?
- No, NPD/PPU not involved
- Yes, involved and seen as helpful
- Yes, involved and not seen as helpful
- Not clear
42. What in your opinion was the overall quality of the management review? (Please refer to the guidance provided on the day when answering this question)
- Excellent
- Satisfactory
- Not Satisfactory
- Poor

43. What further action was recommended by the management review?
- Disciplinary/capability proceedings
  - Further training for relevant staff
  - Change in own policy and procedures
  - Other (please specify)

44. Do you agree with the findings/conclusions at the Management Review?
- Yes
  - No

Please comment

45. Is there evidence that the NPD responded to the recommendations in the management review?
- No evidence
  - Evidence of letter sent asking for confirmation of when recommendations would be implemented
  - Request for further information
  - Other action

46. Do you agree that the NPD acted appropriately?
- Yes
  - No

47. Any other comments?