**Serious Incident Review Part One: Case Review**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | Care Inspectorate SIR reference number |  |
| **2** | Person’s initials |  |
| **3** | Age |  |
| **4** | Basis of review  |  |
| Role of reviewer |  |
| **5** | Chronology prepared | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| **6** | **Case Overview**Provide a brief description of the person’s relevant history including: * the extent and nature of offending history
* response to previous supervision
* the offence(s) resulting in current order/licence
* compliance with current order/licence
* any discipline issues in custody (if relevant)
* any additional details about the current charge/incident that were not included in the notification
* MAPPA category and management level (where relevant)
 |
|  |
| **7** | **Case file examination: answer each of the following questions and provide the evidence and rationale to support your conclusion.** |
| **7.1** | Was an appropriate assessment of risk undertaken and completed? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.2** | Was the LS/CMI assessment completed within nationally agreed timescales (where relevant)? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7.3** | Where risk of serious harm was indicated was a risk of serious harm (RoSH) assessment completed? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.4** | Was the risk assessment updated in accordance with expectations and/or reviewed in light of significant change? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.5** | Was the risk assessment of an appropriate quality? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.6** | Was a case/risk management plan completed within nationally agreed timescales?  |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.7** | Did the case/risk management plan correlate to the identified risks/needs?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.8** | Were the actions in the case/risk management plan appropriately implemented?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.9** | Was the case/risk management plan reviewed and/or updated in the course of the order/licence to reflect progress and/or change?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.10** | Were statutory requirements of the order/licence appropriately delivered?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.11** | Was the level of supervision proportionate to the assessed level of risk/need? |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.12** | Was non-compliance appropriately managed in line with national outcomes and standards? |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.13** | Were home visits undertaken in line with national outcomes and standards? |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.14** | Did statutory social work reviews take place in line with national outcomes and standards? |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.15** | Did the statutory social work review(s) focus on the progress of the case/risk management plan? |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.16** | Was the management oversight of the order/licence sufficient? |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.17** | Where other internal/external professionals were involved, was partnership working and information sharing appropriate?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.18** | Was practice compliant with local policies and procedures?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.19** | Were early warning signs of escalating risk or imminent offending appropriately identified and addressed?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.20** | Were all reasonable steps taken to manage risk and need?  |
| [ ]  Completely [ ] Mostly [ ] Partially [ ]  Not at all [ ] N/A |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |
| **7.21** | Is the need for further examination indicated? Where you have answered ‘no’, ‘not at all’ or ‘partially’ to any of the key considerations, further analysis using the ***Reflective Learning Review*** should be considered to support learning regarding local or national practice. Where you have answered ‘no’, ‘not at all’ or ‘partially’ but conclude that more detailed examination is not required, a clear rationale for this decision should be provided below. Please then complete sections 10, 11 and 12 prior to submission. | [ ]  Yes[ ]  No  |
| *Evidence and rationale to support conclusion:* |