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1 Policy Section

1.1 Statement of Intent – Aim and Rationale

Following the review of the protective service standards set by the College of Policing (COP) it became apparent that Dorset Police needed to improve processes for the commissioning of reviews and debriefs. It was also identified that there was a lack of clarity around the types of investigations that should be formally reviewed or debriefed. This document seeks to provide the necessary guidance and structure in relation to operational debriefs and reviews so that identified areas of good practice and development can be managed through existing boards. This document also provides guidance for the management of recommendations and lessons to be learnt following various inspections and reviews such as those carried out by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), the Independent Police Commission (IPCC) and following major incidents and where the post-incident procedure has been invoked.

1.2 Our Visions and Values

Dorset Police is committed to the principles of “One Team, One Vision – A Safer Dorset for You”

Our strategic priority is to achieve two clear objectives:

- To make Dorset safer
- To make Dorset feel safer

In doing this we will act in accordance with our values of:

- Integrity
- Professionalism
- Fairness and
- Respect

National Decision Model

The National Decision Model (NDM) is the primary decision-making model used in Dorset Police. The NDM is inherently flexible and is applied to the development and review of all policy, procedure, strategy, project, plan or guidance. Understanding, using and measuring the NDM ensures that we are able to make ethical (see Code of Ethics), proportionate and defensible decisions in relation to policy, procedure, strategy, project, plan or guidance.
Code of Ethics

The Code of Ethics underpins every day policy, procedures, decision and action in policing today. The Code of Ethics is an everyday business consideration. This document has been developed with the Code of Ethics at the heart ensuring consideration of the 9 policing principles and the 10 standards of professional behaviour. Monitoring is carried out through the Equality Impact Assessment process which has been designed to specifically include the Code of Ethics.

1.3 People, Confidence and Equality

This document seeks to achieve the priority to make Dorset feel safer by securing trust and confidence. Research identifies that this is achieved through delivering services which:

1. Address individual needs and expectations
2. Improve perceptions of order and community cohesion
3. Focus on community priorities
4. Demonstrate professionalism
5. Express Force values
6. Instil confidence in staff

This document also recognises that some people will be part of many communities defined by different characteristics. It is probable that all people share common needs and expectations whilst at the same time everyone is different.

Comprehensive consultation and surveying has identified a common need and expectation for communities in Dorset to be:-

- Listened to
- Kept informed
- Protected, and
- Supported.
2 Standards

2.1 Legal Basis

Some reviews such as child deaths and serious case reviews are mandated in law. This guidance seeks to provide clear direction to ensure reviews are commissioned and any lessons learned are auditable.

2.2 People, Confidence and Equality Impact Assessment

During the creation of this document, this business area is subject to an assessment process entitled “People, Confidence and Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)”. Its aim is to establish the impact of the business area on all people and to also ensure that it complies with the requirements imposed by a range of legislation.

2.3 Monitoring / Feedback

Policy compliance will be monitored by respective strategic leads and the Recommendations Coordinator. Progress will be overseen by the relevant chief officer chaired Board as described within this policy.

Feedback relating to this policy can be made in writing or by e-mail to

Address: Corporate Development HQ

E-mail: .Corporate development (internal) or corporatedevelopment2@Dorset.PNN.Police.uk (external)

Telephone: 01305 223719
3 Procedure Section

3.1 Review Process

3.1.1 This document does not seek to replace the current review process for major crime, nor interfere with the reviews instigated with partners. The purpose is to ensure reviews / debriefs are commissioned and the resulting good practice and learning recommendations are dealt with effectively. This will achieve an open, transparent and auditable process providing reassurance that Dorset Police are learning the lessons following reviews. This policy complements the post-incident procedure and should enable effective management of any learning identified.

3.1.2 The object of the review is to assist the Senior Investigating Officer (SIO) / Officer in the Case (OIC) to detect offences where they remain undetected; to identify good practice and to identify policy issues that are likely to assist future investigations.

3.1.3 Where an independent review has taken place such as those conducted by the HMIC or the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) any recommendations should be dealt with in the same way as those emanating from a commissioned review.

3.2 Commissioning a Review/Debrief

3.2.1 The process is not in itself intended to act as a separate reviewing function, but rather to commission reviews and then consider the recommendations that arise from the various review processes within the force.

3.2.2 The ‘relevant board’ will consider which recommendations should be progressed and monitor progress. In addition there will be regular exception reporting to the Joint Executive Board. Governance by the ‘relevant board’ is not intended to prevent the adoption of recommendations by strategic leads prior to a meeting where this is necessary.

3.2.3 The ‘relevant board’ is the most appropriate board chaired by a Chief Officer. For example recommendations from a serious case review will be overseen by the Protecting Vulnerable People Board chaired by the Assistant Chief Constable.

3.2.4 The strategic leads can take responsibility for commissioning a review, which will be allocated through their command and notified to the Recommendations Coordinator. The Recommendations Coordinator will ensure the review is raised on the dedicated SharePoint / Force Actions site and the necessary documentation added to the action.
3.2.5 To begin the process of review / debrief the terms of reference will be determined, which include the scale of review / debrief and will be agreed in consultation with the relevant departmental heads and discussed with the reviewing officer to establish an indication of the timescales involved.

3.2.6 The strategic lead (Superintendent or equivalent and above) should also consider the organisational and community impact of the review process, particularly in unresolved or undetected cases. Consideration should be given to conducting a community impact assessment in relevant cases. Guidance as to the potential impact on communities and the means of conducting assessments can be obtained from the People, Confidence & Equality Team part of Corporate Development.

3.3 Terms of Reference

The reviewing officer should be given written terms of reference by the strategic lead commissioning the review. As stated these should be drawn up following consultation with the SIO, if the case is deemed appropriate. Guidance in relation to the content of those terms of reference can be obtained from the Murder Investigation Manual and the Guidance for Domestic Homicide Reviews.

3.4 Methodology

3.4.1 The review process will follow the Home Office Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews irrespective of the type of review commissioned.

3.4.2 It is important that the reviewing officer explains to the SIO or equivalent in the presence of key personnel attached to an investigation, the reason for the review and the areas which will be reviewed. This should dispel any ill-founded beliefs or unease that the review is intended to be critical of the investigation to date.

3.5 Areas Covered by the Relevant Board

3.5.1 Murder and Serious Crimes; the appropriate board will be assigned on a case by case basis (e.g. the Protecting Vulnerable People Board or the Operations Board) within the following areas:

- Homicides; (Specific reference to domestic and vulnerable persons)
- Stranger Rapes;
- Serious Case Reviews / Child Death Overview Reports
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- Non-Stop Fatal RTCs (Offender Unknown)
- Cold Cases (Murder and Rape)

3.5.2 Serious Operational Cases

- Serious and Organised Crime
- High Risk and Long Term Missing Persons (Completed at 28 days)
- Declared Critical Incidents
- Thematic Reviews Post Incident Management Cases
- Public Order Debriefs

3.5.3 Other Categories

These will allow the force the opportunity to review other areas of work, for example Professional Standards Department (PSD) enquiries and murder/manslaughter investigations that are:

- discontinued by the Crown Prosecution Service
- accused found not guilty
- accused convicted but later released on appeal
- investigations that have a public/professional concern
- internal investigations
- HMIC / IPCC reports

3.6 Hot Debriefs

3.6.1 The commander will appoint an officer under their command to conduct a 'hot debrief' where applicable. The purpose of which should be to identify:

- Good practice/innovation
- The challenges and how they were overcome
- Lessons learnt
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- Areas for improvement.

3.6.2 The officer conducting the debrief should be mindful that their report will be subject to disclosure.

3.6.3 The completed ‘hot debrief’ form should be returned to the commander who will consider any points and either deal with them or refer necessary matters to the appropriate board.

3.6.4 The completed form will be added to the review file, the Learning the Lessons SharePoint site and attached to the master action.

3.7 Administration

3.7.1 The Recommendations Coordinator working from within Corporate Development will maintain a SharePoint / Force Actions database of live and completed reviews. This will provide an auditable system of work undertaken, and ensure reviews are completed in a timely manner. The database will also detail the recommendations from the reviews and detail who has ownership using the force actions system.

3.7.2 The database will serve as a knowledge bank and will be accessible to the Force. Where reviews are of a sensitive nature the security levels within the action will be reviewed and restricted as necessary. Consideration should also be given to the level of vetting for those staff members with access to sensitive or restricted information in relation to such reviews.

3.7.3 The ‘relevant board’ will identify how to progress the lessons learned and/or recommendations and who will be responsible for them. The board will monitor progress on the adoption and implementation of recommendations and identify good practice and lessons learnt that need to be raised at regional and/or national level.

3.8 Disclosure

3.8.1 In the event of anyone being charged in connection with a criminal investigation where a review has been conducted, the review report should be revealed to the CPS in accordance with the Criminal Procedures and Investigations Act (CPIA). This may also be disclosed to other investigative bodies where appropriate.

3.8.2 The review report will almost invariably be ‘relevant material’ and therefore needs to be considered in relation to disclosure. The prosecutor, in consultation with the SIO, will then determine whether the whole or any part of the review report undermines the prosecution case or assists the defence case and should, therefore, be disclosed to the defence.
3.8.3 There may be circumstances when the prosecution may feel it appropriate to claim Public Interest Immunity (PII) status in respect of part or all of the review report.

3.8.4 Chief Officers should consider policy in relation to the access to review reports under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 but in general no disclosure under this Act should take place until all legal proceedings or subsequent enquiries have taken place. Due consideration should be given to the appropriate protective marking on documents.

3.8.5 This policy and any reports and findings may be required as evidence (whether in criminal and/or civil proceedings) of the current practices and procedures within Dorset Police.
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Generic Review Template

1. INTRODUCTION

Brief factual/contextual summary of the situation including an outline of the terms of reference and date for completion:

- Identification of person subject to review
- Date of birth:
- Date of incident
- Operation name
- Name, job title and contact details of person completing

Victim, perpetrator, family details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. METHODOLOGY

Record the methodology used including extent of document review and interviews undertaken.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

4. GOOD PRACTICE/LESSONS LEARNT

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations should be focussed on the key findings of the review and be specific about the outcome which they are seeking.
The focus of this debrief should identify:
- Good practice/innovation
- What were the challenges - how they were overcome
- Lessons learnt
- With the benefit of hindsight, what do we need to improve upon

The officer conducting the debrief should be mindful that their report will be subject to disclosure.

Incident Number: I:                                 Crime Number:

Subject..............................................................................DOB.........................

On.........................................................................................

By.........................................................................................

Comments:
E.g. Innovation that led to an early arrest, resulted in effective use of experts, staff/resources etc)

Good practice/innovation
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What were the challenges - how they were overcome

Lessons learnt
What do we need to improve upon?

Officer completing…………………………………………………………………………………………..

Date………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

This document should be returned to the strategic lead who will be responsible for the analysis and dissemination of issues raised.

If there is any learning that would assist officers in the future, consider notifying Operational and Contingency Planning Section (OCPD) so that any contingency plans can be updated with lessons learned.
# Recommendations Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Scope of recommendation i.e. local or regional</th>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target date</th>
<th>Date of completion and outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the overarching recommendation?</td>
<td>Should this recommendation be enacted at a local or regional level? (N.B national learning will be identified by the analyst, however the review panel can suggest a recommendation for national level)</td>
<td>How exactly is the relevant agency going to make this recommendation happen? What actions need to occur?</td>
<td>Which agency is responsible for monitoring progress of the actions and ensuring enactment of the recommendation?</td>
<td>Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted?</td>
<td>When should this recommendation be completed by?</td>
<td>When is the recommendation actually completed? What does outcome look like?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fictional examples:**

1. All coroner’s should receive training on domestic violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action to take</th>
<th>Lead agency</th>
<th>Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation</th>
<th>Target date</th>
<th>Date of completion and outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Review current coroner’s training and identify gaps - Develop training module. - Roll-out revised training package as follows: June-July – Coroners in region X Aug-Sept – Coroners in region Y</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice Coroner’s team</td>
<td>- Review completed in January 15 - Training package agreed April 15 - Roll-out begins June 2015</td>
<td>All coroners to be trained by September 2015</td>
<td>All coroners received training by December 2015 and their narrative verdicts are beginning to reflect that this training has been effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>