

The LS/CMI Quality Assurance Templates:

Guidance Notes

Contents	Page
Introduction	1-2
Evaluating the Offender History	3-4
Evaluating the Initial Assessment & Scan For Risk	5-6
Evaluating the Examination of Risk: LS/CMI 1-8	7-9
Evaluating the Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment	10-14
Evaluating the Risk Management Plan	15-28
<i>Risk Assessment</i>	<i>15-19</i>
<i>Planning & Responding to Change</i>	<i>20-23</i>
<i>Risk Management Measures</i>	<i>24-26</i>
<i>Partnership Working</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Quality Assurance</i>	<i>28</i>

Introduction

1. There are 5 templates in total which can be used to evaluate the quality of assessments and plans drawn from the LS/CMI system. These templates correspond with the following 5 sections of the LS/CMI method:
 - **Offender History**
 - **Initial Assessment** (incorporating the LSI-R:SV and an initial analysis of offending)
 - **LS/CMI 1-8**
 - **Full Risk of Serious Harm Assessment**
 - **Risk Management Planning** (which includes the full RoSH assessment)

A practitioner, manager or service undertaking an evaluation could decide to focus on one aspect of practice (e.g. Risk Management Planning); a few aspects (e.g. Offender History, Initial Assessment and LS/CMI 1-8) or the entire practice process using all 5 templates¹.

2. For each section or aspect of practice being evaluated, a number of items are provided in the form of a checklist which require one of 4 responses:
 - Yes
 - No
 - Partial
 - N/A (Not Applicable)

A response of *Partial* would be used where, for example, there is some evidence, but not strong enough to mark as Yes.

Every item on the checklist should be considered and a response recorded before rating each section overall.

3. A five-point scale is used for the overall rating each of the sections:

4 – Excellent. All areas are strong and demonstrate a high level of quality. No need for improvements identified.

3 – Good. Almost all areas are strong, with room for only minor improvement.

2 – Adequate. Some areas of weakness, and a need for some improvement exists.

1 – Weak. Key weaknesses are present. A need for major improvement exists.

0 – Unsatisfactory. Major weaknesses exist with little or no areas of strength. A very clear need for major improvement exists.

4. A **comments field** for each section is available should raters want to provide a rationale for their rating and/ or detail any particular issues, strengths or weaknesses.
5. An **actions field** is available to record any actions that are required as a result of the evaluation exercise - along with the date the action was completed.

¹ Further templates to enable case management plans and progress records to be evaluated are yet to be developed.

Any item marked as Partial or No within the checklist would likely require an action to be recorded.

For example, a completed evaluation of an Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk:

Quality Assurance TEMPLATE 2	INITIAL ASSESSMENT & SCAN FOR RISK																																								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">LS/CMI System Case Number:</td> <td>1001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>URN/ S-number:</td> <td>S123456/99P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assessor/ assigned worker:</td> <td>I. Hodor</td> </tr> </table>		LS/CMI System Case Number:	1001	URN/ S-number:	S123456/99P	Assessor/ assigned worker:	I. Hodor																																		
LS/CMI System Case Number:	1001																																								
URN/ S-number:	S123456/99P																																								
Assessor/ assigned worker:	I. Hodor																																								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Evaluation completed by:</td> <td>J. SNOW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Date:</td> <td>01/04/18</td> </tr> </table>		Evaluation completed by:	J. SNOW	Date:	01/04/18																																				
Evaluation completed by:	J. SNOW																																								
Date:	01/04/18																																								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">2. Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Yes</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Partial</th> <th style="width: 10%;">No</th> <th style="width: 10%;">N/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2.1 Consider scored item 3 (Currently unemployed?) Is the response consistent with other sources of information about the person's employment status?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.2 Consider scored item 5 (Alcohol/ Drug problem: school/work?) Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.3 Consider scored item 8 (Attitudes/ orientation: Supportive of crime). Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.4 Does the assessment provide a sufficient analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.5 Is the summary of the analysis of offending concise and written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ a decision maker?</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.6 Is the recommended/ preferred disposal as expected given the assessment and analysis of offending which precedes it?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.7 Is the conclusion written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ the decision maker?</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2. Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk	Yes	Partial	No	N/A	2.1 Consider scored item 3 (Currently unemployed?) Is the response consistent with other sources of information about the person's employment status?	✓				2.2 Consider scored item 5 (Alcohol/ Drug problem: school/work?) Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?	✓				2.3 Consider scored item 8 (Attitudes/ orientation: Supportive of crime). Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?	✓				2.4 Does the assessment provide a sufficient analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?		✓			2.5 Is the summary of the analysis of offending concise and written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ a decision maker?		✓			2.6 Is the recommended/ preferred disposal as expected given the assessment and analysis of offending which precedes it?	✓				2.7 Is the conclusion written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ the decision maker?		✓		
2. Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk	Yes	Partial	No	N/A																																					
2.1 Consider scored item 3 (Currently unemployed?) Is the response consistent with other sources of information about the person's employment status?	✓																																								
2.2 Consider scored item 5 (Alcohol/ Drug problem: school/work?) Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?	✓																																								
2.3 Consider scored item 8 (Attitudes/ orientation: Supportive of crime). Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?	✓																																								
2.4 Does the assessment provide a sufficient analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?		✓																																							
2.5 Is the summary of the analysis of offending concise and written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ a decision maker?		✓																																							
2.6 Is the recommended/ preferred disposal as expected given the assessment and analysis of offending which precedes it?	✓																																								
2.7 Is the conclusion written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ the decision maker?		✓																																							
LS/CMI – QA – Template 2: Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk – Version 14/02/18																																									

Rate the Initial Assessment				
0	1	2	3	4
Unsatisfactory	Weak	Adequate	Good	Excellent
		✓		

Comments
<p>The final couple of lines of the analysis of offending are very good and clear (specifies the likelihood, the impact and for whom).</p> <p>However, this is preceded by a large amount of text which mainly lists the previous offences which offers little by way of analysis.</p> <p>The summary of the analysis of offending plus the conclusion could be improved by avoiding the use of language such as 'criminogenic needs' and 'high risk and needs'.</p>

Action(s) Required	Action completed (date)
Advise assessor of the positive aspects of this assessment.	01/05/18
Advise assessor of the areas for improvement: provide more analysis and avoid use of jargon which is unlikely to be understood or misunderstood by others.	01/05/18

Rate the Initial Assessment				
0	1	2	3	4
Unsatisfactory	Weak	Adequate	Good	Excellent
		✓		

Comments
<p>The final couple of lines of the analysis of offending are very good and clear (specifies the likelihood, the impact and for whom).</p> <p>However, this is preceded by a large amount of text which mainly lists the previous offences which offers little by way of analysis.</p> <p>The summary of the analysis of offending plus the conclusion could be improved by avoiding the use of language such as 'criminogenic needs' and 'high risk and needs'.</p>

Action(s) Required	Action completed (date)
Advise assessor of the positive aspects of this assessment.	01/05/18
Advise assessor of the areas for improvement: provide more analysis and avoid use of jargon which is unlikely to be understood or misunderstood by others.	01/05/18

The comments and/ or action fields could also be used by evaluators to note any additional matters which require to be addressed, but are not covered by the specific items within the QA templates (e.g. other evident scoring errors, spelling mistakes, or evidence that policies or guidance are not being adhered to).

Evaluating the Offender History

To report on the Offender History using the LS/CMI system:

- Locate the case within the *System Cases* table on the Dashboard
- Click on [Report](#)
- Select **Offender History** from the *Select Report* picklist
- Select pdf or Word from the *Select a format* picklist
- Click on [Export](#)

1. Offender History		Guidance Notes
1.1	Is the <i>local reference number</i> accurate?	<p>Where is this? This number can be found at the top and bottom of the Offender History document when reporting on the case (alternatively go to the very 1st screen of the case if viewing the record within the system).</p> <p>What is it? The local reference number should be the same as the local information system number (e.g. CareJust; Swift; Framework-i) or prisoner number (for custody based assessments).</p> <p>Look for errors such as the use of court reference numbers, the URN or placeholders such as XXX.</p>
1.2	Is the specified <i>reason for assessment</i> accurate?	<p>Where is this? <i>Section A: Reason for Assessment</i> of the Offender History document.</p> <p>What is it? This is the reason for undertaking the current assessment.</p> <p>Forgetting to update the reason for assessment will likely occur at the following stages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - when a CPO has been imposed & the first full LS/CMI 1-8 is being applied, the reason should be changed from <i>court report</i> to <i>community supervision intake</i> - when a reassessment has been applied during a period of supervision, the reason should be changed from <i>community supervision intake</i> to <i>reassessment</i> - when a record has been imported from another setting (community to prison or vice versa) and a reassessment has been applied, the reason should be changed to reflect whether it is now a <i>community</i> or an <i>institutional</i> based assessment.

1. Offender History		Guidance Notes
1.3	Is the assessment based on a sufficient range of information, gathered from a variety of sources?	Where is this? <i>Section B1: Sources of Information</i> of the Offender History document
1.4	Has the <i>Court Disposal</i> been recorded?	Where is this? <i>Section B3: Disposal</i>

Evaluating the Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk

To report on the Initial Assessment & Scan for Risk using the LS/CMI system:

- Locate the case within the *System Cases* table on the Dashboard
- Click on [Report](#)
- Select **Initial Analysis of Offending** from the *Select Report* picklist
- Select pdf or Word from the *Select a format* picklist
- Click on [Export](#)

2. Initial Assessment & Scan		Guidance Notes
2.1	<p>Consider scored item 3 (<i>Currently unemployed?</i>)</p> <p>Is the response consistent with other sources of information about the person's employment status?</p>	<p>Where is this? LSI-R :SV QuikScore, item 3.</p> <p>This item refers to those who are in the labour market (i.e. able and willing to work).</p> <p>This item should be marked as 'Omit' if the individual is in full time education, a homemaker by choice or a 'pensioner'.</p> <p>'Pensioners' includes individuals who are unable to work and are in receipt of a disability benefit for reasons relating to disability or incapacity, in addition to those individuals who are in receipt of a retirement pension.</p>
2.2	<p>Consider scored item 5 (<i>Alcohol/ Drug problem: school/ work?</i>)</p> <p>Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? LSI-R :SV QuikScore, item 5.</p> <p>This item should only be marked as 'Yes' where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The individual's <u>current</u> use of alcohol or drugs is problematic (current refers to the past 12 months) AND ○ The problematic use of alcohol or drugs have contributed to problems with school/college or employment. Examples include having a hangover that prevented the individual going to college or work, being asked to leave college because of drug use, or losing employment because of intoxication.

2. Initial Assessment & Scan For Risk		Guidance Notes
2.3	<p>Consider scored item 8 (<i>Attitudes/ orientation: Supportive of crime</i>).</p> <p>Is the response consistent with the information within the court report (or other sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? LSI-R :SV QuikScore, item 8.</p> <p>This item is concerned with how and what an individual thinks about themselves and others in relation to rule breaking and law violations. To what extent are their attitudes, values and beliefs procriminal/ anti-social? This item is rated where:</p> <p>3 = A satisfactory situation with no need for improvement.</p> <p>2 = A relatively satisfactory situation, with some room for improvement.</p> <p>1 = A relatively unsatisfactory situation with a need for improvement.</p> <p>0 = A very unsatisfactory situation with a very clear and strong need for improvement.</p>
2.4	<p>Does the assessment provide a sufficient analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 5, Summary</p> <p>Pattern refers to the onset (since when), duration and frequency (how often).</p> <p>Nature refers to the type, diversity and to whom the offences are directed.</p> <p>Seriousness refers to the level of planning, the degree of harm caused and the degree of harm intended.</p> <p>Likelihood based on the balance of identified risk factors, protective factors and strengths.</p> <p>The analysis should provide the reader with an understanding of the person's offending .</p>
2.5	<p>Is the summary of the analysis of offending concise and written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ a decision maker?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 5, Summary</p>
2.6	<p>Is the recommended/ preferred disposal as expected given the assessment and analysis of offending which precedes it?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 6, Evaluation</p>
2.7	<p>Is the conclusion written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ the decision maker?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 7, Conclusion</p> <p>For example, does the conclusion avoid the use of jargon and terms such as 'criminogenic' or 'high', 'medium', 'low' unless clearly explained what this means?</p>

Evaluating the Examination of Risk: LS/CMI 1-8 Assessment

To report on the LS/CMI 1-8 using the LS/CMI system:

- Locate the case within the *System Cases* table on the Dashboard
- Click on [Report](#)
- Select **LSCMI 1 to 8** from the *Select Report* picklist
- Select pdf or Word from the *Select a format* picklist
- Click on [Export](#)

3. Examination of Risk: LS/CMI 1-8 Assessment		Guidance Notes
3.1	<p>Consider Section 1, items 1, 2 & 3: <i>Previous episodes of offending</i>.</p> <p>Are the responses consistent with information within the previous convictions list (or other sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 1.1 Criminal History, items 1, 2 & 3</p> <p>Items 1 to 3 use the terms “conviction” and “documented episodes of offending...” The term conviction refers to a finding of guilt and the registering of a criminal record regardless of the age of the individual.</p> <p>All criminal convictions should be counted, whether the offence was minor or not.</p> <p>Matters that have been dealt with by alternative measures such as diversion from prosecution or restorative justice projects should not be counted.</p> <p>The number of documented episodes of offending/convictions should be determined in accordance with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any number of offences dealt with at the same time or with one sentence equals one episode/conviction. ○ Any offences that took place on the same day, but for judicial reasons were processed at different times or led to multiple sentences, should also be considered a single episode of offending/conviction.
3.2	<p>Consider Section 1, item 4: <i>Three or more present offences?</i></p> <p>Is the response consistent with the number of offences listed within the court report request (or other sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 1.1 Criminal History, item 4</p> <p>This should be marked ‘Yes’ if there are three or more current offences for which the individual has been convicted. Outstanding charges should not be counted here.</p>

3. Examination of Risk: LS/CMI 1-8 Assessment		Guidance Notes
3.3	<p>Consider Section 1.6: <i>Alcohol/ drug problem.</i></p> <p>Are the responses consistent with information within the court report (or other available sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 1.6 Alcohol/ Drug Problem, items 28-35.</p> <p>The focus of this subcomponent is a problematic use of substances rather than substance related offences. Convictions for possession or supply are not sufficient for indicating a substance problem.</p> <p>Items 30 and 31 should be marked ‘Yes’ if the individual’s current use of alcohol or drugs is problematic . Current refers to the past 12 months.</p> <p><i>Pages 16-17 of the LS/CMI Scoring Guide provides fuller guidance on what to consider when scoring these items.</i></p>
3.4	<p>Consider Section 1.7: <i>Pro-criminal attitude/ orientation.</i></p> <p>Are the reponses consistent with information within the court report (or other available sources of information)?</p>	<p>Where is this? Section 1.7 Procriminal Attitude/ orientation, items 36-39.</p> <p>Items 36 and 37 are rated where:</p> <p>3 = A satisfactory situation with no need for improvement. 2 = A relatively satisfactory situation, with some room for improvement. 1 = A relatively unsatisfactory situation with a need for improvement. 0 = A very unsatisfactory situation with a very clear and strong need for improvement.</p> <p><i>Page 18 of the LS/CMI Scoring Guide provides fuller guidance on what to consider when scoring these items.</i></p>
3.5	<p>If an override has been applied: is the reason for override adequate/ appropriate?</p>	<p>Where is this? Sections 6.2 & 6.3 Overrides</p> <p>There are two types of override:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Client based/ clinical overrides Overriding for client based/ clinical reasons should be supported by logical argument and reasonable evidence. ○ Administrative/ policy overrides Criminal justice agencies may have internal policies that certain types of offenders must be declared a particular risk level. The LS/CMI authors do not endorse this practice and advise against it.

3. Examination of Risk: LS/CMI 1-8 Assessment		Guidance Notes
3.6	If an override has been applied: Is the degree of override appropriate?	<p>Where is this? Compare 6.1, Score Based Risk/Need Level with the Final Risk/Need Level in Sections 6.2 & 6.3 of the report (alternatively, the final risk/need level within the system can be found at Section 7.4).</p> <p>Overriding (up or down) by more than one Risk/Need level (e.g. from Low to High or Very High to Very Low) would be unusual and should be supported by very clear and convincing reasons as to why such a large departure from the score based Risk/Need level is required.</p>
3.7	Does the assessment provide an adequate analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?	<p>Where is this? Section 7.3.1: Summary of analysis of offending.</p> <p>Pattern refers to the onset (since when), duration and frequency (how often).</p> <p>Nature refers to the type, diversity and to whom the offences are directed.</p> <p>Seriousness refers to the level of planning, the degree of harm caused and the degree of harm intended.</p> <p>Likelihood based on the balance of identified risk factors, protective factors and strengths.</p>
3.8	Is the summary of the analysis of offending concise and written in a way which is likely to be understood by the reader/ a decision maker?	<p>Where is this? Section 7.3.1: Summary of analysis of offending.</p> <p>The analysis should provide the reader with an understanding of the person's offending and avoid the use of jargon and terms such as 'criminogenic' or 'high', 'medium', 'low' unless clearly explained what this means?</p>
3.9	Does the evaluation and conclusion follow logically from the summary (Is the conclusion as expected given the assessment and summary of analysis which precedes it)?	<p>Where is this? Section 7.3.2: Evaluation & conclusion.</p>
3.10	Are the overall findings and conclusion of the assessment adequately summarised ?	<p>Where is this? Section 8.3, Summary of Findings.</p> <p>The section is intended to be used to summarise the overall assessment and provide the rationale for any recommendations or decisions.</p>

Evaluating the Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment

To report on the full risk of serious harm assessment using the LS/CMI system:

- Locate the case within the *System Cases* table on the Dashboard
- Click on [Report](#)
- Select **Risk of Serious Harm Assessment** from the *Select Report* picklist
- Select pdf or Word from the *Select a format* picklist
- Click on [Export](#)

4. Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment		Guidance Notes
4.1	Is the assessment based on an appropriate range of information, gathered from a variety of sources?	<p>Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.</p> <p>The key documents and sources of information that have informed the risk assessment should be listed, here.</p> <p>Assessments should draw on a range of sources including file, collateral and interview information. This may include interview information, reports, chronologies, risk/ need assessment tools, police intelligence, minutes of meetings and multi-agency discussions, records of correspondence, behavioural observation information, third party information and case file reviews.</p> <p>The date & author of any reports referred to and the date any assessment tool was used, should be noted.</p>
4.2	Have any gaps or limitations been acknowledged?	<p>Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.</p> <p>Where there are gaps, inconsistencies or matters which limit the assessment, these should be recorded here.</p> <p>For example, was the assessment limited by the individual's non-engagement in the interview process? Are there conflicting accounts found in official records? Is the individual's self-report generally unreliable? Are there gaps in knowledge or information?</p>
4.3	Does the assessment evidence the use of appropriate tools to provide a basis for the identification of risk and protective factors?	<p>Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.</p>

4. Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment		Guidance Notes
4.4	Does the assessment provide a sufficient summary of the case?	<p>Where is this? <i>Concise Case Summary</i> field.</p> <p>The purpose of this section is to provide any reader, who may not know the case in detail, with a concise overview of the case.</p> <p>The summary should contain key historic events and current information about the individual, their current status and the reason for the risk assessment and risk management plan.</p> <p>The information provided should be <i>relevant</i> to the risk assessment and management planning process.</p>
4.5	Does the assessment provide a sufficient history of the individual's offending, including the current offence(s)?	<p>Where is this? <i>Brief history of offending</i> field.</p> <p>This section should provide a brief offence history by outlining the nature of the offence types, and give a summary of the index offence(s).</p> <p>This does not need to be a detailed list of all offences but any offences which are of particular concern or which indicate a pattern should be noted.</p> <p>Where there is reference to allegation information, this should be clearly marked as such and its relevance and reliability should be appropriately weighted.</p>
4.6	Does the assessment provide a sufficient offence analysis?	<p>Where is this? <i>Describe the cycle of events, thoughts, feelings and behaviours that precede and follow an episode of seriously harmful behaviour</i> field.</p> <p>This should provide a understanding of the sequence of events which occur just before, during and after an episode of seriously harmful offending.</p> <p>Effort should be made to identify any common attributes, events or circumstances which precede the individual being involved in seriously harmful offending along with identifying any consequences which reward or reinforce such behaviour. The aim is to provide an understanding of the <i>how</i> and <i>why</i> the person becomes involved in seriously harmful offending.</p> <p>Bear in mind, some factors may limit the analysis (e.g. deniers, unreliable self-report, inability to access key information).</p>

4. Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment		Guidance Notes
4.7	Does the assessment evidence a formulation of risk that offers an understanding of the interaction and role of historical and current factors in an episode of seriously harmful offending?	<p>Where is this? <i>Identify the relevance of key factors contributing to offending behaviour field.</i></p> <p>This section draws on the findings of risk assessment tools and the assessors analysis to provide an understanding and explanation of how the identified risk and protective factors relate to an episode of seriously harmful behaviour.</p> <p>The formulation should be in narrative form and organised under four broad categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predisposing: Current or historic factors that may increase a tendency towards offending. Generally, these are identified using risk assessment tools such as LS/CMI Sections 1 & 2 and Stable 07 factors. They will be factors to address in supervision through offence focussed and cognitive behavioural work. ○ Precipitating: Events or circumstances that might trigger offending behaviour by disinhibiting or destabilising. These are the things to monitor in the risk management plan. ○ Perpetuating: Can act to maintain predisposing factors, or act as obstacles to successful intervention. Whilst not risk factors, these issues cause the risk to remain by acting as barriers to change or compliance. They may be of a long term nature, unresolved vulnerabilities or responsivity issues (see LS/CMI Section 5). ○ Protective factors Circumstances, relationships or characteristics that help to prevent, interrupt or reduce the risk. To be deemed protective, these factors must also have been shown to have worked in the past. If they don't interrupt offending they are not protective.

4. Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment		Guidance Notes
4.8	Does the assessment provide a sufficiently detailed analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?	<p>Where is this? <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field.</i></p> <p>Pattern refers to the onset (since when), duration and frequency (how often).</p> <p>Nature refers to the type, diversity and to whom the offences are directed.</p> <p>Seriousness refers to the level of planning, the degree of harm caused and the degree of harm intended.</p> <p>Likelihood based on the balance of identified risk factors, protective factors and strengths.</p>
4.9	Does the assessment include an evaluation of the level of risk of serious harm?	<p>Where is this? Specifically within the field labelled <i>Consider the definition of risk of serious harm and identify the risk level.</i></p> <p>However, it may also be evident within the <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field.</i></p>

4. Scrutiny of Risk: Risk of Serious Harm Assessment		Guidance Notes
4.10	Is the overall evaluation and conclusion as expected given the assessment and analysis which precedes it?	<p>Where is this? <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field and the risk level within the Consider the definition of risk of serious harm and identify the risk level field.</i></p> <p>Judgements relating to imminence and the risk level should be consistent with the definition of risk of serious harm and the MAPPA risk levels.</p> <p><u>Definition of RoSH:</u> <i>There is a likelihood of harmful behaviour, of a violent or sexual nature, which is life threatening and/or traumatic and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, may reasonably be expected to be difficult or impossible.</i></p> <p><u>Risk Levels:</u></p> <p>Very high: there is an imminent risk of serious harm. The potential event is more likely than not to happen imminently and the impact would be serious;</p> <p>High: there are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The potential event could happen at any time and the impact would be serious;</p> <p>Medium: there are identifiable indicators of serious harm. The offender has the potential to cause such harm, but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in circumstances, for example failure to take medication, loss of accommodation, relationship breakdown, drug or alcohol misuse;</p> <p>Low: current evidence does not indicate likelihood of causing serious harm.</p>

Evaluating the Risk Management Plan

The template for evaluating Risk Management Plans is based upon 5 risk practice standards derived from [Standards & Guidelines for Risk Management](#) and the [Framework for Risk Assessment, Management and Evaluation](#).

The 5 standards for risk practice are:

- **Standard 1: Risk Assessment**
- **Standard 2: Planning and Responding to change**
- **Standard 3: Risk Management Measures**
- **Standard 4: Partnership Working**
- **Standard 5: Quality Assurance**

To report on the Risk Management Plan using the LS/CMI system:

- Locate the case within the *System Cases* table on the Dashboard
- Click on [Report](#)
- Select **Risk Management Plan** from the *Select Report* picklist
- Select **Word** from the *Select a format* picklist
- Click on [Export](#)

5.1 Risk Management Plan: Risk Assessment		Guidance Notes
5.1.1	Is the assessment based on an appropriate range of information, gathered from a variety of sources?	<p>Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.</p> <p>The key documents and sources of information that have informed the risk assessment should be listed, here.</p> <p>Assessments should draw on a range of sources including file, collateral and interview information. This may include interview information, reports, chronologies, risk/ need assessment tools, police intelligence, minutes of meetings and multi-agency discussions, records of correspondence, behavioural observation information, third party information and case file reviews.</p> <p>The date & author of any reports referred to and the date any assessment tool was used, should be noted.</p>
5.1.2	Have any gaps or limitations been acknowledged?	<p>Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.</p> <p>Where there are gaps, inconsistencies or matters which limit the assessment, these should be recorded here.</p> <p>For example, was the assessment limited by the individual's non-engagement in the interview process? Are there conflicting accounts found in official records? Is the individual's self-report generally unreliable? Are there gaps in knowledge or information?</p>

5.1 Risk Management Plan: Risk Assessment		Guidance Notes
5.1.3	Does the assessment evidence the use of appropriate tools to provide a basis for the identification of risk and protective factors?	Where is this? <i>Basis of Assessment</i> field.
5.1.4	Does the assessment provide a sufficient summary of the case?	<p>Where is this? <i>Concise Case Summary</i> field.</p> <p>The purpose of this section is to provide any reader, who may not know the case in detail, with a concise overview of the case.</p> <p>The summary should contain key historic events and current information about the individual, their current status and the reason for the risk assessment and risk management plan.</p> <p>The information provided should be <i>relevant</i> to the risk assessment and management planning process.</p>
5.1.5	Does the assessment provide a sufficient history of the individual's offending , including the current offence(s)?	<p>Where is this? <i>Brief history of offending</i> field.</p> <p>This section should provide a brief offence history by outlining the nature of the offence types, and give a summary of the index offence(s).</p> <p>This does not need to be a detailed list of all offences but any offences which are of particular concern or which indicate a pattern should be noted.</p> <p>Where there is reference to allegation information, this should be clearly marked as such and its relevance and reliability should be appropriately weighted.</p>
5.1.6	Does the assessment provide a sufficient offence analysis?	<p>Where is this? <i>Describe the cycle of events, thoughts, feelings and behaviours that precede and follow an episode of seriously harmful behaviour</i> field.</p> <p>This should provide a understanding of the sequence of events which occur just before, during and and after an episode of seriously harmful offending.</p> <p>Effort should be made to identify any common attributes, events or circumstances which precede the individual being involved in seriously harmful offending along with identifying any consequences which reward or reinforce such behaviour. The aim is to provide an understanding of the <i>how</i> and <i>why</i> the person becomes involved in seriously harmful offending.</p> <p>Bear in mind, some factors may limit the analysis (e.g. deniers, unreliable self-report, inability to access key information).</p>

5.1 Risk Management Plan: Risk Assessment		Guidance Notes
5.1.7	Does the assessment evidence a formulation of risk that offers an understanding of the interaction and role of historical and current factors in an episode of seriously harmful offending?	<p>Where is this? <i>Identify the relevance of key factors contributing to offending behaviour field.</i></p> <p>This section draws on the findings of risk assessment tools and the assessors analysis to provide an understanding and explanation of how the identified risk and protective factors relate to an episode of seriously harmful behaviour.</p> <p>The formulation should be in narrative form and organised under four broad categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predisposing: Current or historic factors that may increase a tendency towards offending. Generally, these are identified using risk assessment tools such as LS/CMI Sections 1 & 2 and Stable 07 factors. They will be factors to address in supervision through offence focussed and cognitive behavioural work. ○ Precipitating: Events or circumstances that might trigger offending behaviour by disinhibiting or destabilising. These are the things to monitor in the risk management plan. ○ Perpetuating: Can act to maintain predisposing factors, or act as obstacles to successful intervention. Whilst not risk factors, these issues cause the risk to remain by acting as barriers to change or compliance. They may be of a long term nature, unresolved vulnerabilities or responsiveness issues (see LS/CMI Section 5). ○ Protective factors Circumstances, relationships or characteristics that help to prevent, interrupt or reduce the risk. To be deemed protective, these factors must also have been shown to have worked in the past. If they don't interrupt offending they are not protective.

5.1 Risk Management Plan: Risk Assessment		Guidance Notes
5.1.8	Does the assessment provide a sufficiently detailed analysis of offending in terms of pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood?	<p>Where is this? <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field.</i></p> <p>Pattern refers to the onset (since when), duration and frequency (how often).</p> <p>Nature refers to the type, diversity and to whom the offences are directed.</p> <p>Seriousness refers to the level of planning, the degree of harm caused and the degree of harm intended.</p> <p>Likelihood based on the balance of identified risk factors, protective factors and strengths.</p>
5.1.9	Does the assessment include an evaluation of the level of risk of serious harm?	<p>Where is this? Specifically within the field labelled <i>Consider the definition of risk of serious harm and identify the risk level.</i></p> <p>However, it may also be evident within the <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field.</i></p>

5.1 Risk Management Plan: Risk Assessment	Guidance Notes
<p>5.1.10 Is the overall evaluation and conclusion as expected given the assessment and analysis which precedes it?</p>	<p>Where is this? <i>Provide a summary of the risk of serious harm in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness, likelihood, imminence and implications for risk management field and the risk level within the Consider the definition of risk of serious harm and identify the risk level field.</i></p> <p>Judgements relating to imminence and the risk level should be consistent with the definition of risk of serious harm and the MAPPA risk levels.</p> <p><u>Definition of RoSH:</u> <i>There is a likelihood of harmful behaviour, of a violent or sexual nature, which is life threatening and/or traumatic and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, may reasonably be expected to be difficult or impossible.</i></p> <p><u>Risk Levels:</u></p> <p>Very high: there is an imminent risk of serious harm. The potential event is more likely than not to happen imminently and the impact would be serious;</p> <p>High: there are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The potential event could happen at any time and the impact would be serious;</p> <p>Medium: there are identifiable indicators of serious harm. The offender has the potential to cause such harm, but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in circumstances, for example failure to take medication, loss of accommodation, relationship breakdown, drug or alcohol misuse;</p> <p>Low: current evidence does not indicate likelihood of causing serious harm.</p>

5.2 Risk Management Plan: Planning & Responding to Change		Guidance Notes
5.2.1	Does the scenario, which the plan aims to manage, appropriately reflect the assessment and analysis which precedes it ? (Is the scenario as expected given the assessment and analysis which precedes it?)	<p>Where is this? The assessment and analysis within the RISK FORMULATION fields.</p> <p>The scenario should be within the <i>Describe the likely scenario(s) in which the risk(s) may present in terms of 'what', 'to whom', 'when', 'why' and 'how'</i> field where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the risk? What type of behaviour is likely to happen? ○ To whom is the risk posed? ○ When might the risk occur/ under what circumstances? ○ Why would the risk occur under these circumstances? What is the reason or motivation for this type of behaviour (if known)? ○ How might this occur? How would the individual seek to undertake/ complete the offence? <p>The scenario should describe the likely set of circumstances or events in which an offence may occur and draw upon the interaction of risk and protective factors highlighted in the risk formulation. It is an educated forecast, not a prediction, and so should be based on the available information, be evidence-based, realistic and likely.</p> <p>Where more than one risk has been identified (i.e. more than one type of seriously harmful behaviour that the plan is aiming to manage) there should be a scenario described for each.</p>

5.2 Risk Management Plan: Planning & Responding to Change		Guidance Notes
5.2.2	Are the factors which are listed relevant and expected? (Are the factors consistent with the findings of the risk assessment?)	<p>Where is this? <i>Relevant Factors</i> table.</p> <p>The factors that contribute to or prevent <i>this individual</i> being involved in seriously harmful offending should be listed here. They should be drawn from the narrative formulation of risk and listed under the one of 4 categories, depending on the role they play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predisposing: Current or historic factors that may increase a tendency towards offending. Generally, these are identified using risk assessment tools such as LS/CMI Sections 1 & 2 and Stable 2007 factors. They will be factors to address in supervision through offence focussed and CBT work. ○ Precipitating: Events or circumstances that might trigger offending behaviour by disinhibiting or destabilising. These are the things to monitor in the risk management plan. ○ Perpetuating: Can act to maintain predisposing factors or act as obstacles to successful intervention. Whilst not risk factors, these issues cause the risk to remain by acting as barriers to change or compliance. They may be of a long term nature, unresolved vulnerabilities or responsivity issues (see LS/CMI Section 5). ○ Protective factors Circumstances, relationships or characteristics that help to prevent, interrupt or reduce the risk. To be deemed protective, these factors must also have been shown to have worked for this individual in the past. If they don't interrupt offending they are not protective.
5.2.3	Are the early warning signs/ behaviours to monitor adequate and appropriate?	<p>Where is this? <i>MEASURES OF CHANGE: Early Warning Signs/ Behaviours to Monitor</i> field.</p> <p>This field should list precipitating factors, circumstances or behaviours which might indicate that offending is imminent, the risk management strategies are breaking down or that the plan requires review.</p> <p>The early warning signs/ behaviours to monitor should be drawn from the risk assessment and scenario which the plan aims to manage.</p> <p>Consider whether the early warning signs/ behaviours to monitor appropriately reflect the findings of the risk assessment and the analysis.</p>

5.2 Risk Management Plan: Planning & Responding to Change		Guidance Notes
5.2.4	Are the indicators of positive change adequate and appropriate?	<p>Where is this? <i>MEASURES OF CHANGE: Indicators of Positive Change</i> field.</p> <p>This field should identify the events, behaviours or circumstances which <i>might</i> indicate that the plan is working or that the risk is diminishing (which would indicate that restrictions could be reduced).</p> <p>Examples for some individuals might include pro-social relationships, compliance/ engagement or improved anger management.</p>
5.2.5	Does the plan provide a record of appropriate contingency measures?	<p>Where is this? <i>MONITORING AND CONTINGENCY ACTIVITIES</i> table.</p> <p>This section should document the measures to be taken in response to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the appearance of early warning signs; ○ the weakening or breakdown of protective factors; and ○ the weakening or breakdown of the strategies set out in the <i>Risk Management Strategies</i> section. <p>The contingency plan should identify the agreed actions to be taken in the event that early warning signs emerge. The actions should clearly state what is to be done to manage/minimise the risk, by whom and assigned with one of the following categories of immediacy/ degree of alert:</p> <p>Be Aware – monitor the emerging behaviours closely for any signs of escalation and ensure relevant individuals/agencies are informed about the potential situation.</p> <p>Be Prepared – ensure that precautionary measures are taken and that staff are alert to the possible situation.</p> <p>Take Immediate Action – ‘intervene now’ to deliver identified contingency activities</p>
5.2.6	Does the plan provide sufficient detail regarding the contact details of individuals and/ or agencies responsible for the risk management and contingency activities?	<p>Where is this? <i>KEY CONTACTS</i> table.</p>

5.2 Risk Management Plan: Planning & Responding to Change		Guidance Notes
5.2.7	Is the date for the next planned review of the plan appropriate given the complexity of the case and the identified risk(s)?	<p>Where is this? <i>REVIEW OF PLAN, date of next review of RMP field.</i></p> <p>It is essential that the risk assessment and RMP is reviewed on a regular and ongoing basis to ensure that the identified risk(s) remain relevant and that measures to manage the risk(s) remain proportionate and defensible.</p>

5.3 Risk Management Plan: Risk Management Measures	Guidance Notes
<p>5.3.1 Are the risk management measures comprised of an appropriate balance of preventive and supportive measures?</p>	<p>Where is this? <i>Risk Management Strategy and Activity</i> columns within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.</p> <p>The plan should have a range of measures comprised of the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supervision: a means by which a relationship is established with the individual. The purpose is to ensure that the individual is engaged through dialogue in a process of change and compliance. Supervision may also involve oversight or administration of a Court order, sentence or licence to ensure that any requirements or conditions are being appropriately applied and that compliance with such requirements is being monitored. ○ Monitoring: involves a number of observational activities intended to identify progress or deterioration or draw attention to areas where the RMP needs to be changed. ○ Treatment/ Intervention: is a specific programme, activity or technique focused on encouraging change in a particular behaviour or providing treatment for a particular problem. ○ Victim Safety Planning: is a risk management activity by which attention is drawn to the safety of specific individuals or groups who may potentially be victimised, with a view to devising preventative or contingency plans. <p>Consider whether the plan contains a suitable range of measures to prevent offending , to support the individual and measures to maintain/ encourage the development of protective factors.</p>

5.3 Risk Management Plan: Risk Management Measures		Guidance Notes
5.3.2	Do the risk management measures appropriately target the factors identified in the risk assessment?	<p>Where is this? <i>Risk Management Strategy, Relevant Factor and Activity</i> columns within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supervision activities: would tend to focus on addressing the predisposing and perpetuating factors (and build upon or promote strengths and protective factors, if any exist). ○ Monitoring activities: should monitor for emergence of early warning signs and precipitating factors (and weakening of protective factors, if any exist). ○ Treatment/ Intervention activities: should focus on addressing predisposing and perpetuating factors. ○ Victim Safety Planning activities: depending on the victim type, and circumstances whereby a seriously harmful offence is likely to occur, victim safety planning activities might involve, for example, environmental scanning, notifying past/ potential victims, specific licence conditions restricting contact with past/ potential victims. <p>Depending on the purpose and scope of the risk management activity, the relevant factor could involve a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ an individual factor (identified within the formulation and/ or listed within the <i>RELEVANT FACTORS</i> table); ○ the type of offending (identified within the likely scenario) or, ○ 'all risk factors'.
5.3.3	Are the risk management measures proportionate to the risks and needs identified in the risk assessment?	<p>Where is this? <i>Risk Management Strategy and Activity</i> columns within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.</p>

5.3 Risk Management Plan: Risk Management Measures		Guidance Notes
5.3.4	Are the risk management activities appropriately prioritised/ scheduled?	<p>Where is this? <i>Priority</i> column within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.</p> <p>Within the 'Priority' column each risk management activity should be rated as 1, 2 or 3 where:</p> <p>1: activities which need immediate attention or need to be undertaken before focussing on other activities.</p> <p>2: activities which require intermediate attention.</p> <p>3: activities which are deemed to be a low priority at this point in time.</p> <p>A variety of factors may have an impact in determining how these activities are prioritised and scheduled. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the individuals' readiness to change and engage (efforts to address responsivity issues such as denial or lack of motivation would likely need to be prioritised over a referral to a groupwork programme). ○ the current context (if the person is currently in custody, some risk management activities may only be required upon release). ○ any conditions of the release licence which may require to be prioritised.
5.3.5	Are the risk management measures allocated to the appropriate agencies/ individuals?	<p>Where is this? <i>Responsible Agency/ Individual</i> column within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.</p>
5.3.6	Does the plan consider and appropriately identify limitations of the risk management strategies and activities?	<p>Where is this? <i>LIMITATIONS OF STRATEGIES</i> table.</p> <p>No plan can completely eliminate risk therefore it is important to consider the limitations which may be present.</p> <p>This section should highlight gaps or weaknesses in the plan, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Areas of uncertainty; ○ Interdependencies between risk management activities (i.e. one activity is reliant on the successful application or completion of another); ○ Where the success of a risk management strategy or activity depends on engagement of the subject of the plan; ○ Reliance on availability of programmes; ○ Gaps in knowledge; ○ Impact of the presence of personality disorder.

5.4 Risk Management Plan: Partnership Working		Guidance Notes
5.4.1	Does the plan involve an appropriate range of people from different disciplines and agencies?	<p>Where is this? Throughout the plan, but in particular consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basis of report; ○ <i>Responsible Agency/ Individual</i> column within the <i>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table; ○ <i>Responsible Agency/ Individual</i> column within the <i>MONITORING RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</i> table.
5.4.2	Is there evidence that the individuals/ agencies involved are working together to manage the risk(s)?	<p>The degree of communication, co-ordination and collaboration will be commensurate to the identified risk(s) and complexities of the case.</p> <p>There may be a need to seek evidence outwith the plan itself. For example: review minutes, minutes of MAPP meetings, the RMP Progress record (Section 10 of the LS/CMI).</p>
5.4.3	Is there evidence that efforts have been made to engage and involve the subject of the plan in the process of risk management?	<p>Some evidence for this might be gleaned from within the plan (e.g. the <i>basis of assessment</i>, <i>concise case summary</i> and some of the activities within the <i>supervision</i> and <i>treatment/ intervention strategies</i>).</p> <p>However, there may also be a need to seek evidence outwith the plan itself. For example: review minutes, minutes of MAPP meetings, the RMP Progress record (Section 10 of the LS/CMI).</p>

5.5 Risk Management Plan: Quality Assurance		Guidance Notes
<p><i>The Quality Assurance standard does not relate specifically to the content of individual RMPs. Rather, it relates to individual practice and organisational matters that support the preparation and implementation of RMPs.</i></p> <p><i>However, it may be apparent from the RMP that policies or guidelines have not been followed either at an individual, managerial or organisational level. If so, this should be reflected in the rating and actions below.</i></p> <p><i>Other matters to reflect upon in considering an overall rating and possible actions in relation to quality assurance could include:</i></p>		
5.4.1	Is the individual with lead responsibility for the assessment and compiling this plan suitably qualified, skilled and competent to carry out this work?	
5.4.2	Has the individual with lead responsibility for the assessment and compiling this plan been provided with sufficient supervision and professional development opportunities?	
5.4.3	Does your service have appropriate guidance, policies and structures to support those involved in compiling risk management plans?	
5.4.4	Does your service routinely evaluate the quality of assessment and risk management planning practice?	Using the LS/CMI QA templates to evaluate and formulate actions plans is one means of evaluating the quality of practice.

