

Sophie Jarrett
County Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence
Strategic Coordinator
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Prism House, Davy Way
Waterwells Business Park
Gloucester
GL2 2AD

28th March 2024

Dear Sophie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Amanda) for Stroud Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 24th January 2024. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel felt that the DHR process was greatly assisted by the level of engagement from the victim's family and friends,

The QA Panel noted that the family's wishes to share the victim's full life journey were considered, with the DHR report providing a clear picture of the victim's whole life experience leading up to her death. The report provided a good sense of who the victim was, and the adversities she experienced throughout her life. The report also demonstrated a good understanding of abuse and was sensitively written.

The QA Panel also commended the way in which the report acknowledges previous local DHR's and reflects this within the recommendations. The QA Panel felt it was positive to see recommendations around a thematic review of local suicide DHRs. Finally, the QA Panel commended the support of the children/their kinship carers in this case, and the report being attached to their social care records.

The QA Panel felt that there are some aspects of the report which may benefit from further revision, but the Home Office is content that on completion of these changes, the DHR may be published.

Areas for final development:

- The age and ethnicity of the victim and their partner are not stated in the confidentiality section, this is required to comply with the statutory guidance.
- The use of gender-neutral pseudonyms for the children would allow for easier reading.
- Given the engagement with the victim's family, it is unclear if the victim's family chose the pseudonym, or whether the family were invited to contribute a pen portrait or similar to accompany the report.
- Within the scope of this report, the victim was employed, it is unclear if an attempt was made to engage with the victim's employer to consider their perspective.
- The executive summary refers to the homicide of the victim, when the victim died by suicide, which is also not referenced as a key line of inquiry.
- A suicide prevention representative was not present on the panel to provide an insight into domestic abuse and the link between self-harm, mental health and suicidality. This would have been helpful, so please do bear in mind for future reviews.
- Whilst providing clarity for individual agencies, the agency separation of incidents felt disjointed at times.
- The report would be strengthened by further exploration of the economic abuse.
- Some areas of the report are missing information (e.g., a job role is missing for a panel member on page 13, footnote 11 does not provide the link to past DHRs).
- There is a discrepancy between 1.6.4 and 1.7.2 regarding the number of IMRs and short reports submitted to the review.
- Throughout the report, references to the victim's real name may be used (e.g., 4.1.1, 5.2.213 and throughout the action plan).
- Throughout the report, the gender of the children is referenced (5.3.37, 5.3.256, 6.1.1 and at 1.7.4 in the executive summary). This must be addressed before publication to improve anonymity.
- The equality and diversity section requires further development with regard to protected characteristics, for example religion would be relevant as the victim identified as Christian.
- The QA Panel noted that themes of mental health/self-harm and domestic abuse linked to suicide risk would have benefited from further exploration.

- The multi-agency action plan (Appendix 5) is missing.
- There are several typos and formatting errors throughout the report. The report requires a thorough proofread.

Once completed the Home Office would be grateful if you could provide us with a digital copy of the revised final version of the report with all finalised attachments and appendices and the weblink to the site where the report will be published. Please ensure this letter is published alongside the report.

Please send the digital copy and weblink to DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk. This is for our own records for future analysis to go towards highlighting best practice and to inform public policy.

The DHR report including the executive summary and action plan should be converted to a PDF document and be smaller than 20 MB in size; this final Home Office QA Panel feedback letter should be attached to the end of the report as an annex; and the DHR Action Plan should be added to the report as an annex. This should include all implementation updates and note that the action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk

On behalf of the QA Panel, I would like to thank you, the report chair and author, and other colleagues for the considerable work that you have put into this review.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel