

Home Office Feedback Letter - DHR/SAR RM03 - Response

Areas for final development:	Response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful to clarify why the time period of five-and-a-half years was set for the review. 	<p>2.6. The Review considered the contact and involvement that agencies had with Tracy and Robert from January 2017 to the date of Tracy's death in March 2022. These dates were selected, as it was at this time that Tracy had reported domestic abuse to the Police subsequent to divorce proceedings commencing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is helpful that Tracy's friend contributed to the review. However, if there was more information from the friend about Tracy's background and circumstances it would be helpful to include this as much of the picture of Tracy is built up from views of professionals who may have had limited contact with her. 	<p>Unfortunately, the friend had no further information to provide to the Review as she was not in contact with Tracy. Information that she was able to provide was what she had known at the time.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel asked why a request was made not to involve the eldest child, who was over the age of 18. It would be helpful to set out further information around the family circumstances, specifically on the ages of the children and the decision by the father that the oldest child should not participate. 	<p>The father requested that the older child not be contacted as he is severely autistic.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is currently unclear from Section 6 who was written to when the review chair contacted Tracy's family. 	<p>6.1 Now reads - At the commencement of the Review, the Review Chair contacted Robert (Tracy's husband), Tracy's younger child and Natasha (Tracy's friend) by formal letter and followed up by a telephone call. Robert requested that his older child not be contacted as the older child is severely autistic. The Review Chair respected Robert's wishes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel felt that it would be helpful to include further information on economic abuse and the financial 	<p>Covered in:</p>

<p>issues Tracy disclosed, particularly post- separation economic abuse and how this can be used in legal proceedings. They noted that it would be beneficial to draw upon research such as Surviving Economic Abuse’s global study on economic abuse, which includes a summary of evidence on how legal proceedings can be used as part of economic abuse (page 51), and how prolonging proceedings can be a form of this.</p>	<p>17.4. The domestic abuse disclosed by Tracy was not recognised by agencies in all its forms. Tracy experienced post-separation abuse. Post-separation abuse can be defined as the ongoing, wilful pattern of intimidation of a former intimate partner including legal abuse, economic abuse, threats and endangerment to children, isolation and discrediting and harassment and stalking (Spearman, Hardesty and Campbell, 2022)¹. Covered in the article in the footnote.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no public health/mental health or suicide prevention representative on panel, to provide the lens of domestic abuse, self-harm, mental health, and links to suicidality. The CSP may wish to consider this in the future. 	<p>Charlotte Underwood - Safeguarding Advisor & Consultant Psychiatrist from Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Trust (SaBP) was a member of the panel as well as members of the panel who are trained in domestic abuse, self-harm, mental health and links to suicidality.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In section 3, there are references to ‘Samantha’ and to ‘Natasha’. It is not currently clear if these are pseudonyms for the same friend, or for different people. 	<p>Cannot pick up in the report anyone by the name of Samantha.</p> <p>3.2 To protect the identity of the deceased and her family, pseudonyms have been used throughout this report. The pseudonym ‘Tracy’ was chosen for the deceased, ‘Robert’ for the deceased’s husband and “Natasha” for the deceased’s friend. The pseudonyms were chosen by the Review Chair as the family declined to participate in the Review. The pseudonym, “Natasha” was chosen by Tracy’s friend.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the timeline, the exact dates of the appointments immediately leading up to the death are set out. In terms of anonymising the case, it may be best to leave out this level of detail. 	<p>Taken out the exact appointment dates in March 2022.</p>

¹ Spearman KJ, Hardesty JL, Campbell J (2022). ‘Post-separation abuse: A concept analysis’. Journal of Advanced Nursing, p1225-1246.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 16.7 appears to reveal the sex of the eldest child, which should be amended to ensure anonymity. 	<p>No reference in 16.7 that reveals the sex of the oldest child.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a reference to the family not wishing to contact the police due to 'mistrust'; it would be helpful to explore this further. 	<p>Unable to explore this further. No explanation given to police and the family declined to participate in the Review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel felt that the equality and diversity section could go into greater detail. For example, it would be helpful to set out whether any of the protected characteristics raised barriers to accessing services. 	<p>It is noted in 11.6 - There is no information within organisations' records to indicate that any incident mentioned within this report was motivated or aggravated by age, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race or sexual orientation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In section 12, the dissemination list should include the Domestic Abuse Commissioner. 	<p>Included.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.1 states that 'The Chair of this Domestic Homicide/Safeguarding Adults Review is a legally qualified Independent Chair of Statutory Reviews'. It is unclear what this means around DHRs. Further information on where the Chair has held positions would aid transparency. 	<p>A Domestic Homicide Review is a Statutory Review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A learning around agencies increasing their professional curiosity may be worth a consideration. 	<p>Learning has been identified in:</p> <p>18.3. There was a lack of professional curiosity into the information provided by Tracy. Subsequent partnership working, particularly with Tracy's GP and CMHRS was ineffective and a holistic approach with the family was not undertaken.</p>

	<p>18.12. GPs will often support patients at times of relationship breakdowns, including separation and divorce. Consideration should be given to the coexistence of domestic abuse alongside acrimonious separations; both as a reason for the relationship breakdown and as coercive/controlling behaviour through the Courts. Staff need to be empowered in asking, enquiring about post-separation abuse and offering referrals to specialist support services if domestic abuse is found to be a factor.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no recommendations for the Metropolitan Police Service. It is accepted their policies have changed in recent years, but areas such as lack of professional curiosity may still be relevant, as above. 	<p>Metropolitan Police Service not making a recommendation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please cross-check the Action Plan for dates, as some of these have passed since the report was submitted. 	<p>Agency checks completed and updated Action Plan included.</p>