Dear Councillor Hill,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Kent (Joyce Jackson/2015) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 24 January 2018.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded this was a well written, well structured report which clearly articulates a complex case. The review has been enhanced by the contribution of family and neighbours and this allows a reader to see events through the victim’s eyes. In particular, the Panel found the comprehensive accounts of the victim, the perpetrators and significant others extremely useful in terms of understanding their lifestyles. The Panel also felt the introduction and explanation of the term “mate-crime” was especially helpful.

There were, however, some other aspects of the report which the Panel felt may benefit from further analysis, or be revised, which you will wish to consider:

- You may wish to review the report to ensure the language used is not perceived to be victim-blaming. For example, the narrative in paragraph 15.2.10;

- Paragraph 17.17 describes an incident in which the police advise the neighbour not to call again unless the complaint concerned activity outside the house. The Panel felt this practice warranted further exploration and any learning identified;

- It may have been helpful to examine the fact that contact between the victim and her siblings diminished after her friend moved in with her;
• Other protected characteristics, such as the victim’s disability, age and sex, which the Panel felt were all relevant, could have been considered as part of the discussions on equality and diversity;

• You may wish to consider describing the ethnic origin of the subjects of the review as White British;

• The Panel noted that the author of the report had retired from his police force some time ago but that he went on to work for the force as a review officer until as recently as 2016. You may, therefore, wish to consider expanding section 9 to assure readers that the author has no conflicts of interest;

• The Panel noted there were no condolences expressed in the report which is common practice in DHRs;

• The action plan will need to be updated before publication.

The Panel does not need to review another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could include our letter as an appendix to the report. I would be grateful if you could email us at DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk and provide us with the URL to the report when it is published.

The QA Panel felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners on DHRs in their local area. I am, accordingly, copying this letter to the PCC for information.

Yours sincerely

Christian Papaleontiou
Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel