**Systems Analysis Review Report Checklist**

Informed by the Incident Management Framework, this checklist has been designed to guide reviewers and those governing the review process e.g. the SIMT, in the finalisation and acceptance of review reports so as to ensure that:

 The report has kept within the scope outlined in the Terms of Reference[[1]](#footnote-1).

 The process applied was consistent with the requirements of a systems analysis review.

 There are clear linkages between the analysis, the findings and any recommendations that are made.

 The recommendations made are practical and proportionate to the findings and designed to facilitate the development of an action plan which can be monitored to ensure implementation and provide assurance to service managers.

 The process applied has adhered to the principles of natural justice and due process.

Review Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | NIMS Number: |  |
| 2 | Date Checklist Completed: |  |
| 3 | Checklist Completed by: |  |

Areas for Consideration when Reviewing the Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Pseudo – Anonymisation | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report use codes in order to pseudo-anonymise the report in terms of persons/gender and location? |  |  |
| Is the *Review Report Pseudo-Anonymisation Codes* *Form* completed? Note: this is to be returned separately to the Commissioner and not filed with the report. |  |  |
| Plain English | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is the report written in plain English and is there an explanation, provided by way of an appendix, of any medical and technical terms and abbreviations used? Definitions used should be referenced. |  |  |
| Does the report have a logical flow that will enable the reader to engage with the report and clearly understand the sequence of events leading up to the incident, the process of review, the analysis and how the reviewers reached their findings and recommendations? |  |  |
| Bias | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is the review report balanced and fair or does it appear biased – either towards an individual or as a result of hindsight bias or outcome bias or in terms of the language used? |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Checklist for Body of Report (by Section)** | | |
| Title Page: Are the following items included? | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Date of Incident |  |  |
| Is it marked confidential? |  |  |
| NIMS Number |  |  |
| Location of Incident i.e. Hospital Group/CHO/NAS |  |  |
| Name of Commissioner |  |  |
| Chair of Review Team |  |  |
| Report Completion Date |  |  |
| Contents Page | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is a contents page included? |  |  |
| Executive Summary | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is the purpose of the review stated? |  |  |
| Is the timeframe of the review stated (i.e. length of time taken to undertake the review)? |  |  |
| Does the executive summary state who conducted the review? |  |  |
| Does the executive summary state that the reviewers were not involved in the incident and that they do not directly manage the service within which the incident occurred. |  |  |
| Does the executive summary summarise the key findings of the report and the recommendations to address these? |  |  |
| Acknowledgement | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is an acknowledgement included in the report |  |  |
| Overview of the Review Process (methodology) | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is there detail included in relation to who commissioned the review and the remit or scope of the review? |  |  |
| Is there detail of how the review was conducted including reference to the approach used? |  |  |
| Is there detail provided in relation to the documents/records considered as part of the process? |  |  |
| Is there detail in relation to how the person(s) harmed/relevant person(s) (as appropriate) were involved and supported in the review? |  |  |
| Is there detail in relation to how staff were involved and supported in the review? |  |  |
| Is there detail in relation to how the principles of natural justice and fair procedures were observed? E.g.   Does the report state if persons participating in the review were allowed the opportunity to comment on the draft report in terms of its factual accuracy?   Does the report state if feedback in relation to matters of inaccuracy identified by persons asked to review the draft report was incorporated into the final report?   Does this review report include details of a legal review? Note: this is only required if complex legal issues arose during the review or if it is the condition of the involvement of an individual external expert used. |  |  |
| Persons Involved In the conduct of the review | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report contain detail of the name of those who conducted the review and others who assisted in the process, including any subject matter experts (if involved)? |  |  |
| Background | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is there a brief summary of events leading up to the incident? |  |  |
| Is it concise and does it avoid repetition? |  |  |
| High Level Chronology of Events | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is there a high level chronology included which sets out sequentially the key events leading up to the event and the immediate actions taken to mitigate harm? |  |  |
| Aftermath of Incident | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Is there a summary of the immediate aftermath of the incident? |  |  |
| Does this section reference the Open Disclosure process? |  |  |
| Is there a summary of what happened in the longer term after the incident? |  |  |
| Analysis and Findings of the review team | **Y/N/Partial/n/a** | **Comment** |
| a) Findings | | |
| Does the report set out Statements of Findings or does the report state that none were identified following the analysis of the chronology? |  |  |
| If the report states that no findings were identified is there evidence to support this? |  |  |
| If the report identified findings is the context in which these occurred explained and is each finding adequately supported by evidence within the report? |  |  |
| **b) Contributory Factors** | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report show that the reviewers used relevant systems analysis tools to identify the Contributory Factor(s) for each finding? |  |  |
| Is each identified Contributory Factor clearly linked to the relevant finding? |  |  |
| If no Contributory Factors are identified does the report state a reason for this? |  |  |
| **c) Incidental Findings** | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report identify issues that while not impacting on this incident highlight an area for service improvement? |  |  |
| **d) Notable Practice** | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report identify areas of notable practice either prior to the incident occurring, in the management of the immediate aftermath of the incident or during the conduct of the review? |  |  |
| Review Outcome | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the review identify one of the 4 available outcomes listed? |  |  |
| Other issues raised by the family | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the review address any issues raised by the family not covered already in the report? |  |  |
| Recommendations | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Are recommendations included in the report? |  |  |
| Are the recommendations linked to the Contributory Factors highlighted in the review? |  |  |
| Do the recommendations include all actions necessary to ensure that the risks associated with the Contributory Factors are reduced as far as is reasonably practical so that the incident is unlikely to recur? |  |  |
| Does the report state who has responsibility for implementation of the recommendations? (This may already have been covered in the terms of reference.) |  |  |
| Learning | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| Does the report identify any learning from the review of the incident that may provide an opportunity for improvement to be shared with other services? |  |  |
| Appendices (whilst a review may require the addition of a number of appendices the two most commonly included are referred to in this checklist). | | |
|  | Y/N/Partial/n/a | Comment |
| **Terms of Reference** - Are terms of reference included in the review report? |  |  |
| **Definitions and Abbreviations** – Is there a list of definitions and abbreviations used in the report? |  |  |

Reference: HSE Incident Management Framework (2020), available at <https://www.hse.ie/eng/about/who/nqpsd/qps-incident-management/>

1. It should be noted that the TOR may in exceptional circumstances be amended in the course of the review and in such cases it is the amended TOR that should be considered. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)