New Directions in Community Safety

Consolidating Lessons Learned about Risk and Collaboration

Mitigating Acutely Elevated Risk of Harm
Considerations in Adopting "The Situation Table"

Hugh C. Russell and Norman E. Taylor

April, 2014

Ontario Working Group on Collaborative, Risk-driven Community Safety
Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police

Table of Contents

Mitigating Acutely Elevated Risk of Harm

… considerations in adopting “The Situation Table”

“The [Situation Table] is structured as a venue for human service professionals from a variety of disciplines, to meet and collaborate on interventionist solutions to situations of acutely-elevated risk. The [Situation Table] itself is inherently risk-driven, which means it focuses on secondary prevention, as opposed to being incident-driven with a focus on tertiary prevention … The focus … is to identify complex risks of individuals or families that cannot be addressed by a single agency alone. When situations are brought to the table by one of the partner agencies, the appropriate human service professionals become engaged in a discussion, which results in a collaborative intervention to connect services and supports where they were not in place before. The goal … is to connect individuals-in-need to services within 24 to 48 hours. … Results from interviews … suggest that the model allows high risk individuals with composite needs to gain access to services that they otherwise would not receive. The collaborative, solution-based support from the [Situation Table] intervention team, more often than not, reduces risk and averts crisis.

“… supporters of the model believe that mobilizing various community resources around an individual who is in a situation of acutely-elevated risk, is the surest means of reducing multiple risks and lowering the probability of harm occurring. The results of this preliminary impact assessment confirm that in many respects, they may be right. As such, fellow researchers, on-looking practitioners and curious government decision-makers should be prepared—for there is a wave of enthusiasm … [built upon] the belief that the [Situation Table] model can produce positive and sustainable outcomes in public safety and wellness. This wave is powered by the simple desire to do better.[1]”

Dr. Chad Nilson, Inaugural Research Fellow, University of Saskatchewan (2014)

Inside the Amber Circle

The proposed *Framework* identifies four colour-coded zones of action necessary to any comprehensive community strategy for safety and well-being. Throughout this paper, we highlight the potential for expanded *collaboration* within all four zones or circles on this model. Similarly, *risk* is consistently highlighted as the most effective point of leverage at every phase. But, nowhere in the model do these two terms come together

[1] Nilson, C. (2014). Risk-driven collaborative intervention: A preliminary impact assessment of Community Mobilization Prince Albert’s hub model. p 23. Saskatoon. University of Saskatchewan.

more directly than within the amber circle, where the focus is on active steps to mitigate risk factors, after they have accumulated to acute levels, but before they have manifest in the kind of incidents that demand emergency response from one or more agencies. It is here that much of the work of the Ontario Working Group has been focused throughout the past year.

The opening quotes above are extracted from a forthcoming research report based upon about 18 months of on-site study, observation and interviewing conducted in the midst of the continuing evolution and refinement of the Prince Albert Hub model. We stress that the concept of intervention to mitigate risk was not invented there. The hub model is also not the only such model to address the issues contemplated within the amber circle. Emerging collaborations in several Ontario municipalities among police, mental health professionals, hospital emergency rooms and others to provide rapidly deployed interventions and supports to restore the care path and avert crisis are also vivid examples of what is contemplated within the amber circle.

But for the members of the Ontario Working Group, the early promise and apparent impacts of this Hub model provided an important stimulus for their work. The OWG elected to rebrand this model the Situation Table in an effort to distinguish it from various existing combined service facilities in this province that also use the hub label with different purposes in mind. The adoption and adaptation of Situation Tables is already well underway in Ontario.

The First Decisions

The purpose of this resource paper and its accompanying appendix is to highlight a number of considerations that the OWG deems important for instructing those who are hoping to move forward with this model in their own community. As promising as it may be, it is not without its own risks. The OWG is encouraging the careful, responsible, and perhaps most importantly, the appropriate adoption of this model wherever it might be a suitable choice for collaborative action in the amber circle. As described in *An Interpretive Guide to Information Sharing Practices in Ontario* (the Interpretive Guide):

> … the greatest risk … is most likely to arise from unprepared practitioners and/or inadequately managed practices at Situation Tables … This must be avoided. Any unwarranted and careless breach of privacy could bring discredit to the process, with the potential to affect all Situation Tables and other related initiatives in the province and elsewhere.

The Interpretive Guide devotes several passages to explaining the actual functioning of a Situation Table, with an emphasis on privacy considerations. This alone is a good place to start in preparing would-be adopters. As well, Appendix A to that paper expands on the actual practices at a Situation Table, tracing in detail the steps involved in the prototypical meeting. Thus, it is not necessary to restate those procedural considerations here. However, the Interpretive Guide also asserts,

> … in our collective view there can be no substitute for effective training and qualified operational guidance to support the rigorous application of these disciplines in Ontario.

Some thoughts on that training and guidance are also outlined below. Possibilities related to data capture at Ontario Situation Tables are also discussed.

But, before such decisions arise, the first decision a community will face in its community safety planning process is whether or not a Situation Table is an appropriate solution to local needs, and if so, whether the particular community is prepared to move forward with its adoption. Most of this resource paper is devoted to those decisions.

Understanding What It Is ... and Is Not

This Hub/Situation Table model was initially adapted in Canada from ideas observed late in 2010 by a Saskatchewan study team after visiting Glasgow, Scotland. There in Govanhill, one of Scotland's most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, local police and their partners in multiple community service agencies had grown frustrated with conventional forums that seemed locked in continual discussions about the recurrent needs in their community and in its households. Typically, these forums met monthly, included only policy level representatives, and concentrated on longer-term strategies and plans. Motivated by growing urgency, these same local partners decided instead to invite front-line practitioners from every sector to come together daily, for just an hour, and to put on the table those accumulating risk situations that were coming to the singular attention of their own agencies on a regular basis.

By examining these situations together in real time and through multiple lenses, seen through the various perspectives and informed by the active case files of multiple agencies all at once, it became apparent almost immediately that effective interventions could be launched directly out of the meeting and mobilized collaboratively within hours. The Scots called this process 'daily tasking'. Results were impressive in short order, heralded in an independent evaluation report mere months after the practice commenced[2].

The Prince Albert Hub was launched shortly afterward in February 2011. To date it has seen over one thousand situations brought forward by every sector, cutting across every demographic and addressing a multitude of accumulating risk profiles. Throughout this proof-of-concept phase, much attention has been directed to defining and clarifying precisely what the model is and is not, in terms that experienced professionals and

[2] Govanhill (2010). Three month review of the Govanhill Operational Hub. Glasgow Centre for Population Health.

policy makers can readily distinguish. As a result, we can say with confidence that there are some important things that are not designed to happen at a Situation Table. These cautions are not offered here for purposes of being overly prescriptive or overly protective of the practices to date. Rather, these observations and conclusions result from extensive deliberations and study, and they are offered in the spirit of strengthening the long-term sustainability of a highly promising model.

Not a Planning Table

One of the most common remarks we have encountered is "We are already doing that". Usually, through further conversation, the reference has turned out to be to a collaborative planning table. To be clear, planning is important. But, this is not why a Situation Table should be convened. If this was the full solution, Govanhill's partners might never have conceived of their hub. Moreover, the nature of the exchange, and the scope and time frame under consideration at most planning tables is very different from the immediate focus of Situation Table interventions. There is no justification at a planning table for sharing any degree of confidential information about individuals or families at risk. Misguided attempts to combine these activities into a single forum, for the sake of convenient meeting times, would be a serious mistake. We advise strongly to maintain a clear distinction between meetings convened for community safety planning purposes and those dedicated to acutely elevated risk-driven interventions~~.~~

Not a Complex Case Management Table

The temptation here is strong and understandable. Why wouldn't we just proceed with managing our more complex cases while we have some of the right people assembled around our Situation Table? The answer is two-fold. First, the information sharing issue touched on above still applies here. As the Four Filter process outlined in the Interpretive Guide advocates, only the most minimal information sharing should occur at the Situation Table … just enough for recognition of appropriate roles to be played in an intervention. Actual intervention planning, and any follow up (with properly obtained consent for ongoing information sharing), should occur outside the meeting, at and after the Filter Four level.

Secondly, most human service and criminal justice agencies will have clear policies that define the responsibilities associated with case management within a particular service discipline. There is a recognized danger of transferring that responsibility to a collective, should actual case management enter into the discussion at a Situation Table. This could be problematic for the professionals involved. By design, a Situation Table is not an entity, and it neither creates nor keeps identifiable case records.

These roles should be clear and distinct. The purpose of the Situation Table is merely to facilitate the necessary conversation that can reveal, and achieve consensus on, a situation of acute risk that demands attention from multiple agencies. Once identified, case management must remain within the authorities and responsibilities of the respective disciplines involved in developing and executing appropriate actions to mitigate those risks.

Not a Table for Multi-Sector Analytics

Here again, the temptation of convenience arises. Why wouldn't the same people who meet regularly to exchange information about high-risk situations be the ideal people to conduct ongoing analysis and follow through studies? In fact, there is no compelling reason that these can't be the same individuals, albeit in a different time and place. The issue is that they should not be engaging in such activities within the context of the Situation Table, with its clearly defined Four Filter focus. Such analytics are an important part of the blue circle zone on the *Framework*, and the potential to be gained from continuing analysis of the de-identified information that arises at a Situation Table is explored in greater depth in *Collaborative Analysis for Systemic Improvements*.

Is it Right for Us?

Will it Work Here?

So, with a clear distinction established for what a Situation Table is not, and equipped with an understanding of what it does (as addressed in the Interpretive Guide), the next important question community planners will face is whether or not such a specifically defined process is indicated to meet their local needs, and/or likely to succeed amid their local circumstances. Here are some questions and considerations that might assist in that determination[3]:

Are acute risk situations a significant concern in the community?

Do the agencies that provide essential community safety and human services in your community agree that there exists a significant and recurring volume of acute and multi-dimensional risk situations within specific neighbourhoods, or within a defined catchment area, sufficient to warrant a weekly (the minimum frequency recommended[4]) collaborative forum, and likely to benefit from multi-agency interventions?

[3] Much of this guidance is sourced from replication support materials that have assisted early adopters across Saskatchewan and in other provinces, available from www.saskbprc.com and co-authored by Lisa Taylor, advisor to the Ministry of Justice: Corrections and Policing and Community Mobilization Prince Albert, and Brent Kalinowski, Coordinator of Gateway Community Mobilization in North Bay, ON.

[4] Minimum frequency of once weekly is recommended due to the need (as described in the Interpretive Guide) to adhere to a strict consensus-based threshold of acutely elevated risk. This threshold is likely to be questioned if meetings to address these situations can be deferred for more than a week.

Is there a champion (or champions) to lead this initiative?

Each community should have one or more champions of the cause to lead the progression towards a Situation Table. This champion can be from any one of the human Services. This champion sees the big picture and the success that can be achieved for all involved. The champion should be driven to change the community, while bringing greater efficiency and effectiveness to the service providers, and be capable to lead in the face of the challenges and obstacles that accompany any such culture change. The champion will be challenged to find other sector champions within each agency to assist in moving the initiative forward and building ongoing support. Networking and having conversations with key individuals will help find additional leaders in each of the human services.

Change in practices is not easy, and for some may be threatening. This champion will have to navigate through situations and individuals that may be inclined to challenge the very notion of collaborative risk-driven intervention. Educating individuals as to the potential benefits and safeguards alike will be a large component of the navigation. Once a suitably inspired team is gathered, the champion(s) will continue to lead, and together, the group will begin to move towards change for community safety and well-being.

Can you bring the right people to the table?

The Situation Table differs from more traditional community groups and so it is important to ensure that the individuals at the table are both informed and committed to working in this new way. These sector representatives are essential to spread the direction of change and encourage common goals. Collaboration needs to be understood and embraced on a continuing basis. They must be qualified and well-informed sector representatives with leadership abilities, and suitably empowered for making decisions at the table. The representatives will be responsible for driving changes in practice through their respective agencies, which will include educating others on the Situation Table concept, shared practices, directives and policies, as well as a shared sense of systemic responsiveness, systemic transparency, and practical data collection within each respective agency.

The acute care sectors represented at the table should include (subject to local services available to the community): addictions, mental health, child and family services, income Assistance, police, probation, education, and First Nations representatives and/or settlement support services for New Canadians (if applicable to the community). The active sectors may also include: public health, bylaw, housing, representation from the municipality, fire, emergency medical services and the hospital emergency room.

The relationship between sector management and their representatives at the Situation Table is important, as it is through the support from within their home agency that communication will flow up and down. Concerns from agencies can be expressed through the representatives to the Situation Table, and information can flow back the other way as well. A table referral can be channeled up to the representative, and possibly explored and discussed at a meeting. It will be up to these representatives to create this system of communication and ensure the process is understood. Open and non-territorial leadership is key to success in sustaining these communication flows.

Have you determined the structure and logistics of the operation?

As with any endeavour, the logistical considerations need to be examined upfront. It is important to address the following:

Internal Structure:
When the group will meet (minimum of once per week, average twice weekly)?
Who will be the Situation Table Chair, responsible to ensure that all protocols are followed consistently?

Facilities:
Where will the Situation Table meet?
(Note that a Situation Table should not require its own dedicated infrastructure.)
Should you use a smaller location for the first year with an eye to scaling up if necessary later on?
What equipment (i.e. Computers, phones, networks, furniture, etc.) will be necessary and how will this be sourced?

Have you defined the geographic or demographic scope for your Situation Table?

The Situation Table can be used for an entire community, for a combination of communities, or in some cases for smaller areas within one municipality. It can also be applied to a limited and defined scope of risk factors or a specifically defined range of affected parties (such as youth).

In determining community readiness it is important to define the scope or catchment area to be served by the Table. If this is not done upfront, then there may be confusion when situations are brought forward, leading to conflicts if some members feel some fall outside the group's appropriate focus.

Is the community ready for action?

Aside from the preparedness of the Situation Table and its supporting organizations, it is important to consider the community's own appetite for action. Is the public ready to accept this type of assistance and will they work with the organization or stand against it?

The community must be fully aware of the initiative, comfortable and secure that this is not about targeting any individuals or groups, and that privacy laws will be respected and upheld.

Above all, they must see a need in their community for this model to be applicable. If there is a distinct need but the community is not fully aware or unsure of the effectiveness of this model, then a communication plan can be created and executed to build broader buy-in and ongoing support.

Training and Operational Guidance

The final consideration before moving forward with a Situation Table concerns the degree of training and coaching support that will be made available to the participating agency representatives, their agency managers, the Chair, and the person or persons charged with recording de-identified trend data for later analysis. Each community has its own options here of course.

Experience has already shown that the enthusiasm surrounding this model has led to a generous availability of inter-jurisdictional support. Building on the tradition that began with Community Mobilization Prince Albert, where over 30 delegations have been hosted since operations commenced, Ontario's own early adopters have begun to share their experience with equal vigour. Communities giving consideration to the model may wish to contact their colleagues in other Ontario communities who have already moved past the first critical stages of start-up. It may be possible to acquire the necessary training and guidance from these fellow practitioners. Beyond that option, experienced support is also available from a limited number of private practice consultants. Any of these sources can be contacted directly or by way of the Ontario Working Group.

As one example of this cooperation, late in 2013 Peel Regional Police entered into a partnership with the Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice: Corrections and Policing, Community Mobilization Prince Albert, and private consultants to produce a comprehensive learning program for Hub and Situation Table practitioners. The result is an interactive video-based program that combines online study with on-site support, suited for completion by a full cohort of community representatives. The video components of the program include both experienced and inexperienced Hub and Situational Table practitioners and related stakeholders from Saskatchewan and Ontario communities, working together through simulated situations, while enumerating the most important learning elements.

This particular learning program is neither mandatory nor yet endorsed by any specific body, but rather was developed and is offered in the spirit of supporting those who would wish to exercise appropriate care as they adopt the model. It requires an investment of about four hours of online, independent study by each member, with interactive discussion forums as a part of that learning experience. In addition, a one-half day meeting is recommended, with specialized support, once the online component has been completed by everyone involved. This training package is expected to be available in the spring 2014 (at limited cost to cover online and on-site mentoring support only). More information on this learning program is available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3y7_K2zMVPE

Data Collection at Situation Table Meetings

A Potential Model for Ontario Situation Tables

It is now a provincial policy requirement that all Saskatchewan Hubs collect specified non-identifiable data, including but not limited to: Hub discussion number, risk factors, age category, gender, originating agency, lead agency, assisting agencies, closing information. This data is collected at the consensus of the Hub table. The recording database system is typically projected onto a wall for the Table to view and participate in the data entry choices being made.

A custom designed web-based system has been available since the spring of 2013 and is now compulsory in that province. The web-based system is accessed online by each Hub, with a secure login via an internet connection. Once accessed, the system incorporates the identical risk factors that have been agreed by the participating Hub communities in cooperation with the province (approximately 100 factors, grouped in risk categories). These factors and all other entry fields are presented in drop-down menus. The drop-down options are locked and not changeable, with the exception of the agency menu, which can be adapted to reflect local participants in each Hub.

The server is located in Regina and alleviates the issues of storage and data integrity for each of the communities. The province's dedicated Building Partnerships to Reduce Crime (BPRC) team maintains the web access, pays the master license fees, and maintains the site for all Provincial users. Each Hub site pays a nominal license fee for access to the system. Training is provided by BPRC for Hub Chairs and/or designated Hub Recorders from each of the respective Hub sites to ensure a proper understanding of the system and its data entry procedures.

Through the work of the OWG, an agreement is nearing completion between the Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice and the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to permit the use of this same data recording and tracking system by any Situation Tables in this province, with the potential for Ontario-specific modifications to the relevant tables within the database. No firm decisions have yet been made with regard to an operating plan and related policies governing the potential roll out of this system.

However, if incorporated alongside the Situation Table uptake process currently growing across Ontario, the system would offer each community an evidence-based source for ongoing analysis of the root causes and risk issues being presented in each community. It will also have the capability to run agency-specific reports to illustrate the level of involvement for that agency. All of this local information will also be available for composite analysis at regional and provincial levels. (See *Collaborative Analysis for Systemic Improvements* for more discussion on the development of this tool and the related potential for data analytics.)

In Summary

Several options exist for communities wishing to move forward with the adoption of a Situation Table in a careful, responsible, and appropriate manner. What is important is that the steps and considerations outlined throughout this resource paper not be overlooked. Experience has shown that the local success and sustainability of the Situation Table model will be heavily determined by the disciplines at the table, the effectiveness of interventions that result, the useful data that emerges from the effort for continuing analysis, and the qualities of collaboration that can be maintained.

Appendix

… the Prototypical Situation Table Meeting

Background

This guidance is adapted from replication support materials that have assisted early adopters across Saskatchewan, in Ontario, and in other provinces. Co-authored by Lisa Taylor, advisor to the Ministry of Justice: Corrections and Policing and Community Mobilization Prince Albert, and Brent Kalinowski, Coordinator of Gateway Community Mobilization in North Bay, ON, the meeting framework and procedures described below reflect a prototype, based on combining the early experiences of several locations with the policy advice received from a variety of sources in multiple jurisdictions throughout the proof-of-concept phases of this emerging model.

Over the past two years, the adaptation of the Hub or Situation Table model in Ontario has also begun to yield a growing body of practice, with some adjustments to this prototype based on local experience, differences in the make-up of the Table, and variations in the policies affecting Ontario agencies. In particular, FOCUS Rexdale now has the lengthiest and most documented experience in this province.   The reader is encouraged to consult with multiple sources.

Attendance at Situation Table Meetings

Situation Table Members, Irregular Members, and Visitors

The purpose of the Situation Table is to address community safety and wellness issues, which are at an acutely elevated level of risk as seen across multiple agencies, and develop strategies to resolve issues as expediently as possible; typically within 24 to 48 hours.

Agencies will need to designate and authorize individuals within their organizations to participate in meetings designed to identify social problems rooted within the community and implement strategies in addressing these problems with the view of achieving the Situation Table's purpose.

In addition to the members of the Situation Table who represent their agencies, there will also be a designated Chair and Record Keeper.   The chairperson must be from one of the member agencies, or, subject to the approval of the Steering Committee, may be a suitably qualified individual from the community who can commit their time to the Situation Table and be eligible to be bound to privacy through a non-disclosure agreement formed with the Steering Committee.

All individuals involved in the Situation Table must adhere to the Privacy Principles as outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed among the participating agencies.

Additional agencies or representatives may participate from time to time at the Situation Table only with the express consent of each participating agency that is party to the MOU.

Confidentiality Agreements

It is essential for the Situation Table to have proper confidentiality agreements in place for Situation Table members, as well as Situation Table visitors. (Note: visitors are generally discouraged except for local and inter-jurisdictional learning purposes – see below)

All Situation Table members must review and sign the confidentiality agreements prior to the first meeting. As an extension of workplaces and internal policies, what occurs at the table, stays at the table.

Situation Table Visitors and Protocols

As Situation Tables develop and members become more proficient in the "discussion" process, visitors from other agencies may request a visit. A visit can be a valuable experience for agency representatives looking to further understand the process. Exploratory visits may also be requested by other communities looking to replicate. Witnessing a Situation Table in action is an invaluable experience as 'seeing really is believing'.

Visitors to Situation Tables are required to be connected to any of the Human Services and should thus be familiar with their own internal policies on privacy, i.e. Teachers, Child Family Services, Police, etc. Political figures, media, community groups and general citizens should be discouraged from visiting the Situation Table.

Any visitors need to be announced to the Situation Table in advance of the visit. This gives the table an opportunity to approve the attendance, and have awareness of the guest(s).

Conducting the Situation Table Meeting

Opening the Meeting

- Chair asks if there is anyone new to the Table or any guests present. If so, welcomes them and invites Situation Table members to introduce themselves.
- Chair announces any regrets for attendance.

Preliminary Discussion

- The Chair brings forward any pending visitor attendances to the Table and polls for any concerns – identifies when those guests will be in attendance
- The Chair then asks the Table if they have anything they would like to bring forward or discuss which is of general value to the Table.

Part One – Pending Items: (Follow-up on previous situations addressed)

- Chair brings forward the discussion/situation number and lead agency of any pending items (see below for further explanation of the situation number)
- The lead agency identified for that situation reintroduces the discussion for the group
- The group discusses what steps were identified, and if those actions/services were applied or provided. Then the group must ask the question "Are we satisfied the situation is no longer considered acutely elevated risk?"

    - If further actions are pending – determine the date of next follow-up discussion.
    - If the actions are complete and the situation still classifies as acutely elevated risk, determine why and what next steps could be taken. Recognize noteworthy actions taken in mitigating the 'acutely elevated risk'.
    - If the situation is no longer presenting elevated levels of risk, then the situation is closed and with the table's input, the closing and the captured de-identified data is completed in the Situation Table database for research purposes. (No identified case files are created at any time by the Situation Table)

- The Chair makes certain that as a situation item evolves, with more information becoming available and perhaps more agencies becoming involved, that the appropriate updates are entered into the Situation Table de-identified record, i.e. risk factors, lead and assisting agencies, study flags, etc.
- This process continues in rounds format until all currently active situations, from earlier meetings, have been reviewed within the current meeting.

Part Two – New Items:

- Any agency that wants to bring forward a situation must first have applied Filter 1 from the Four Filter Thresholds, prior to the meeting.
- Using a rounds format, the first and then each subsequent agency that is bringing a situation forward begins by providing a de-identified synopsis of the situation. When enough information is presented – the group asks the question 'Are we satisfied we are now in acutely elevated risk?' (Filter 2)

- If consensus from the table is gained that the answer is "yes," then the agency now identifies the situation with limited personal and location information. Should it become apparent once the discussion has been identified that multiple agencies are now recognizing the discussion as an ongoing file held, with services already being provided, the question is asked "Are we satisfied this is being managed and is not appropriately a Situation Table discussion?" If not, the item will move to Filter 3.
- Once the item has been identified and discussed and successfully passed through the first 3 filters – agreement must be obtained from the table to make it a 'Numbered Situation Table Discussion'. At this point, de-identified information will be entered into the Situation Table database, using the pull-down menus provided.
- The lead agency must identify which other agencies should be taking notes based on which agencies will be involved. All others present will desist from taking notes at this point.
- The Chair leads the table in completing the appropriate fields in the Situation Table record, i.e. lead agency, assisting agencies, risk factors, whether or not it is a Youth with charges pending – if so – reminds the table they are now in a young offender conference[1], as contemplated under that legislation. The chair also reminds the Table that only those with a role within the discussion are making notes.
- Once the lead and assisting agencies have been identified they agree to discuss further details in a private meeting together to plan the actions and service connections to be undertaken after the meeting. (Filter 4)
- The Chair then gains agreement of the most appropriate agencies for follow-up actions, confirms who is participating and determines the next follow-up discussion – with the date to be recorded against the de-identifed Situation Table record.
- This process continues in rounds format until all situations have been presented for the current meeting.

Review Tasks

- With Time permitting, at the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair may remind agencies of their respective participation on the situations.

---

[1] For an explanation of the provisions related to a young offender conference see http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/ycja-lsjpa/back-hist.html