### PEER REVIEW FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF PEER REVIEW</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FILES AUDITED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FILES NON COMPLIANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

64% NON COMPLIANCE

Number of files scoring:
- below 75% --- 0
- between 76% and 85% --- 2
- between 86% and 94% --- 2

### LIST MAIN AREAS OF DIFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Deficiency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did all the non-compliant folders have the same general area of deficiency? NO
Did all the non-compliant folders have the same Case Officer? NO
Were all non-compliant folders the same type of case? NO
Were all the cases at the same point in supervision (length)? NO

### WHAT ARE THE AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT?


### WHAT IS THE PLAN TO BRING THE FILES INTO COMPLIANCE?


### WHAT DOES THE AUDIT TELL US, WHAT TRENDS DO WE SEE WHEN REVIEWING FILES?


### WHAT CHANGES MAY IMPROVE THE AUDIT SCORES?


### WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING THE CHANGES


FOLLOW UP PLANS

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE_________________________________________ DATE__________________