

MAJOR CASE

Peer Review Worksheet

A multidisciplinary, red-team process for keeping investigations active, testing assumptions, and turning fresh perspectives into accountable action.

PURPOSE Improve the case - not grade, blame, or embarrass the case team. Candor about uncertainty, unfinished work, and resource needs is a strength.

1

CASE AND REVIEW INFORMATION

Complete before the case presentation.

Case / incident number

Incident type

Victim(s)

Incident date / time

Lead investigator(s)

Review date / interval

Review trigger

☐ 7-14 day early review ☐ No arrest ☐ 30 / 60 / 90 day ☐ Pre-charging ☐ Other: _____

2

ROOM COMPOSITION

Invite knowledge, not merely rank. Record who is present and what perspective each person brings.

☐ Case detectives / peer detectives☐ Patrol / beat officers☐ Community policing / outreach☐ Crime scene / latent evidence☐ Digital forensics / phone extraction☐ Cell network / records specialist☐ Crime analyst / intelligence☐ Video / real-time crime center☐ Gang / street crimes / warrants☐ Financial crimes / fraud☐ Property crimes / pawn systems☐ Victim services / advocacy☐ Missing persons / human trafficking☐ Prosecutor / legal advisor☐ Other niche discipline: _____

Participants and specific knowledge / resource offered

Name	Unit / discipline	Knowledge, contact, tool, or resource

FACILITATION RULE The case team presents facts first. Peer detectives, specialists, patrol, analysts, and community personnel offer observations before supervisors or commanders. Leaders ask, listen, and speak last to reduce anchoring and authority effects.

3

CASE SNAPSHOT

Give the room enough context to think independently without drowning it in detail.

Confirmed facts

What is directly supported by evidence? Separate observations from interpretations.

Current working theory

Who, what, when, where, why, and how - and what remains uncertain?

Current suspects / persons of interest

State the basis for each designation. Avoid repeating rumor as fact.

What is blocking progress?

Information, cooperation, authority, technology, staffing, time, or strategy?

4

TIME-SENSITIVE EVIDENCE SCAN

Identify evidence at risk of loss, overwrite, degradation, replacement, or decreasing cooperation.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Business / residential video preserved | ☐ Public transit / traffic / city video |
| ☐ Doorbell / private camera sources | ☐ 911 / CAD / radio / body-worn camera |
| ☐ Social media accounts / messages preserved | ☐ Cloud, app, or provider records preserved |
| ☐ Phones located, seized, imaged, or extracted | ☐ Cell-site / tower / geofence options evaluated |
| ☐ Vehicles located / telematics preserved | ☐ Witnesses located, separated, and recontact planned |
| ☐ Scene revisit / daylight-night comparison | ☐ Physical evidence storage / submission checked |
| ☐ NIBIN / DNA / latent / lab deadlines tracked | ☐ Businesses, apartments, alleys, and upper floors canvassed |

What may disappear first? What must be preserved or completed in the next 24-72 hours?

5

MULTIDISCIPLINARY OPPORTUNITY SCAN

Ask each discipline: What might your expertise see that the case team may not?

DISCIPLINE	PROMPT	IDEA / LEAD / RESOURCE
Patrol / beat / community	Local geography, hidden residences, businesses, routes, informal gathering places, aliases, relationships, reluctant witnesses, neighborhood contacts.	
Digital / phone / network	Missing devices, extraction status, cloud sources, provider records, cell-site data, Wi-Fi / app artifacts, new techniques, lawful preservation needs.	
Crime scene / laboratory	Unsubmitted items, comparison opportunities, alternate testing, trace evidence, NIBIN, DNA, latent prints, reconstruction, scene revisit.	
Crime analysis / intelligence	Link charts, timelines, associations, pattern cases, calls for service, vehicle / person movement, neighboring jurisdictions, open-source information.	
Video / RTCC	Uncollected angles, time synchronization, dead spots, route reconstruction, vehicle / clothing comparison, enhancement limits, camera owner follow-up.	
Financial / property / pawn	Transactions, account activity, purchase or sale of relevant items, pawn / resale systems, fraud, benefit, motive, association, movement.	
Specialty investigations	Gang, narcotics, trafficking, missing persons, domestic violence, sex crimes, robbery, firearms, warrants, corrections, probation / parole.	
Victim / witness support	Safety, access, transportation, language, trauma, relocation, advocacy, trust, recontact strategy, barriers to cooperation.	

6

RED-TEAM CASE THEORY CHECK

Challenge the theory, not the investigator. Document disagreement and uncertainty.

FIRST QUESTION What information, interpretation, or assumption would we most regret failing to challenge before charging or closing the case?

KEY ASSUMPTION CHECK	PRESSURE-TEST PROMPT	NOTES / EFFECT ON PLAN
1. Is the theory logical?	Does the explanation follow from the facts, or are there gaps in the reasoning?	_____ —
2. Is it accurate?	Which parts are verified facts, inferences, secondhand information, or uncorroborated claims?	_____ —
3. Are biases shaping it?	Could confirmation bias, guilt-presumptive thinking, anchoring, availability, clustering, bandwagon effects, or overconfidence be influencing us?	_____ —
4. Are historical analogies relevant?	Are we assuming this resembles an earlier case? What important differences could make that analogy misleading?	_____ —
5. What must happen for it to be true?	List the necessary conditions, sequence, access, opportunity, capability, and timing.	_____ —
6. How confident are we?	Record confidence and the evidence that would raise or lower it.	_____ —
7. Will it remain true under all conditions?	What change in motive, sequence, identity, timeline, technology, or witness reliability would break the theory?	_____ —
8. What if it is untrue?	How would the investigative plan, suspect focus, interviews, warrants, and resource allocation change?	_____ —

7

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS AND EVIDENCE RELIABILITY

Actively search for disconfirming information and plausible alternatives.

Theory / alternative	Supporting evidence	Weakening / missing evidence	Test that could distinguish it

Information reliability and corroboration check

Information / source	Direct or hearsay?	Corroborated?	Reliability concern	Next validation step

Potentially disconfirming evidence

What does not fit? What would we expect to see if the current theory were wrong? What have we explained away too quickly?

Unresolved contradictions / statement-evidence inconsistencies

8

INTERVIEW AND INFORMATION-GATHERING PLAN

Use the review to improve objectives, questioning, cooperation, and evidence disclosure.

Person / role	Objectives: what do we need to learn?	Account-first questions / topics	Evidence to withhold, disclose, or corroborate

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Recontact reluctant or incomplete witnesses | ☐ Use rapport / barrier-reduction strategy |
| ☐ Obtain free narrative before focused questions | ☐ Separate what we know from what we infer |
| ☐ Plan evidence disclosure; avoid contaminating account | ☐ Identify explanations to test before disclosure |
| ☐ Preserve nonpublic / holdback facts | ☐ Corroborate interview-derived facts independently |
| ☐ Consider interpreter, accessibility, or support needs | ☐ Document new leads and inconsistencies |

Interview support or resource needed

9

ACTION PLAN AND ACCOUNTABILITY

No action item leaves the room without an owner, due date, and follow-up mechanism.

#	Lead / task / resource request	Owner	Priority	Due	Result / follow-up
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

10

REVIEW CLOSEOUT

Capture what changed, what leadership must support, and when the group reconvenes.

New information or lead generated

What did the review add that the case team did not have before?

Theory or assumption changed

What was strengthened, weakened, rejected, or reframed?

Resources / authority requested

Personnel, overtime, technology, legal process, cross-jurisdictional support, laboratory priority, or specialist assistance.

Communication and visibility plan

What should patrol, affected beats, specialty units, analysts, dispatch, or partner agencies know? Protect sensitive facts.

Follow-up reviewDate: _____ Trigger: ☐ 14 / 30 days ☐ 60 days ☐ 90 days ☐ Pre-charging ☐ Major development ☐ Other

Lead investigator _____ _____	Review facilitator _____ _____	Supervisor / commander _____ _____
Signature / date _____ _____	Signature / date _____ _____	Signature / date _____ _____

FINAL CHECK Did the review produce at least one of the following: new information, a new lead, a different perspective, a challenged assumption, a resource commitment, or another investigative angle? ☐ Yes ☐ No - reconvene / escalate

Peer review keeps a major case visible, challenges tunnel vision, and makes the full agency part of the investigation.

Adapt review timing, legal process, and tasking to agency policy and jurisdictional requirements.