

Enhanced Narrative

The screenshot shows a web browser at the URL <https://app.supportsignal.com.au/new-incident/>. The browser's address bar and tabs are visible at the top. The application interface has a sidebar on the left with a menu icon and a search bar. The sidebar contains the following sections: **Dashboard**, **WORKFLOWS** (with a sub-item **New Incident**), **Incidents**, **Analysis**, **COMPANY ADMINISTRATION** (with sub-items **Participants** and **Company Management**), and **Admin Tools**. The main content area is titled **New Incident** and features a section for **Before Event Enhancement**, which includes a sub-section for **Enhanced Narrative**. This section contains three paragraphs of text. The final sentence of the third paragraph, "This attention to detail and adherence to safety protocols were crucial in fostering a supportive atmosphere, even as uncertainties lingered regarding Michael's prior experiences.", is circled in red.

Home > New Incident

Before Event Enhancement
Enhanced narrative combining original observations with clarification responses about pre-incident circumstances

Enhanced Narrative

On a typical evening, the staff were engaged in their regular duties, attending to other participants and managing shift responsibilities. During this time, one staff member was focused on administrative tasks, specifically writing notes on the computer.

The atmosphere was calm, with staff members ensuring that the needs of all participants were met while maintaining a structured environment.

Prior to the incident, Michael Chen had been absent from the Supported Independent Living (SIL) facility for over 24 hours, and there was limited information regarding his activities during that period. Upon his return, staff initiated a series of questions to assess his well-being and the nature of his time away. It was during this conversation that Michael disclosed having picked up various items from the street, which raised concerns among the staff about his safety and decision-making during his absence.

The staffing ratio for the evening was maintained at 1:4, consistent with standard levels for similar shifts, allowing for adequate supervision and support for all participants. As the evening progressed, the staff remained vigilant in their monitoring practices, ensuring that all participants were safe and engaged. The proactive approach taken by the staff in questioning Michael upon his return reflects their commitment to maintaining a secure environment and addressing any potential risks that may arise from participants' actions outside the facility.

This attention to detail and adherence to safety protocols were crucial in fostering a supportive atmosphere, even as uncertainties lingered regarding Michael's prior experiences.

- This is long winded and repetitive.
- We don't want the tool to be making statements about the 'quality' of the support in the narrative. It needs to purely be a descriptions of what occurred.

During Event Enhancement

Enhanced narrative combining original observations with clarification responses about the incident occurrence

Enhanced

Enhanced Narrative

At approximately 7:30 PM, an unknown participant, referred to as MC, returned to the site carrying a collection of items she had gathered from the street. Among these items was a nitrous oxide canister, which she presented to the staff. Recognizing the potential hazards associated with the canister, the staff promptly informed MC that she could not keep it due to its flammable nature and the safety risks it posed to both the facility and other participants.

In response, MC muttered some expletives quietly to herself, expressing her displeasure with the situation. Despite her frustration, she ultimately complied and handed over the canister, albeit reluctantly, stating that she was unhappy about relinquishing it. In addition to the nitrous oxide canister, MC had also collected a lighter and various pieces of rubbish.

During this incident, the other participants were largely disengaged, remaining in their rooms and showing little interest in MC's behavior or the items she had brought back.

It is noteworthy that MC had a history of bringing potentially hazardous items to the facility, including ice and needles, which raised concerns among the staff. Following the handover of the canister, a debriefing session was conducted to explain to MC why such items are dangerous, reinforcing the protocols in place for handling hazardous materials.

This incident underscored the ongoing challenges staff face in managing participant behaviors and ensuring a safe environment.

Original Narrative

At 7:30pm, MC returned to site, carrying with him a heap of items that she had picked up off the street. One of the items that mc showed staff was a nitrous oxide canister. Staff explained to mc that she cannot keep this as it is flammable and said that it poses a safety risk to

- Needs to accept Initials – Michael chen = MC
- Words like complied shouldn't be used as it sets an expectation that the participant should do what they are told.
- The tool should have picked up that asking MC to hand over the canister could have been a restrictive practice

End Event Enhancement

Enhanced narrative combining original observations with clarification responses about incident resolution

Enhanced

Enhanced Narrative

At 7:35 PM, staff initiated communication with the on-call manager to seek confirmation regarding the removal of a specific item and to clarify the appropriate procedures for its handling. This call was a critical step in ensuring that the situation was managed effectively and in accordance with established protocols. The staff exhibited diligence in reaching out to the manager, reflecting a commitment to maintaining operational integrity during the incident.

Following the confirmation from the on-call manager, staff proceeded with the removal of the item as instructed.

The decision-making process was guided by the manager's directives, ensuring that all actions taken were aligned with safety and compliance standards. The collaborative effort between the staff and the on-call manager underscored the importance of clear communication during the incident's resolution phase, ultimately contributing to a swift and organized response to the situation at hand.

Original Narrative

Staff called the on-call manager at 7:35pm to confirm removing the item and what to do with it.

Post-Event Enhancement

Enhanced narrative combining original observations with clarification responses about post-incident support

Enhanced

Enhanced Narrative

During the post-event support phase, the situation was addressed with careful consideration for safety and compliance.

The participant was informed about the reasons for the decision regarding the cannister, emphasizing the importance of adhering to safety protocols. It was explained that the retention of the cannister posed potential risks, which necessitated its removal.

This conversation was conducted in a respectful and informative manner, ensuring that the participant understood the rationale behind the actions taken. Following this discussion, the cannister was securely relocated to a designated area, ensuring that it was handled in accordance with established safety guidelines.

This step was crucial in mitigating any potential hazards associated with the cannister's presence.

The actions taken during this phase were aimed at maintaining a safe environment while also providing the participant with clarity regarding the incident's management. The overall approach reflected a commitment to safety and effective communication, fostering a sense of trust and understanding in the aftermath of the event.

Original Narrative

Explained to mc the reasons why she could not keep the cannister. Removed the cannister to a secure location.

- Wanted more detailed questions to prompt in this section – eg what was the persons behaviour like? Did they ask after the canister once it was removed from sight etc. who was the oncall manager. What was the direction given?

- Where was the canister stored? What arrangements were made for its safe disposal. What conversations were had with the participant about picking things up from the street

Complete Report

Comprehensive incident overview and final submission for analysis workflow

Complete Incident Report

Comprehensive overview of all captured information and workflow completion status

Complete

draft

Incident Overview

Reporter: Angela Harvey

Created: 33 minutes ago

Participant: Michael Chen

Status: capture_pending

Date/Time: 2025-08-31T09:00

Location: SIL Home - Lounge room

Summary

Completion

Export Preview

Handoff

Complete Incident Information

All captured narratives, clarifications, and enhancements

Participant
Michael Chen

Reported by
Angela Harvey

When
Sunday, 31st August 2025, 9:00 AM

Where
SIL Home - Lounge room

Update details if needed - Back to Step 1

FULL INCIDENT STORY

Before the incident

Normal evening. Staff attending to other participants and shift duties.

0 follow-up questions answered

See story & questions - Back to Step 3

During the incident

At 7:30pm, MC returned to site, carrying with him a heap of items that she had picked up off the street. One of the items that mc showed staff was a...

0 follow-up questions answered

See story & questions - Back to Step 4

How it ended

Staff called the on-call manager at 7:35pm to confirm removing the item and what to do with it.

0 follow-up questions answered

See story & questions - Back to Step 5

After the incident

Explained to mc the reasons why she could not keep the cannister. Removed the cannister to a secure location.

0 follow-up questions answered

See story & questions - Back to Step 6

- I put the incident time at 9am. Then in the incident I referenced evening and 730pm. Tool should pick up the discrepancy and ask clarifying question.

This has a nice look and feel
But I did answer follow up questions for before and during

INCIDENT DOCUMENTATION REPORT

Generated: Sunday 31 August 2025 at 07:34 am

INCIDENT OVERVIEW

Incident ID: m979geb3mg4fmh32ts1ew4z6jh7ppg6x
Participant: Michael Chen
Date & Time: Sunday 31 August 2025 at 09:00 am
Location: SIL Home - Lounge room
Reporter: Angela Harvey
Created: 31/08/2025, 6:56:54 am
Current Status: CAPTURE PENDING
Capture Status: IN PROGRESS
Questions Generated: Yes
Narrative Enhanced: No
Analysis Generated: No

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

Full Name: undefined undefined
Date of Birth: Unknown
NDIS Number: Not provided
Support Level: Not specified
Contact Phone: Not provided
Emergency Contact: Not provided

INCIDENT NARRATIVE - BRIEF SUMMARIES

BEFORE THE INCIDENT

normal evening. Staff attending to other participants and shift duties.

DURING THE INCIDENT

At 7:30pm, MC returned to site, carrying with him a heap of items that she had picked up off the street. One of the items that mc showed staff was a nitrous oxide canister. Staff explained to mc that she cannot keep this as it is flammable and said that it poses a safety risk to the house and other participants. mc responded with some swear words quietly to herself. mc did however hand the cannister over although

- Will the participant info copy across?
- Staff need to be able to confirm the enhance narrative is an accurate reflection of what occurred
- This is good but nothing happened when I hit submit for analysis

WHAT'S NEXT

Share this incident:

Email to team

Print report

Save to file

+ Report new incident

View all incidents

Workflow Completion Status

Verification of all required workflow steps and data quality

Workflow Progress Complete

5 of 5 completed

100% Complete

Basic Information Required

Reporter name, participant name, date/time, and location

Incident Narratives Required

Before, during, end, and post-event narratives completed

Clarification Questions

AI-generated clarification questions answered

AI Enhancement

Narrative enhanced and reviewed by AI

Final Validation Required

All data integrity checks passed

All workflow requirements completed. Ready to submit for analysis.

Previous: Enhanced Review

Review Completion

Submit for Analysis

Rules to feed the AI for defensible progress notes

- The persons initials should be recognised but any other abbreviations or acronyms should be clarified.

Focus on objective:

- **Observed** – what was seen, heard, smelt, touched (objective – not subjective). Only include these details if they are relevant to the supports you are providing
- **Did** – what actions you took on shift, this could relate back to your duty of care such as how you mitigated risk on shift. It could also be how you supported the participant with dignity of risk
- **Said** – information communicated to other staff/ office/ family. Particularly if there is an issue it is important to know where responsibility for the issue sits

Objective	Subjective
Does this statement describe actions or outcomes without personal interpretation?	Does this statement express personal feelings or opinions?
Does this statement rely on observable facts or measurable data?	Can different people perceive or interpret this statement differently to what you meant when you wrote it?
Can this statement be supported by evidence?	Is there room for disagreement or differing perspectives on this statement?
Can this statement be objectively true or false?	Does this statement reflect the writers's emotions, beliefs, or experiences rather than objective reality?

Objective notes are based on **facts and observations**.

They are a description of what actually happened and are not influenced by personal feelings or opinions.

Objective notes should Be able to stand alone and have a focus on interactions.



Seen



Heard



Smelt



Touched

Other Considerations



AVOID CRITICISM OR BLAME IN YOUR
PROGRESS NOTES AS THIS IS
UNPROFESSIONAL.



BE CLEAR AND CONCISE. WE DO NOT EXPECT
ESSAYS.
DOT POINTS ARE RECOMMENDED



UTILISE THE “SUBJECT” FIELD IN THE
PROGRESS NOTES. MAKE SURE IT IS RELEVANT
TO THE SERVICE BEING PROVIDED.

Words to not use

You are not the boss.
You are there to support the client
living their own life.

These words are subjective and
demonstrate a power imbalance
between the worker and the client

- ✗ Appeared
- ✗ Seemed
- ✗ Agitated
- ✗ Non-compliant (legal terminology)
- ✗ Advise (use inform)
- ✗ Refused/ declined (use “chose” instead)
- ✗ No slang/ colloquialism

Goal of the end narrative should be

Defensible documentation provides **evidence** that **quality support** was provided by **competent staff**.

It reflects **duty of care** and provides evidence that:

- Actions were informed by policy, procedure, care plan and support plans

- Actions occurred to prevent harm in response to complaints, incidents and foreseeable risks

- Service provisions were directed/ controlled by participants or their nominee (such as their family)

- Dignity of risk was supported by informed decision making

- Shows that you provided support in a safe and competent manner with care and skill, a requirement of the code of conduct
- It gives you and your provider legal protection if something goes wrong. It will back up your account of the events that took place on a particular date of service as well as demonstrate that you met the standard of care

Checks for final narrative

- Would documentation support your actions if a client claimed he or she was injured during your supports?
- Could you review your notes from a support that took place two or three years ago and know what happened?
- Would a third party be able to read the same notes and understand what happened?
- Are the phrases and abbreviations you use in your documentation clear enough for someone else to understand the events that you describe?