



**Norfolk Drug Interventions Programme**  
**Room 401**  
**Breckland Business Centre**  
**Dereham**  
**Norfolk NR19 1FD**

**Tel: 01362 852930**  
**Fax: 01362 852939**

## **Drug Intervention Board Strategy Group Minutes**

**3<sup>rd</sup> June 2009**

### **Present**

Tony Oram (TO) (Chair) DAAT Strategy Manager  
Anne-Louise Schofield (ALS) Adult Joint Commissioning Manager (N-DAP)  
Stuart MacDonald (SM) (Assistant Chief Officer Norfolk Probation Service)  
Peter Burnham (PB)  
Andrew Barwick (AB) (Criminal Justice Manager Matthew Project)  
Jacqueline Westrop (JW) (DIP Manager and minute taker)  
Roz Brookes (RB) Service Manger TADS  
Mark Adney (MA) Service Manager West Norfolk PCT  
Daniel Harry (DH) Partnership Manager N-DAP  
Karen Hillen (KH) Government Office representative

### **Apologies for absence**

Colin Pearce (CP) (Norfolk Constabulary)  
Steph Ross-Wagenknecht (SRW) Finance & Administration Manager (N-DAP)

### **Minutes of the last meeting and any matters arising**

#### **Page one**

#### **Matters of accuracy**

Noted that Ann's name was incorrectly spelt apologies to Ann matter corrected

#### **Matter arising from this page**

None

## **Page two**

### **Matter of accuracy**

Page accurate

### **Matters arising form this page**

1. Conditional cautioning, the meeting was updated on this matter the meeting was advised that the data on conditional cautioning at government office was taken from non secure CPS sources, and was not going to be a match with locally collated data.

Accuracy of data is important and further clarification of this was sort by TO as to why this matter was occurring KH agreed to check back with colleagues and report to the Board the results of her inquiries.

**ACTION** KH to advice on the position prior to the next board meeting

2. CJIT/EAR data split. TO inquired about progress, AB advised that the process had been started with information staff at the DAT but had not progressed due to one of the research and information officers leaving, the matter was therefore ongoing

**ACTION** AB to link up with Research and Information Officer to progress this matter further.

## **Page three**

### **Matters of accuracy**

Page accurate

### **Matters arising**

The Board looked again at the Halo contract. Probation Service hold the contract, in practice functionality issues are beginning to occur, as more is required of it by the NTA in terms of data management. The Board acknowledges that in systems terms the providers in the market are broadly providing the same type of system, the difference is coming down to the SLA's we have with system providers in terms of upgrades and technical support. HALO not doing very well on this one at the moment. Longer-term system change needs to be considered and therefore current contract needs to be examined for the extent of support we can expect and longevity.

**ACTION** a meeting between probation contract manager AB & JW to be facilitated to look into this matter.

## **Page Four**

### **Matters of accuracy**

Page accurate

## **Matters arising**

1. Priority and Prolific Offenders - on the main agenda.
2. Communication strategy - this is progressing, there is a questionnaire set for the survey monkey and AB progressing this one.

**ACTION** AB to report to the next strategy meeting on progress.

3. Information group - This is progressing satisfactorily, there has been a meeting between police/probation and county council, to pull resources together scheduling pro active campaigns and pro active messages that need to be delivered through a single source so that there is no confusion around messages etc, there is a link with COG who are outlining a direction of travel, Jane Evans is the official to be contacted and involved.
4. Service review – an agenda item
5. EAR no update
6. PPO/IDTS issues on the agenda

## **Main Agenda Items**

### **DIP Review**

JW introduced the recently published “Moving up a gear – next steps for DIP” which is the report resulting from the Home Office lead research into the DIP’s. This report has been circulated to Board members previously. The recommendations contained in the report sparked a wide-ranging debate in the meeting that encompassed most of the agenda items. The emergent points included.

- The role of the LAA grants mechanism. DH advised the Board that at the current stage of LAA development, funding was being put into the area budgets, and then being passport back to agencies for them to manage. It was assumed that should the DIP budget ring fence be lifted that the same process would occur. PB noted that there would be advantages to this insofar as this could result in a wider ownership of the DIP process.
- The role of the CDRP. JW advised the Board that both the report and a recent presentation at the DIP/CARATS forum reinforced the point, that a greater role for the CDRP’s was forecast. This came as a surprise the Board, and it was noted that this may be included in the upcoming Police and Crime Bill, currently before Parliament
- IDTS not raised, but this was going to impact on the whole treatment system.
- VFM was part of the report, the debates here concentrated on the issue that how, within existing processes, do we manage, and are we delivering VFM. Following on from this the question was posed, are we should we be mapping the treatment journey and the costs involved in each aspect of the programme, and include in this what we are doing and why, is the programme difficult to cost.

- Meeting then considered what was driving this whole debate, changing environment, changing processes, are we being asked do more of the same, or the same for less? This is not clear.
- The changing nature of the PPO message, i.e. the grip on the mutual PPO/DIP cohort was raised, as was the issue of integrated offender management, which is seen as the future for managing DIP.
- This lead into a wider debate about the management of the PPO cohort generally, PB lead a discussion on this point, indicating that a model was being built which would bring cohesion and consistency to the management of the PPO cohort across the county, the DIP programme it was envisaged was one of the seven pathways out of offending. It was however clear from the debate that a much more in depth presentation was going to be needed for the Board to appreciate this, and the role of DIP within it. PB agreed to lead this at the next Board meeting.
- There was brief debate about how we understand and manage the business of the programme, and manage what we do, what information we need to progress this one, and how we feed into the wider strategic and partnership processes, i.e. how other partners are brought into the debate of what DIP does. There seemed to be an issue around how processes were becoming disconnected and pulled about without the Board shaping the vision etc. The Board therefore need to re-visit its strategic vision.
- As a side bar to this debate JW noted that all DIP's were to be reviewed by regional office/NTA and that this has already started, i.e. those whose performance was not high/areas of concern had been visited, this was separate from the NTA review of DAAT's which ALS knew about, no one else had been advised of the DIP review. KH to clarify this with colleagues at GO.
- AL drew the Board back to the document (previously circulated to the Board) that underpinned the agenda **item "Service Review"**. The whole service cost review document; this review is about the delivery and cost effectiveness of DIP and the need to tie this into the wider strategic aims of DIP and the changes and pressures it faces.
- This work was contained within the Adult Treatment Plan/Commissioning Intentions. Work had already been commenced on the process, in so far as point's 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the treatment plan was concerned and had been completed using data within the DAAT. The decisions today for the Board was to review point's 3.1.3, and 3.1.4, and establish if the Board was happy for this item to progress in their current format.

## **ACTION POINTS**

- PB to do a presentation to the Board in September detailing the PPO structure and principles underpinning the approach
- KH to clarify whether or not the DIP programme will be. visited/reviewed by GO/NTA colleagues and report back on this matter.

- Board adopted the action points as detailed in the adult treatment Plan ALS to progress.
- The Board to consider as part of its wider debate what its strategic vision was.

## **DIP CRITERIA**

This item was brought to the Board, in light of the pressures being placed on the programme by the ongoing developments in IDTS, particularly in respect of the NTA view on what constitutes an IDTS service user, and the NTA view, expressed in various meetings, and as part of the IDTS annexe, that all IDTS clients were DIP. These documents to some extent conflict with the Norfolk DIP Criteria and this has led to some difficult conversations and pressures being placed on CJIT in particular; the emergent points from the debate included the following

- Few discussions about the impact of changed criteria on the programme had occurred, and these changes and pressures will be considerable, there is no capacity in the programme to take all problematic drug users.
- What a problematic drug user was, is unclear.
- There was no national driver to change the shape and function of the programme – are we in danger of skewing the programme.
- It was pointed out and reiterated to the GO representative, that the Norfolk programme was a high performing one and that this in part was because of the criteria we applied. The Board noted the GO representatives comment that these discussions/problems were not apparent elsewhere.
- There was a debate around the issue of what constituted a problematic drug user and what the link to offending actually meant (i.e. should it be the fact that the service user uses drugs, not the relationship this has to offending BUT this negates the purpose of the programme which is crime reduction through treatment) the care continuity debate may or may not be clouding the issue.
- Where does unconvicted crime fit into this?
- At this time the Board did not feel (particularly in light of the preceding debate around the future role and shape of DIP) that it should be rushed into determining an absolute set of criteria for the programme, so that in effect the current criteria will stand, but the DIP Strategy Manager was advised that the Board wanted to see the CJIT be flexible about the criteria and monitor what occurs. No definition of flexibility was decided on at the meeting.

**ACTION** DIP Strategy manager to instruct team to take flexible approach to acceptance.

## **DIP CLINICAL**

RB outlined to the Board the upcoming issues that are faced in the DIP clinical budget. The Board were advised that the non recurrent uplift was due to end in September 09,

and that this would have the effect of significantly reducing the slots available to the programme, this in turn has a knock on effect to the treatment system, and performance generally this issue needs to be looked at in depth at commissioning level, RB therefore needs to talk to TO and the commissioning group about this issue. MA emphasised the point and added that the expectations raised in custody re scripting and maintenance of script and the effect of the uncertainty of this point on the system, the service user and staff, could not be underestimated.

**ACTION RB** to arrange a meeting with TO to discuss the issue and the wider issue to be brought to the attention of commissioners.

## **PERFORMANCE**

There were several matters raised under this item

- AB continues to note the discrepancy between his and Constabulary data in respect of referrals.
- The programme overall is performing at or above the required levels.
- TO reminded all the Board that Norfolk contributes significantly to the overall regional total of PDU's in treatment.

## **NATIONAL INDICATOR**

Item noted today, the national indicator relating to class A drug uses a measurement that is using data from across the partnership, it is also still unclear what it is trying to measure. Item therefore taken off the agenda until further information and clarification was available.

## **A.O.B**

The meeting decided that in view of the issues in front of it, to extend the meeting times in September to start at 9.30 with a 1.00 p.m finish.

## **Date and time of next meeting**

September 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009 9.30 a.m – 1.00 p.m