



GREEN AND GREEN SOLUTIONS
WWW.GREENANDGREEN.ORG.UK



July 2010

Drug Interventions Programme (DIP)
London Review
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A report examining the delivery of DIP in London

1 INTRODUCTION

The Executive Summary of the Final Report for the London Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) Review has been produced as a stand-alone document. The full Final Report has been made available only to the members of the Review Steering Group as it contains views expressed by partners in confidence as part of the Review research.

The London Arrest to Recovery Group will oversee the implementation of the recommendations (found in Section 4, Findings).

2 REVIEW AIMS

Given the level of investment in DIP and the importance of the operation, it was considered good practice to review the operational delivery of DIP across London and the contribution of drug testing and treatment referrals from police custody to strategic DIP outcomes.

Therefore a piece of work was taken forward to take stock of the DIP across London. The review was timely given the Home Office and The Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) shared ambition to extend DIP intensive status across the London boroughs and to extend drug testing to all Designated Detention Officers working within custody.

Broadly, the key issues addressed as part of the review and implementation project were:

- Strategic positioning, effectiveness and buy-in to DIP within London.
- Operational delivery of DIP.
- The Police Strategic Lead role.
- Future direction of DIP in London.

In London the Criminal Justice Intervention Teams (CJIT) are co-terminus with borough boundaries and there are 22 (including the City of London) Intensive DIP and 11 Non-Intensive DIP Areas.

The London DIP Review was managed and undertaken by an Independent Consultant;

Kevin Green: Green and Green Solutions Limited

The project was directed by a Steering Group which included;

- Home Office
- NTA
- GOL
- MPS
- Green and Green Solutions Ltd

3 METHODOLOGY

The review was informed by:

A **desktop review** of existing DIP related performance data for London.

A **borough survey** of views on DIP strategy & leadership, CJIT delivery, partnerships, operational delivery and case management was sent to all borough Community Safety Managers, Police Leads, DIP managers and DIP champions. 56 responses (covering every borough) were received.

Strategic interviews of 18 key partners, including; Home Office, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), National Treatment Agency (NTA), Government Office for London (GoL), London Criminal Justice Partnership, National Offender Management Service (NOMS), Counselling Assessment Referral Advice and Throughcare teams (CARATs), London Probation Service, and commercial service providers.

Borough workshops were held in Brent, Enfield, Hackney, Islington, Hammersmith & Fulham, Havering, Southwark, and Westminster. Each workshop was well represented by a wide range of partners involved in the local delivery of DIP. A fictitious case scenario of an individual accessing DIP services was used to structure the workshops and understand the roles and relationships of partners. The workshops also followed up a number of issues raised by the responses to the borough survey.

A total of 24 '**local champions**' were interviewed in the boroughs selected to host workshops. Those interviewed included the Borough DIP champion (typically a police or council lead), DA(A)T managers, DIP managers, and police senior managers or custody managers.

4 FINDINGS

4.1 Strategic Issues

4.1.1 London Governance

The Governance of DIP at a London-wide level is led by the London Arrest to Recovery Group, which involves the NTA, the MPS, London Probation, NOMS, GoL, Jobcentre Plus, Offender Health and the Home Office. Respondents to the survey endorsed the Arrest to Recovery Group as being the appropriate forum (with the correct membership) in which to oversee the key issues in relation to the delivery of DIP in London.

The 'Cross-Border Group' that had previously been brought together by the NTA/ GoL (to reduce cross-borough attrition during the assessment stage of the DIP process) was seen as valuable.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the NTA support boroughs to establish and evaluate the use of local Cross-Border groups to help reduce cross-borough attrition

4.1.2 Roles of Strategic Partners

Those engaged during the strategic interviews expressed positive views of the relationships and existing level of communication between the strategic partners, including the Home Office, NTA, GoL and MPS. Over two thirds of partners at borough level were generally supportive of the NTA and GoL and most said that at borough level there was a good understanding of the aims of DIP and that drug related offending was given a high priority. 88% of survey respondents considered that local leadership was strong (many good examples were given). However, some boroughs local governance structures were less well developed.

Areas which incorporated joint training of all organisations involved with delivering the DIP had found this to be beneficial with improved links between partner agencies.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that borough DIP Strategic Groups, where joint agency training is not (or rarely) undertaken, examine ways to deliver increased opportunities for joint training across DIP delivery agencies

4.1.3 Local Partnership Working

Most boroughs visited displayed strong partnerships, built around inclusive relationships. Partners in some boroughs were keen to improve relationships with the police, with inconsistent police representation at meetings cited as an issue. The borough workshops also found a variable level of engagement with London Probation.

In the boroughs visited there were differing arrangements for contact between the CJIT, prisons and CARAT teams. CJITs which had embedded staff within the prisons reported that the contact and sharing of information between CJIT and CARAT teams was stronger than those without such posts.

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the NTA conduct an audit of borough staff that are embedded in, or have regular 'keyholder' access to, all London prisons to support the London DIPs as part of the assessment of their local operational delivery model

4.1.4 Police Strategic Lead

Since the recruitment of a new DIP Police Strategic Lead (PSL) in late 2009, and by the conclusion of the Review, progress had been made on a number of areas for development highlighted during the review. For example, a programme of borough support visits had been instigated together with a review of the MPS DIP intranet site.

69% of respondents to the survey expressed a positive view of the PSL role. Some of the less positive views expressed, including lack of visibility and poor communication were clearly being addressed in the subsequent months, for example with a London-wide DIP seminar taking place on 18th May 2010.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the PSL continues to develop a London-wide support network with borough police leads both for Intensive and Non-Intensive Boroughs, coupled with a systematic programme of monitoring and support visits to maintain a sound oversight of performance and relationships and to drive improvements where necessary (and reported to partners as appropriate)

4.2 Operational Issues

4.2.1 Identification of Clients

53,437 DIP drug tests were carried out by the Metropolitan Police Service in 2009/10. These tests accounted for almost one quarter of all tests conducted across England & Wales.

The desktop review revealed that the majority of boroughs performed well in terms of identifying DIP clients. A number of the 22 boroughs where drug testing takes place had met the accepted standard of testing at least 95% of adults arrested for a 'trigger offence' in every month in 2009/10 (and most other boroughs achieved this standard in most months). The targeted use of 'Inspector's Authority' (to drug test for 'non-trigger' offences) was varied, with the positive test rate for tests conducted under Inspector's Authority between 15% and over 60%). The MPS and NTA are aware of the boroughs where improvement is needed.

The desktop review demonstrated a reduced positive test rate in London, influenced by a range of factors including reduced drug purity and operator issues, the latter of which the MPS had taken steps to address.

Although responses to the survey suggested that Designated Detention Officer (DDO) (who conduct the DIP drug tests) coverage was at times sparse, a more positive picture was evident from the borough workshops and strategic interviews. Also the MPS initiative 'Project Herald' is in the process of increasing the number of DDOs available across the capital.

60% of survey respondents said that Conditional Cautions were not well used or understood – some felt that this disposal is bureaucratic and expensive to manage. This view was reflected in the workshops with the use of Conditional Cautions apparently low. Partners in one borough workshop identified the potential for greater use of Conditional Cautions (with a DIP condition) as a good way of coercing offenders into treatment in areas where drug testing is not conducted.

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the Metropolitan Police Service fully explores the options to develop an effective protocol, with all relevant agencies, to exploit the use of Conditional Cautions more fully.

4.2.2 Assessment of Clients

The Review found a universally sound approach to conducting Required Assessments. This reflected sound communication between and within boroughs and cover during day and night. Although 100% of survey respondents felt that breaches of Required Assessments were dealt with robustly, the boroughs visited revealed inconsistent approaches. For example, the 'cooling-off' period (in which re-engagement with the client is sought) ranged between 48 hours and 5 days. It was felt that a more systematic approach to improve enforcement performance across London would lead to better engagement with services users.

Recommendation 6: It is recommended that the MPS develop a corporate policy to ensure consistent approach to breaching individuals who fail to attend both Required Assessments and Restrictions on Bail appointments. This policy would include action for partners, as agreed by the NTA.

4.2.3 Case Management

93% of survey respondents reported a level of case management that met the needs of DIP clients in their borough. Most boroughs performed well in 2009/10 in terms of progressing appropriate DIP clients onto the caseload and into treatment. Those surveyed felt that action taken by the police (95%) and CJIT drug workers (100%) was well managed, and 93% felt that DIP clients' needs were being met with an appropriate range of services.

Case management recording systems (of varying types and levels of sophistication) were in place in all boroughs. In some areas, there were two or more recording systems on the same borough with associated compatibility problems.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the local DIP Strategic Groups review case management recording systems to ensure that the systems provide effective support for the case management of clients and that barriers to the sharing of information are identified.

4.2.4 Person Escort Records

The Person Escort Records (PERS) form is used universally throughout England & Wales for persons taken from police stations to courts and from courts to prison. However, the form could be improved by including valuable information on any engagement that prisoner has had with DIP, such as previous positive drug tests.

Recommendation 8: It is recommended that the Home Office consider requesting the NPIA to revise the national PERS form to include details of DIP drug testing results

4.2.5 Continuity of Care

The borough workshop attendees demonstrated a good understanding of principals of the Home Office / NOMS Continuity of Care Guidance, published in June 2009. However, the 'Alert Form' introduced with the guidance (to communicate between CJITs and Substance Misuse Teams in prisons changes in the circumstances of an offender) was generally not being used as envisaged. The Form was perceived by some to represent an additional level of bureaucracy. Workshop participants also expressed some confusion between the 'Alerts' and Drug Interventions Record (DIR) forms.

Recommendation 9: It is recommended that the implementation of the Continuity of Care Guidelines across the London Prison Estate and CJITs is reviewed at an early stage by the Home Office, NTA and NOMS.

4.2.6 Prisons Intelligence Notification System

The Prisoner Intelligence Notification System (PINS) contains information on all those in prison nationally and can provide trained individuals with valuable information, including advanced warning of a prisoner's release. PPO teams and CJIT staff in the boroughs visited felt PINS would be a valuable tool for them to have access to regarding DIP clients. The cost of additional software licences would need to be taken into account in considering wider use of PINS.

Recommendation 10: It is recommended that the MPS and NOMS jointly evaluate and review the use of PINS for general DIP clients to assess whether it is a more effective way of communicating changes of DIP client status.

4.2.7 DIP Intelligence Sharing Protocol

While the borough workshops found the intelligence flows between agencies on DIP clients to be acceptable, a gap was identified where DIP caseworkers were not informed of any DIP client encounters with police where no offence or specific offence is involved, or where a Penalty Notice for Disorder (PND) has been issued.

Case workers said they need a comprehensive picture of their clients offending behaviour, and while some boroughs were exploring ways to improve intelligence protocols there, was no common approach, so it was felt that this gap needed attention.

Recommendation 11: It is recommended that local areas ensure intelligence sharing, between agencies, for DIP clients that are neither arrested nor proactively identified be developed in a way that benefits the effectiveness of DIP client management

4.2.8 Use of Drug Rehabilitation Requirements

While there is an expectation that local agencies working within CJITs should develop protocols to outline when and how probation officers and case workers should consider the suitability of DIP clients for a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement (DRR), this practice was not consistently embedded across boroughs, and existing protocols varied.

Recommendation 12: It is recommended that London Arrest to Recovery Group consider how to strengthen relationships between London Probation and CJITs to ensure better information sharing about individuals who may be suitable for a DRR.