

# Scrutiny Report



## **Community Safety – Diversionary Activities**

**Report of the Resources Scrutiny Panel  
March 2005**

## **Chairman's Foreward**

When choosing a topic for scrutiny, one of the main questions we ask as a Scrutiny Panel, is what can we hope to achieve and what difference can we make.

Councillor Dan Wicksteed brought this issue of community safety and diversionary activity to the attention of the Panel and has been the Lead Member of the joint Task Group (made up of Members from both the Resources and Education Scrutiny Panels) on this cross cutting scrutiny exercise. I would like to thank him for his intense activity and commitment in leading the way on this exercise, which I believe has led to conclusions and recommendations that could genuinely make a difference to peoples' lives in the County.

On behalf of the Resources Scrutiny Panel, I would like to thank all those who contributed to this scrutiny, in particular the representatives from South Worcestershire, Bromsgrove, Wyre Forest and Redditch Community Safety Partnerships for their helpful and positive discussions.

Thank you also to those representing the Connexions Service, the Youth Offending Service, the Substance Misuse Action Team, the Police, the Domestic Violence Forum, and of course our own Youth Service, Social Services and Chief Executive's Unit, for sharing their views with the Task Group – it is greatly appreciated.

Finally, thank you to the Members of the Education Scrutiny Panel for their helpful input, and to the scrutiny team for their research and support, and for arranging so many meetings at such short notice.

I commend this report to you.

Councillor Frank Baillie  
Chairman, Resources Scrutiny Panel.

### **Resources Scrutiny Panel Membership**

Mr F Baillie (Chairman)  
Mr R A A Bullock  
Mr J M Cairns  
Mrs P E Davey  
Mrs J M Davy (Vice Chairman)  
Mr A Fry  
Mr W P Gretton  
Mr P A Mould  
Mr M J Shellie  
Mr B A Taylor  
Mr P D Wicksteed

### **Community Safety Diversionary Activity Task-Group Membership**

Dan Wicksteed (Lead Member)  
Frank Baillie (Chairman of Resources Scrutiny Panel)  
John Cairns  
Russ Clayton (Chairman of Education Scrutiny Panel)  
Jennette Davy, (Vice Chairman of Resources Scrutiny Panel)  
Mike Shellie (Education and Resources Scrutiny Panels)  
Leslie Towey, (Education Scrutiny Panel)

### **Officer Support**

Suzanne O'Leary (Overview and Scrutiny Manager)  
Stella Wood (Overview and Scrutiny Officer)  
David Onions (Principal Research and Partnership Officer)

# Contents

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Introduction	3
2. County Council's Community Safety Responsibilities	3
3. County Council's Support for Community Safety	4
4. Diversionary Activities	7
5. A model for enhancing County Youth Work	9
6. Alcohol Misuse	12
7. Domestic Violence	13
8. Conclusion	13
Glossary	15
<i>Appendix 1</i> Youth Service support to vulnerable young people	16
<i>Appendix 2</i> Report to the SMAT Board on Alcohol Treatment Services in Worcestershire	20
<i>Appendix 3</i> Gap analysis and proposals for addressing alcohol issues in Worcestershire	34
<i>Appendix 4</i> Note of discussion with Domestic Violence Co-ordinator	35
<i>Appendix 5</i> List of documents provided to the Task Group	36

# Resources Scrutiny Panel

## COMMUNITY SAFETY - DIVERSIONARY ACTIVITY

### Executive Summary

The County Council plays a key role in community safety and has a duty to work with District Councils. **We consider there is a significant piece of work to be done to examine how we are discharging our community safety responsibility.**

We are very pleased to see in the 2005/06 budget that increasing emphasis will be given to strengthening budgets for Community Safety and the Youth Service. We believe they are appropriately considered together and that our proposals will best enable the county to be a safer place where more vulnerable people are identified early.

With regards to diversionary activity for young people, we have found that there is a lot of good, innovative, and often-evaluated work going on.

**We feel that the concept of 'diversionary activity' needs to be seen within a wider concept of 'providing services to vulnerable young people'**

If young people are to lead positive lives, it is vital that there is regular provision of activities and support for vulnerable young people at the right time, in their locality, preferably with the involvement of the local community. We have listened carefully to those currently charged with delivering such activity and all agree that the provision of more "detached" youth workers would be the most effective way to target current gaps in provision and give greater support to existing ones.

**We therefore firmly believe the Council should move towards a strategy where detached youth work is the core activity of the Youth Service.**

There are costs attached to doing this – we estimate our Youth Work proposals will cost at least an extra £250,000 every year for four years (i.e. an increase of £1m in the base budget). The provision of a senior officer concerned with Community Safety and a more extensive back up service to support alcohol rehabilitation and tackle domestic violence could involve an additional £200,000 a year for several years (the 2004/05 budget increase for community safety).

We believe a failure to grasp this opportunity has huge hidden costs that will make the investment pale into insignificance.

By accepting the recommendations contained in this report, the Cabinet has the chance to genuinely improve the lives of some of the most vulnerable young people and provide safer communities in which to live. We strongly urge the Cabinet take this opportunity to make a positive difference.

## **Recommendations**

- 1. In order to strengthen the involvement of county councillors in community safety, we recommend that the Member Reference Group becomes the responsibility of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Resources and that meetings are timetabled regularly. (see paragraph 16)**
  
- 2. We recommend that a review of how Worcestershire County Council discharges its duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, is carried out, to include:**
  - a) A Section 17 audit, based on the Audit Commission's Acknowledge document;**
  - b) A review of what duties should or could be addressed centrally;**
  - c) An assessment of how County Council services and directorates consider community safety in their decision making and budget allocation process;**
  - d) A review of County Council involvement with local CDRPs to enable greater cohesion between County and District;**
  - e) The involvement of Members in strategic thinking around community safety. (see paragraph 21)**
  
- 3. We also recommend that the Council's existing support structures for Community Safety are reviewed. As part of this, the support provided to community safety by other County Councils and beacon authorities should be examined. (see paragraph 22)**
  
- 4. Although we cannot predict the outcome of such a review, we recommend that consideration is given to the establishment of a senior post to coordinate community safety activity in the County Council. Such a role is the epitome of a cross cutting one and would be best placed within a cross-cutting directorate. (see paragraph 23)**
  
- 5. We recommend that the County Council should ensure provision of detached 'youth workers' for every area which shows up on the JUIS information system as experiencing high levels of anti social behaviour. (see paragraph 41)**
  
- 6. Although we are not able to specify how any extra resources should be spent, we recommend that the Council review the resources targeted at alcohol. (see paragraph 57)**

# Resources Scrutiny Panel

## COMMUNITY SAFETY - DIVERSIONARY ACTIVITY Scrutiny Report

### 1. Introduction

1. Feeling safe is the number one factor in making Worcestershire a good place to live.<sup>1</sup> It is also a major theme of the Community Strategy. The County Council plays a key part in addressing community safety and helping to respond to the community safety audits conducted by the District Councils. We work in partnership with others and it is vital that members and officers are aware of the obligations on the Council and how they can contribute.

2. The origin of this scrutiny was to examine whether the County Council was making as effective a contribution to Community Safety as it could and to help raise the visibility of its duty and its present contributions among members particularly. Due to the size of this task, the Resources Scrutiny Panel agreed to initially focus on one aspect – the provision of diversionary activities for young people. The following terms of reference were agreed:

- To assess the effectiveness of diversionary activities, where possible, describing how they are effective, and produce a gap analysis of the provision of such activities across the county;
- To raise the visibility of community safety issues in the County Council, particularly amongst elected members;
- To identify how the County Council could engage better with Districts on these issues;
- To address concerns about the sustainability of schemes which only have short term funding; and
- To provide a model for producing a gap analysis (for a possible future scrutiny exercise) which could be applied to other areas of community safety (eg drugs rehabilitation, domestic violence, anti-social behaviour, young offenders etc).

3. Because of the role of the County Council's Youth Service in diversionary activities, the Scrutiny Steering Group agreed that the Resources Panel should form a joint task group, involving members of the Education Scrutiny Panel.

### 2. The County Council's Community Safety Responsibilities

4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 gives the County Council a duty to

*“exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area”.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 2003/04 Best Value General Satisfaction Survey

In effect this means the Council must examine everything it does to ensure that community safety matters have been taken into consideration. This duty is very wide ranging and includes such diverse issues as planning, youth work, school truancy, street lighting, trading standards, our own children in care, bullying, Police Authority membership and so on.

### **3. The County Council's Support for Community Safety**

5. The main responsibility for community safety lies with the District Councils and there are four Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) covering Worcestershire – where agencies work together on local initiatives to tackle crime and fear of crime.

6. Worcestershire-wide partnership work on Community Safety, Substance Misuse, Domestic Violence and Youth Offending is developed and overseen by the Community Safety Steering Group (CSSG), one of Worcestershire Partnership's thematic groups. The Steering Group works with local partnerships to help them meet the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act. This includes training, developing systems to support collection of data and monitoring performance, and should address opportunities for closer countywide working where appropriate.

7. The Community Safety Steering Group comprises officers from a wide range of organisations. County Councillor involvement in community safety is through a Member Reference Group chaired by the Adviser to the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Resources.

8. At present, the County's duties on community safety are overseen by Diane Tilley, the Head of the Chief Executive's Unit. We understand this comprises about one seventh of her workload. She is assisted by David Onions, Principal Research and Partnership Officer.

9. In the light of both the likely changes to the mechanism for distributing community safety funding (described below), which will give a larger role to the County Council, and the revised structure that the Council must adopt to meet the demands of the Children's Act, we consider that the present structure needs to be re-examined.

#### Funding

10. Funding for community safety currently comes from a number of different funding streams, the main contributors being the Home Office Building Safer Communities Initiative, and Police Basic Command Units grants as well as County and District funds. At present Worcestershire County Council contributes £20,000 to each District per year to facilitate and deliver projects.

11. The Government has set out a new mechanism for distributing community safety funding, which from 2006/07 will give the County Council a much more central role through the implementation of Local Area Agreements.

12. The Safer and Stronger Communities Funding brings together a number of existing funding streams that are designed to reduce crime, tackle anti-social behaviour, improve public spaces, and ensure services are more responsive to local needs in deprived neighbourhoods. The SSCF is designed to reduce the bureaucracy relating to multiple funding streams and increase flexibility for partnerships to use funding to deliver agreed local and national outcomes. Government Office has stated that funding will be held at County level, with a Local Area Agreement being negotiated with all Worcestershire's Community Safety Partnerships.

#### *The importance of Community Safety work being sustainable*

13. Everyone we spoke to emphasised the difficulty of continually having to seek new sources of funding for work that had often richly proved its value. Sustainability of provision is a major concern of those with whom we spoke. The form of provision may need to be flexible but its funding should be secure if at all possible. To this end should the County Council decide to put more resources in to support frontline Community Safety work it is likely that the most helpful contribution would be to move some project funded activities which had already amply proved their worth into core funded activities. For example, the key model described in paragraph 42 is largely happening in Worcester City and developing in South Worcestershire, but we understand, its funding is at risk.

#### *Member Involvement and Awareness*

14. The present structure whereby Community Safety oversight and the partnership structures that go with them are placed with district councils can easily reduce the visibility of County Council duties and responsibilities.

15. We feel there is a need to raise awareness across all Directorates and particularly among county councillors. Indeed, county councillor involvement in community safety is limited to the Member Reference Group chaired by the Adviser to the Cabinet Member for Resources. The Member Reference Group comprises 15 members and, although it has valuable terms of reference, it meets irregularly. Given the importance of raising the visibility and contribution of the County and keeping this top community concern at the forefront of everyone's mind, not to mention a probable increase in formal responsibility for funding, it is vital that county councillors take a central role in community safety.

**16. In order to strengthen the involvement of county councillors in community safety, we recommend that the Member Reference Group becomes the responsibility of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Resources and that meetings are timetabled regularly.**

#### *Officer support for and Coordination of Community Safety*

17. The changes in the funding mechanism also mean that officer support for community safety needs to be effective and properly resourced. The task of coordinating community safety issues across the county in liaison with Community Safety Partnerships is a key one, and we believe it is currently under resourced. If community safety is to be taken seriously by the County Council we believe more coordination, oversight and leadership is needed for this function

within the Council. There is clearly a need for ongoing, high level, expert officer support at a senior level.

18. Coordination of activities and strategies is important across all the organisations involved in community safety. It is vital that the relationships between the Worcestershire Partnership thematic groups are effective and well developed. In particular, it is essential that there is a dialogue and good communications between the Community Safety Steering Group and the Children and Young People Strategic Partnership, due to the synergies in strategies and activities. This raises the issue of the role of the Community Safety Steering Group. As the new funding arrangements develop, the CSSG will become increasingly central, and it is important that it is effective and can deliver on outcomes.

#### A review of community safety

19. In addition, a full County Council Section 17 audit similar to those done by some district councils would help the County make a positive response to these challenges. At present the Council leaves monitoring of Section 17 responsibilities to the Head of Chief Executive's Unit who checks we are complying by reading every policy paper which goes to COMB and Cabinet. This sounded to us like a conscientious, responsive style, rather than an energetic and proactive style. This is certainly not meant to be read as a criticism of an effective and hardworking officer.

20. The Scrutiny Panel considered there is a significant piece of work to be done to examine how we are discharging our community safety responsibility.

**21. We recommend that a review of how Worcestershire County Council discharges its duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, is carried out, to include:**

- f) A Section 17 audit, based on the Audit Commission's Acknowledge document;**
- g) A review of what duties should or could be addressed centrally;**
- h) An assessment of how County Council services and directorates consider community safety in their decision making and budget allocation process;**
- i) A review of County Council involvement with local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships to enable greater cohesion between County and District;**
- j) Consideration of how Members are involved in the development of community safety strategies.**

**22. We also recommend that the Council's existing support structures for Community Safety are reviewed. As part of this, the support provided to community safety by other County Councils and beacon authorities should be examined.**

**23. Although we cannot predict the outcome of such a review, we recommend that consideration is given to the establishment of a senior post to coordinate community safety activity in the County Council. Such a**

**role is the epitome of a cross cutting one and would be best placed within a cross-cutting directorate.**

24. Even without conducting a Section 17 audit, our scrutiny has highlighted areas - youth work, alcohol misuse and domestic violence - where we believe action needs to be taken. These are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

#### **4. Diversionary Activities**

25. The Scrutiny Panel acknowledges that the best long-term strategic intervention with regards to anti-social behaviour by young people is in connection with improving the quality of parenting. This might be done, as has been done in some projects, by recruiting known local parents who can be trained to provide support that is often much better received from a peer than from an employee of an authority. The key is to find people with good interpersonal skills. Members also considered that Homestart is providing a valuable service, which is coming under a lot of pressure. Recently, the Government has advised that improving parenting skills is one of the keys to tackling anti social behaviour, and future legislation is planned to support this.

26. There are many initiatives supporting young children. However, this does not detract from the importance of initiatives supporting young people now and those in the age group 13-19 in particular. We chose to focus on this area as these activities are supported by a wide range of authorities e.g. district councils, police, probation, the voluntary sector, Connexions, Youth Offending teams and the County's own youth service of course. Community Safety Partnerships can provide for some co-ordination but it seemed worth scrutinising:

- the sustainability and adequacy of provision,
- the possibility of sensibly agreeing priorities with so many funding sources,
- the establishment of what makes for the most effective provision, and
- the possibility that some functions might best be planned and/or managed on a countywide basis.

It was crucial to involve the CSPs at an early stage in our discussions and they were universally helpful to us.

27. We focused on two questions:

- What makes for effective diversionary activity?
- How are gaps in provision located? (i.e. How are priorities in provision decided?)

#### *Effective Diversionary Activity*

28. It became obvious quite early in our scrutiny that the concept of 'diversionary activity' has marked limitations. It can imply the reason for providing activity is purely to distract otherwise troublesome young people.

29. It is important not to reinforce a stereotype about young people that they are basically 'a problem'. The great majority are not and even the majority of those who congregate and worry local residents are not. However it cannot be denied that some young people do cause significant problems for the areas they live in. Selecting those for special provision is a key challenge.

30. In addition, distraction is an inadequate ambition for those who become involved in supported activities. We would seek to educate as well and to engender a growing commitment to social and community activity.

31. We welcome the establishment of the Guru Directory ([www.gurudirectory.info](http://www.gurudirectory.info)) of groups and services for children, young people and their families as a way of encouraging such education.

32. Our scrutiny has identified that there are a number of agencies and authorities with statutory duties to provide for young people generally, including the Youth Service, and there are a number of agencies and authorities with statutory duties to provide support for those who are involved in offending, anti-social behaviour or who are vulnerable for other reasons. However, there is a substantial number of young people who fall between these two groups, who are at risk of becoming involved in crime or anti-social behaviour for whom no agency or authority has any statutory duties or responsibilities.

**33. We feel that the concept of 'diversionary activity' needs to be seen within a wider concept, described in the Community Strategy, of 'providing services to vulnerable young people'.** This duty will include helping all those who may be described as vulnerable. The fact that a sub group of the vulnerable cause distress in local communities and need effective support is where diversionary activities come in. Support in this context can be wide ranging. It may involve setting clear boundaries to acceptable behaviour and 'policing' adherence, which will be predominantly a police activity. It may involve negotiating acceptable behaviour with individuals in this group and working with them to help them achieve responsible behaviour. It probably will involve locating who and where such young people are and deciding where on a spectrum of intervention they are best placed. We believe the County Council in its concern to help all vulnerable young people has a clear duty to see this latter duty is met in every area.

34. A further distinction we found helpful when describing what made for quality in provision was between those activities which got young people to attend and those activities which helped change their lifestyle. Outreach work for example was excellent at making contact with relevant young people but generally needed some session-based facilities if it was to have a lasting impact.

35. Another key principle that should guide the provision of activities was to get young people themselves to advocate and prioritise what is offered. It was important that such issues as the cost of providing an activity be considered by them as every decision is an opportunity to further help them take responsibility for their own decisions and ultimately their own lives. They should equally be involved in assessing the success of activities that have been organised.

36. We also heard how young people can be very territorial and often will not access services provided in a particular location because it is out of their patch. Dave Evans, a very experienced Youth Worker for North Worcestershire, noted one example where a group of young people preferred to use a lock-up garage in their area, which they had helped to locate and do up, rather than travel a short distance to a newly refurbished youth centre with good facilities.

37. We found a high level of consensus among those we questioned that any worthwhile diversionary activity should create opportunity (probably in an informal way at first) for the young people we most want to influence to talk about what their lives were really like with some responsible (and trusted) adult. This has implications for the qualities of the people we employ to provide diversionary activity – we discuss this in more detail later.

## 5. A model for enhancing County Youth work

***“If you were to spend any more money on diversionary activities I would spend 85% on preventative activities and 15% on reactive activities.”***

Police Sergeant Chris Allen.

38. As we have set out above, our discussions have highlighted a clear need to provide support to targeted groups of vulnerable young people, wherever they are. There was also strong support from those we spoke to for prevention and for development and strengthening of “detached” youth work, rather than the traditional centre based youth work. This is described in more detail in Appendix 1. In addition, the Audit Commission’s Acknowledge document lists the actions Councils can take to mainstream community safety in basic services:

- Increase the profile of young people’s services
- Focus on disadvantaged young people
- Provide detached and outreach street-based youth work.

39. We consider that the County Council’s responsibility for providing a Youth Service is a major contributor to, or limitation on, community safety. One estimate suggests around £2,000,000 could be saved each year in Worcestershire by reducing the number of offences using diversionary activities.<sup>2</sup> We are therefore very supportive of a substantial enhancement of youth work in the County.

---

<sup>2</sup> In Worcestershire, in 2002/03, there were 2,926 offences committed by this age of young people on the Youth Offending Service caseload. It is estimated that about 1 in 4 crimes are recorded. Hence, for Worcestershire the number of offences would be about 11,700.

The DfES evaluation of a national “Summer Plus” in 2002 showed a net additional reduction of 9% in recorded offences in the 10-17 age group in the areas where the project ran. Applied to the annual figure for Worcestershire, this would be a reduction of 1,054 offences over the year.

Using figures in Home Office Research Study 217, the economic and social cost of an “average” crime is £2,000. Therefore, the annual saving resulting from a reduction of 1,054 offences would be £2.108 million.

40. In our view, and in the view of many of those we spoke to, this enhancement should be to increase the number of detached youth workers. Their prime responsibility would be to the young people of an area wherever they meet. The most vulnerable young people often might not attend existing Youth Centre provision and can therefore easily be 'overlooked'.

**41. We recommend that the County Council should ensure provision of detached 'youth workers' for every area which shows up on the JUIS information system as experiencing high levels of anti social behaviour.**

Typically these areas will contain a considerable number of vulnerable young people including those who show up as prolific and persistent offenders.

42. South Worcestershire has developed a valuable model of detached youth work. This involves having a detached team of youth workers which can be called in to any area (identified by service professionals such as social services, the police and local councillors) to engage with young people causing concern in a particular community. Their main purpose is to build relationships rather than enforce behaviour. It also involves planning and developing diversionary activities, often from community centres, which are important focal points. Estate or locally based groups/activities, where detached youth workers are present, worked most effectively, engaging with and enabling young people to have access to advice on issues which affect their lives. The Young Peoples' Leisure Centre and skate park at Perdiswell, Worcester, is a good working example. Another pivotal aspect was involvement of the local community.

43. We believe the Council, in conjunction with Community Safety Partnerships, should explore the possibility of promoting this model as a priority across the county. We do not believe the model would interfere with the good work already going on, but it would give a focus and provide a basis for selecting what needs to be given priority. Core funding must make this model sustainable.

*Qualities of Detached Youth Workers*

44. During our discussions with Community Safety Officers, Youth Service, SMAT, the Police and Connexions staff, we explored the qualities these detached youth workers should display. We believe youth workers are particularly suited to such work and found that these qualities should include:

1. An ability to work with young people, wherever they congregate.
2. An ability to build longer term relationships with young people who are vulnerable.
3. An ability to distinguish normal risk taking from uninformed, dangerous or self-destructive risk taking.
4. An awareness of routes to more expert advice and support.
5. A familiarity with the area in which they serve e.g. significant local people like Councillors, shopkeepers, Police beat officers, Community Support officers, and possible funding sources as well as opportunities for leisure pursuits.
6. An ability to support young people in organising activities themselves.

45. We do not assume that only highly qualified professional youth workers can do this, though we believe an increase in such professional youth workers will be necessary to support and generally 'quality assure' such work.

46. The level of expertise required to create an opportunity for young people to talk about their lives and their issues was a matter of some discussion. Many people can do it and probably even more find it hard. Some of the best have themselves experienced difficulty and could be ruled out by a too rigorous professionalisation of the process.

47. However we agreed two things are crucial and one highly desirable:

- The first is that the people we use **can** build up a rapport with the young people we wish to influence. The second is that we should seek to provide such people with a **knowledge of a back up service** of more specialist advice and support when their discussion revealed a deeper underlying problem e.g. drugs, pregnancy, domestic violence, alcohol, debt, housing.
- We also agreed that it was crucial for there **to be** an adequate back up service of this kind. It may be that such specialisation is an area which the County Council could undertake to oversee and thus ensure that there was a county-wide service. (Again, the new Guru directory is valuable here.)

48. A highly desirable quality in those working with the young people is that they should be local. Ideally they should live in and know the area. Learning a commitment to improving the life experiences of people living in an area can best be fostered by those living in and committed to that area. A sustainable policy will support the growth and learning of local people willing to become involved.

### Recruitment and Retention

49. Difficulties with recruitment and retention could be eased in a number of ways. Firstly by recruiting from the local community and developing community capacity. It may also be possible to provide some training to existing "expert" providers – such as local sports coaches or others who provide tuition to young people – to enable them to have the confidence to deal with, or refer on, issues which are raised with them by young people. Again, we believe it is vital to recruit those with relevant skills but not necessarily with formal qualifications. It is also important to develop a proper career structure, with a lengthened pay scale, to enable good quality staff to be retained, as well as encouraging more people to apply for jobs.

### Costs of the model

50. Our recommendations do require extra funding for the Youth Service. The potential costs are set out in detail in Appendix 1.

51. The Council has recently agreed a proposal to enhance the Youth Service budget by £350,000. If the County Council agreed, in addition, a medium term strategy to continue enhancing the core Youth Service budget by a minimum of £250,000 a year from 2005/06 for the next four years (i.e. growth in the base budget of £1m), we believe this model could be delivered, as well as supporting

enhanced provision within existing centres. It would still not take us to the government's recommended funding level for youth service, nor put us above the average spend per 13-19 year old of other County Councils.

## 6. Alcohol Misuse

52. Everyone we spoke with agreed that the funding to support people with alcohol problems was much less adequate than that available to support those with drug problems. Whilst we do not advocate any reduction in the support for drug related work it was clear that alcohol is a more common problem with young people and support for getting it into proportion was less well funded.

53. Research suggests that 4% of the adult population drink at harmful levels and 23% drink at hazardous levels. For Worcestershire this equates to 90,000 harmful or hazardous drinkers. In a recent YouthComm survey, 76% of young people admitted to having been drunk.

54. The annual cost of alcohol misuse to the country is approximately £20 billion, the costs of which are largely borne by health services and the criminal justice system. Translated to a local level, this equates to an annual cost to the local economy of approximately £200,000,000 per annum. Expenditure on alcohol treatment in Worcestershire is currently £534,000 per annum.

55. Phil Deakin, the Substance Misuse Action Team (SMAT) Coordinator, advised that SMAT concentrates on Class 1 substance abuse i.e. heroine, cocaine and crack – it does not have the resources to cover other substances. His recent report to the SMAT board (attached at Appendix 2) states that there are significant gaps in provision within Worcestershire. Currently almost 99% of estimated harmful and hazardous drinkers in Worcestershire are not accessing treatment. Funding for the main service provider is insufficient to maintain provision at the current level.

56. It is important to remain mindful of the different nature of the harm caused by alcohol and drugs. That caused by alcohol abuse tends to be more visible (eg on the streets of the town centre on a Saturday night) than harm caused by drug abuse, which is often in the form of harm within the family, theft and a far higher level of criminality is required to support drug abuse.

57. However, it is clear that alcohol misuse, particularly by young people, is a major issue with regards to community safety. We believe that if more money is to be injected it would be best targeted at alcohol abuse.

58. The Scrutiny Panel asked the SMAT co-ordinator to set out how an extra £200,000 (the proposed budget increase for community safety) could be spent. In response he provided an analysis of the current gaps in provision, which is attached at Appendix 3. **Although we are not able to specify how any extra resources for alcohol misuse should be spent, we recommend that the Council review the resources targeted at alcohol.**

## **7. Domestic Violence**

59. A startling statistic that emerged during our scrutiny was that, nationally, 50% of young people involved in anti-social behaviour came from families affected by domestic violence. This highlights the need for a different focus on preventing anti-social behaviour and it is important that there is support on domestic violence issues in schools for young people as well as younger children. Appendix 4 suggests areas where there are current gaps in provision in support for domestic violence.

60. There is also a link with alcohol misuse, although alcohol abuse exacerbates, rather than causes, domestic violence it (i.e. it increases the risk of an argument becoming a physical assault.)

## **8. Conclusion**

61. The County Council plays a key role in community safety and we consider there is a significant piece of work to be done to examine how we are discharging our community safety responsibility.

62. We are very pleased to see in the 2005/06 budget that increasing emphasis will be given to strengthening budgets for Community Safety and the Youth Service. We believe they are appropriately considered together and that our proposals will best enable the county to be a safer place where more vulnerable people are identified early.

63. With regards to diversionary activity for young people, we have found that there is a lot of good, innovative, and often-evaluated work going on. Nothing in this report should be read as being critical of what is going on so much as seeking to support more.

64. If young people are to lead positive lives, it is vital that there is regular provision of activities and support for vulnerable young people at the right time, in their locality, preferably with the involvement of the local community. We have listened carefully to those currently charged with delivering such activity and all agree that the provision of more detached youth workers would be the most effective way to target current gaps in provision and give greater support to existing ones.

65. We therefore firmly believe the Council should move towards a strategy where detached youth work is the core activity of the Youth Service.

66. This would be a practical way to support the aims of the CYPSP “to co-ordinate multi-agency initiatives on prevention and early intervention”. It would also support the review of provision for Children with Emotional, Social and Behavioural Difficulties.

67. There are costs attached to doing this – we estimate our Youth Work proposals will cost at least an extra £250,000 every year for four years (i.e. a growth in the base budget of £1m). The provision of a senior officer concerned with Community Safety and a more extensive back up service to support alcohol

rehabilitation and tackle domestic violence will involve an additional £200,000 a year for several years.

68. We believe a failure to grasp this opportunity has huge hidden costs that will make the investment pale into insignificance.

69. By accepting the recommendations contained in this report, the Cabinet has the chance to genuinely improve the lives of some of the most vulnerable young people and provide safer communities in which to live. We strongly urge the Cabinet to take this opportunity to make a positive difference.

## Glossary

<b>ASB</b>	Anti Social Behaviour
<b>ASBO</b>	Anti Social Behaviour Order
<b>CDRP</b>	Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership
<b>CSP</b>	Community Safety Partnership
<b>CYPSP</b>	Children's and Young People's Strategic Partnership
<b>CSSG</b>	Community Safety Steering Group
<b>Guru</b>	<p><b>Guru Directory</b> <a href="http://www.gurudirectory.info">www.gurudirectory.info</a></p> <p>Guru is the new way to find about services and groups for children, young people and their families. Guru helps match people to the services they need and supports professionals in making appropriate referrals. The Children's Information Service is responsible for developing and maintaining Guru, under the direction of the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP). A multi-agency group, with representatives from Health, Social Services, Education, Connexions and the voluntary sector oversees developments. GURU's Quality Standards cover issues such as confidentiality, impartiality, accuracy of information and complaints and will ensure that the directory is of a high quality.</p>
<b>JUIS</b>	Joined Up Information System
<b>LAA</b>	Local Area Agreement
<b>LSP</b>	Local Strategic Partnership
<b>PCT</b>	Primary Care Trust
<b>SCI</b>	Safer Communities Initiative
<b>SMAT</b>	Substance Misuse Action Team
<b>YOS</b>	Youth Offending Service

### **Youth Service support to vulnerable young people**

#### *Introduction*

1. Members of the Youth Service were recently invited to meet with councillors undertaking a scrutiny on community safety with a special focus on diversionary activities.
2. On 10<sup>th</sup> February Geoff Taylor–Smith – Head of Community Education and Lifelong Learning and Bridget Cooper, Head of the Youth Service, gave a presentation on the Youth Service to the Education Scrutiny Panel.

#### *Youth Service and support for vulnerable young people*

3. The County Council has a significant role to play in the response to the local crime audits and the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP). Central to this is the statutory requirement for all local authorities to ensure that implications for community safety are taken into account within every element of their work across all directorates as laid out in section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act.
4. At the community safety scrutiny meeting it was highlighted that diversionary activities can have positive responses where the activity has both a clear focus on outcomes and a well-established relationship between staff and young people.
5. Following the scrutiny meeting the board asked for a response from the Youth Service as to how youth work, and in particular detached work, could contribute to support for vulnerable young people at risk of getting into crime related trouble and anti social behaviour and seen as a nuisance in their community.
6. The Youth Service currently has a range of provision, which provides a service for young people across a broad youth work curriculum. Further detail about this provision is available from the papers and PowerPoint presentation handout prepared for the 10<sup>th</sup> February Scrutiny meeting.
7. Although there has been good progress and expansion within the Youth Service over the past five years it is acknowledged that traditional centre based youth work is not suited to every young person's needs. This could be for a variety of reasons including:
  - The territorialism of young people (both those using the provision and those not doing so)
  - Young people's perception that such a provision is inappropriate to them
  - Limited availability of provision
  - Poor transport infrastructures which limits access
  - The location of some provision.
8. By opening existing provision more often will not guarantee that that we would attract in those young people who currently opt to spend their time on the streets with their friends.

9. Outreach and detached work are recognised youth work approaches successful in contacting and working with these, often vulnerable, young people to enable them and their communities to have positive outcomes.

#### *Outreach Youth Work*

10. If the issue is about perception of the provision, or lack of awareness then it may be appropriate to instigate a programme of outreach work. Outreach work is where the centre and its provision is promoted by staff going out into local communities to meet young people and encourage participation within the centre programme or project.

11. It also serves to raise awareness of specific opportunities and resources available for young people through the centre in particular and the service in general.

12. Usually this approach will be time limited and targeted. For example for a particular number of sessions or at certain times of the year to highlight specific changes in programming or activities. Performance indicators for outreach work will normally include increased attendance at the respective centres.

13. An outreach approach may not have an impact where individual or groups of young people continue to prefer to stay outside the centre.

#### *Detached Youth Work*

14. Detached youth work is the method most commonly used by youth services nationally to contribute to tackling community safety issues within the community whilst maintaining a positive, needs led approach with young people.

15. Detached youth work differs from outreach youth work because it is accepted from the outset that the programme of activities and opportunities must be focussed on an appropriate venue of setting within the young people's local community.

16. This is usually an area that young people have identified for themselves as a meeting place. Locations for the work may be identified in a number of ways and in consultation with other agencies and must always be based upon appropriate reconnaissance and risk assessment.

17. One of the strengths of detached work is its flexibility in being able to respond to local needs and seasonal variation by relocating within communities as appropriate.

18. Many young people on the streets are engaged in risky behaviours including anti social behaviours and a crucial role for the detached workers is to provide young people with information about harm minimisation in relation to these behaviours. Youth workers also have a role to encourage young people to seek specialist support and advise where needed.

19. For the local community detached youth work may not answer their desire to see less young people on the streets. What they may see is a young person more aware of the impact their behaviour has on themselves, their peers and the community. This in turn may lead to changes in their behaviour.

20. Detached youth work is not a quick fix solution to anti social behaviour and best practice shows that a period of approximately 6 months is needed for a team of detached youth workers to work in one location in order to develop strong working relationships and trust with the young people targeted.

21. The areas to be the focus of detached work would need to be identified and prioritised in consultation with partners and agencies engaged in the CDRP and also through the local Youth Strategy Groups and using the JUIS information system to determine the areas experiencing high levels of anti social behaviour.

### *Good Practice*

22. As with all quality youth work contact with young people in detached youth work settings can be made on a number of different levels including:

- Observation of young people
- Casual acknowledgement
- Routine conversation
- Positive constructive conversation
- Planned intervention leading to participation of young people and/or accredited outcomes.

These different levels can be noted through the Youthworcs evaluation sheets and the Youthworcs Awards Scheme.

23. The importance of needs analysis and a planned curriculum delivery to respond to these identified needs is as important in detached youth work as it is in centre or project based youth work. It is the responsibility of all members of the team to participate in and influence these processes through the evaluation, monitoring and review procedures in place.

24. The Youthworcs Curriculum has as much relevance and importance in the delivery of work in detached settings as it does in centre and project based work. Planned delivery is a vital component of all quality youth work interventions, and is crucial to the development and measurement of quality outcomes as outlined in the appropriate delivery plans at all levels. Workers will be expected to contribute to the development and evaluation of Curriculum Framework as a mechanism to develop and share good practice throughout the organisation.

25. In order to achieve good practice workers must recognise the change in relationship as they work with young people on their territories as opposed to working in venues with explicit rules and expectations such as youth centres. This may have an impact on what constitutes acceptable behaviour in the eyes of the young people, particularly concerning such issues as use of language and smoking. Whilst workers must acknowledge this impact it does not mean that we should sacrifice our own standards in order to fit in with the young people. This

should be reflected in the expectations placed upon staff concerning their behaviour.

26. At all times workers must be realistic about their abilities, influence and resources. Whilst it is right to encourage young people we must not raise unrealistic expectations of what they or workers can achieve. Good youth workers, irrespective of the setting within which they work, will never make commitments upon which they cannot deliver.

27. The work undertaken by the detached work teams must be based within a multi-agency approach if we are to achieve the aims and objectives of the Youth Service, the County Council and its partners.

#### *Resourcing the Establishment of Detached Youth Work Teams*

28. Detached youth workers must work as part of a pair as an absolute minimum. At times the nature of the client group may require a team of three.

29. Where teams work in areas considered to be a community safety hotspot then we would need to recruit a suitably experienced and qualified staff and also ensure that there is sufficient funding to resource and support the work.

30. In order to achieve this the recruitment of full time workers to lead the teams would be the most positive option, with each of the full time workers taking responsibility for the management of a small team of sessional staff.

31. A full time worker with a staffing complement of 37 assistant worker hours per week would enable a detached project to work up to four evenings in the targeted area, (current JNC terms and conditions). As the lead worker would not have responsibility for a building then they would have more flexibility for developing daytime work and establishing partnership working in order to ensure a fully flexible approach. This would enable the workers concerned to also play a full role in holiday diversionary activity programmes and various inclusion opportunities etc.

32. The estimated costs for the establishment of each detached team based on two full time equivalent youth workers is as follows:

Salary costs including on costs and setting up costs	£ 49,000
Travel, equipment, admin and programme costs	£ 7,000
Estimated Total costs per annum	£ 56,000

#### *Conclusion*

33. At the Youth Service presentation to the Education scrutiny meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> February, the establishment of detached youth work was one of the development areas outlined by the Head of the Youth Service. The Community Safety and Education scrutiny reports will inform which of the development areas which will be taken forward following the forthcoming Council decision about additional funding to the Youth Service in 2005/06.

**Bridget Cooper – Head of Youth Service, February 2005**

<b>WORCESTERSHIRE SUBSTANCE MISUSE ACTION TEAM</b>
--

## Report to the SMAT Board on Alcohol Treatment Services in Worcestershire

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The SMAT Partnership Board has requested a report on the provision of alcohol treatment services in Worcestershire and a review of best practice.

### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The aim of this report is to review alcohol treatment provision in Worcestershire against best practice and to provide recommendations on the way forward.

#### **Objectives**

- Analysis of all services provided by all agencies working within the alcohol field in the county, together with a breakdown of funding
- Analysis of what is considered within the field to be best practice
- Identification of any gaps in current service provision
- Preliminary assessment of the cost benefits of funding expansion of the treatment sector

Research suggests that 4% of the adult population drink at harmful levels and 23% drink at hazardous levels. For Worcestershire this equates to 90,000 harmful or hazardous drinkers. In 2003/4 HWASA treated 1,224 clients, i.e. just 1.36% of this population.

The annual cost of alcohol misuse to the country is approximately £20 billion, the costs of which are largely borne by health services and the criminal justice system. Translated to a local level, this equates to an annual cost to the local economy of approximately £200 million per annum. Expenditure on alcohol treatment in Worcestershire is currently £534,000 per annum.

There is currently no agreed model of best practice for an alcohol treatment system, and the NTA has yet to publish its Models of Care for Alcohol. However, the Commission On The Future of Alcohol Services has produced a report which identifies the key underlying themes which should characterise any future Models of Care Structure for Alcohol.

#### **Conclusions**

- When profiled against the Commission On The Future of Alcohol Services' suggested model for delivery of alcohol services, there are significant gaps in provision within Worcestershire at all four tiers.
- Currently, almost 99% of estimated harmful and hazardous drinkers in Worcestershire are not accessing treatment.
- Funding for the main service provider is insufficient to maintain provision at the current level.

#### **Recommendations**

- A commissioning strategy should be developed, to target the key gaps in service provision and priorities for future development.
- Baseline funding for HWASA should be secured to ensure current levels of provision are maintained.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Following concerns of the SMAT Partnership Board regarding the consequences of alcohol misuse in Worcestershire and the level of service provision, it was agreed that greater clarity was required regarding the funding and delivery of alcohol services in Worcestershire. It was also agreed that treatment services should be profiled against Models of Care and best practice.

## **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The aim of this report is to review alcohol treatment provision in Worcestershire against best practice and to provide recommendations on the way forward.

### **Objectives**

- Analysis of all services provided by all agencies working within the alcohol field in the county, together with a breakdown of funding
- Analysis of what is considered within the field to be best practice
- Identification of any gaps in current service provision
- Preliminary assessment of the cost benefits of funding expansion of the treatment sector

## **NATIONAL EVIDENCE**

In Britain alcohol misuse costs an estimated £18–20 billion per annum to the NHS, the criminal justice system, to the workplace and wider economy (appendix 1).

### **Health**

- It is estimated that alcohol misuse accounts for 12% of total NHS spending on hospitals
- 15% of acute hospital admissions misuse alcohol (Canning, 1999)
- 1 in 4 male acute admissions a year are caused by alcohol dependence or poisoning.
- 1 in 6 people attending A&E departments for treatment have alcohol-related injuries or problems, rising to 8 out of 10 at peak times. (HEA, 1998)
- 20% of inappropriate ambulance calls are alcohol related
- 3% of all cancers are attributable to alcohol (Heather et al, 2001)

### **Mental Health**

Heavy drinking is closely linked with psychiatric morbidity including clinical depression (HEA, 1997)

- 72,500 hospital admissions in a 12 month period with a diagnosis of mental and behavioural disorders due to alcohol (DoH, 1999)
- one study found that 21% of psychiatric admissions were alcohol related (CMO, 2001)
- 65% of suicide attempts are linked with excessive drinking (HEA, 1999)

### **Criminal Justice**

It is estimated that the following can be linked to the consumption of alcohol:

- 50-73% of assault victims' injuries
- nearly 50% of cases of domestic violence against females
- 61% of the 125,000 facial injuries sustained each year in violent circumstances
- around 50% of all serious road crashes

- 25% of young people who drink weekly have a criminal record, compared to 6-7% of occasional or non-drinkers (Newcombe 1995)
- 30% of probation clients and 58% of remand and sentenced prisoners have severe alcohol problems (NAPO 1994)

A breakdown of costs to the criminal justice system are detailed in appendix 2.

### **Children of Alcohol Misusing Parents**

An estimated 920,000 children are currently living in a home where one or both parents misuse alcohol (NACOA, 2000).

Analysis of NSPCC helpline calls (NSPCC, 1997) showed parental alcohol misuse to be a factor in:

- 23% of child neglect cases
- 13% of calls about emotional abuse
- 10% of calls about physical abuse
- 5% of calls about sexual abuse

Heavy drinking by parents was identified as a factor in over 50% of child protection cases conferences (Davidson 1994).

Children of problem drinkers have higher levels of behavioural difficulty, school-related problems and emotional disturbance than children of non-problem drinking parents. These are all factors which contribute towards school exclusion.

### **BEST PRACTICE**

There is no accepted model of good practice for an alcohol treatment system as there is for drugs. The NTA is in the process of producing a Models of Care for Alcohol, but no indication has been given as to when this will be published.

The Commission On The Future of Alcohol Services produced a report in June 2003, "What services are needed, who needs them, and how they should be provided". The report recommended that any tiered Models of Care for Alcohol should address four key underlying themes:

- **Services in non-specialist settings**  
Staff in generic services should be trained to:
  - identify and assess problems relating to alcohol
  - refer on to appropriate services when necessary
  - educate clients about alcohol and its effects
  - undertake brief interventions
  - undertake motivational interviewing
  - use harm reduction approaches
- **Low threshold specialist services for problem drinkers and their families or carers**  
Specialist alcohol agencies should provide swift, local access to the following:
  - advice & information and referral for drinkers and their families
  - easy access or drop in facilities

- specialist screening and assessment in settings such as criminal justice or primary care
- self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and AI-Anon
- **Structured specialist programmes of care**  
For clients identified as needing the highest tiers of intervention there should be a move away from short-term interventions to long-term structured programmes of care, encompassing:
  - assessment and care co-ordination
  - specialist community-based detox services via specialist teams and primary care
  - specialist in-patient services, ideally in separate units or designated beds
  - controlled drinking programmes
  - a range of structured care planned counselling and other therapies
  - structured day programmes
  - residential rehab programmes
  - aftercare programmes
  - liaison services with the acute medical sectors and psychiatric sectors
  - liaison with local social services around issues such as child protection and family services
  - self-help groups
- **Services for people who are chronically affected and unable to change their drinking**
  - assertive outreach
  - floating support
  - wet services
  - services for brain damaged drinkers

The report recommends that the needs of particular groups such as women drinkers, young drinkers, BME populations, homeless and rough sleeping drinkers should also be provided for.

### **Interventions in Healthcare Settings**

A number of opportunities exist within healthcare settings for identifying alcohol misuse.

Early intervention is an effective strategy for tackling alcohol misuse in the early stages by encouraging excessive/hazardous drinkers to reduce consumption. A brief intervention can range from 5-10 minutes of information and advice given to an excessive drinker to 2-3 sessions of motivational interviewing or counselling. Research has shown them to be a very successful form of alcohol intervention. A brief intervention given to someone misusing alcohol can lead to a 24% reduction in alcohol consumption (Freemantle et al, 1993).

The initial findings of the United Kingdom Alcohol Treatment Trial were that brief interventions are just as effective as other treatment modalities when reviewed after six months and one year.

Successful interventions are reliant on screening to identify hazardous drinkers, who often show no signs or symptoms of alcohol misuse.

## **Primary Care**

Research has shown that up to 20% of patients presenting to general practice settings will be consuming alcohol at harmful or hazardous levels (Anderson, 1993).

A survey of GPs in the Midlands found that 65% of GPs only managed 1-6 patients for excessive drinking in the last year. When this figure is compared to the average list size for GPs, this suggests that as many as 98% of excessive drinkers presenting to primary care are being missed (Kaner et al, 1999a). The potential of primary health care to reduce alcohol problems was demonstrated in a UK study, when 73 GPs screened over 11,000 patients and identified 3,000 'at risk' drinkers during a 3 month period (Kaner et al, 1999).

One US study found that brief intervention in primary care leads not only to reduced alcohol consumption, but also to a reduction in the use of accident and emergency and other hospital facilities, reduced levels of crime and reduced involvement in road traffic accidents (Fleming et al 2000).

## **A & E**

One in six people attending accident and emergency departments for treatment have alcohol-related injuries or problems, rising to 8 out of 10 at peak times (HEA, 1998).

During trials of the Paddington Alcohol Test (PAT) at St Mary's Hospital in Paddington almost half of those patients identified as having an alcohol problem kept an appointment with a review clinic. Brief interventions by an alcohol health worker resulted in a reduction of 43% in alcohol consumption.

## **Acute Hospital Services**

One report found that 1 in 16 hospital admissions were alcohol related (Pirmohamed, 2000).

A report of a Working Party of the Royal College of Physicians in 2001 recommended that each acute Hospital Trust should have a defined hospital strategy, which should include:

- routine screening for early detection of harmful/ hazardous drinkers
- early assessment of dependence severity
- protocols for the pharmacotherapy of detoxification
- readily available 'acute response' from liaison of specialised alcohol psychiatry services for the management of more complex patients undergoing alcohol withdrawal
- assessment of the need for referral to on-going support services by appropriately trained staff
- provision of brief interventions for hazardous drinkers
- provision of general staff education

The report recommends that every acute hospital needs a minimum of one trained alcohol health worker.

An alcohol specialist nurse is employed at the Royal Liverpool University Hospital to optimise the medical management of alcohol-dependent drinkers and offer brief interventions to inpatients identified as hazardous drinkers. A research project to assess

the effects of her interventions estimates that during an 18 month period her interventions prevented 258 admissions, covering the costs of her salary 10 times over.

### **Mental Health Services**

The Working Party's report also recommended that:

- there must be appropriate mental health support for liaison psychiatry to assist in the management of dependent drinkers presenting to acute hospitals
- problems from alcohol misuse must be recognised as falling within the remit of all liaison psychiatric services

### **Training**

Research has found that medical professionals find it difficult to identify the majority of patients misusing alcohol. Only 6 hours of formal training in substance misuse is normally delivered in medical schools. One study indicated that 74% of GPs would like more training in the treatment of alcohol misuse.

## **THE ALCOHOL TREATMENT SYSTEM IN WORCESTERSHIRE**

Alcohol treatment services are delivered in Worcestershire by two providers: Hereford & Worcester Advisory Service on Alcohol and the Worcestershire Mental Health Partnership Trust.

### **Hereford & Worcester Advisory Service on Alcohol**

HWASA is a not for profit organisation, which was founded in 1979 as an alternative to the medical route for treatment.

### **Income & Expenditure 2004/5**

<u>Funding for 2004/5</u>	
Worcestershire NHS	335,887
Worcestershire LA	27,971
West Mercia Probation	25,500
Wyre Forest PCT	27,207
Arrest Referral (north)	38,000
Arrest Referral (south)	31,090
Project Indigo (until March 2005)	48,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>533,655</b>

<u>Service costs 2004/5</u>	
Pay costs	373,167
Non pay costs	36,066
Overheads	131,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>540,933</b>

### **Funding issues:**

In 2003/4 HWASA had a deficit of £24,000 which was funded from reserves. The Charity Commission recommends that 6 months operating costs are held as a reserve: HWASA is currently well below that figure. A deficit of circa £7,000 is forecast for 2004/5.

Uplift for inflation awarded to WMHPT, and pay increases to their staff, invariably exceed the uplift for inflation awarded to non-statutory agencies. This causes recurrent budget deficits where staff secondment arrangements exist. WMHPT have uplifted the costs of the posts seconded to HWASA by 13.4% for 2004/5, whereas HWASA have only received a 2.3% increase in baseline funding, creating a discrepancy of £15,000.

Since 2001/2 Probation have decreased their funding contribution from £40,000 to £25,000.

Project Indigo, which provides £48,000 funding from GOWM ceases on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005.

Funding of the GP liaison post supported by Wyre Forest PCT has not been increased year on year, and contains no contribution towards management costs.

Funding of Arrest Referral is confirmed on an annual basis. The Police have not indicated whether funding will be continued after 2005/6.

### Staffing

HWASA currently employs:

1 Manager  
1 Team Leader  
5.5 wte Case Managers  
5 CPNs  
1 Primary Care Worker (Wyre Forest)  
1 Young Person's Alcohol Education Worker  
1 Finance Manager  
4 p/t admin & clerical staff

Five post-holders are seconded from the Mental Health Trust. There are no formal secondment agreements in place, and the financial arrangements of the secondments have never been clearly defined. There is a lack of clarity as to what costs each organisation is liable for. Arrangements to cover long term sickness and maternity leave have never been agreed with the Trust, leaving the service undermanned when these situations arise (as is the case at the moment).

### Activity

When fully staffed HWASA have a caseload capacity of 445 clients, with an average caseload of 35 clients per case manager. The service is currently operating at full capacity, with a waiting time of 3-4 weeks for new clients to access a first appointment and a waiting list of approximately 20 clients.

<b>HWASA ACTIVITY LEVELS 2002 - 2005</b>			
	<b>2002/3</b>	<b>2003/4</b>	<b>2004/5 (half year)</b>
Number referred during year	1609	1900	952
Number assessed during year	934	1224	508
Number completing treatment (discharged)	700	1128	427
Number DNAs for assessment	299	451	300

HWASA have this year changed the way their activity statistics are collated to provide more accurate data. The apparent reduction in numbers assessed from the previous year is due to this change, and not to a decrease in clients seen.

There is also a waiting list of approximately 20 probation clients for the service element funded by the Probation Service. This situation is exacerbated by a requirement being placed on some clients by courts that they attend HWASA for a period of six months (the more usual attendance period for clients attending HWASA would be 6-8 weeks).

36% of clients are female and less than 1% of all clients are from ethnic minorities.

### The Service

The organisation operates from four (rented) premises, in Worcester, Kidderminster, Bromsgrove and Redditch, with outreach services in the Malvern and Evesham areas. HWASA also own premises in Worcester, which are currently being used for groupwork and social reintegration activities.

The service offers:

- Advice and Information
- One to one counselling
- Telephone counselling
- Assessment of alcohol related problems
- Groupwork: abstinence and controlled drinking groups
- Confidential drinkers check ups, including blood tests
- Alternative therapies i.e. auricular acupuncture, reflexology and aromatherapy
- Supervised community detoxification
- Community care assessments for residential treatment
- Support for parents, carers and concerned others
- Referral to the Substance Misuse Consultant at the Mental Health Partnership Trust
- Outreach services
- Social reintegration
- Outdoor activities

The service is open access and is therefore available to anyone over the age of 18, including parents, carers and concerned others.

### Arrest Referral

The Arrest Referral Scheme operated by HWASA received 696 referrals in 2003/4, broken down by the following offences:

Drink/Drive	296
Drunk & disorderly/drunken & incapable	204
Public order	64
Assaults (ABH, common assault etc)	72
Criminal damage	42
Indecency	4
Section 25 & Place of Safety	2
Vehicle related crime	2
Others	10

57% of referrals attended for assessment and 26% of those who were assessed became clients. It is anticipated that a new initiative of conditional caution currently being piloted

will improve the initial attendance rate, with an anticipated associated rise in the number becoming clients.

Arrest Referral has been in operation in the south of the county since 2002 and in the north since 2003. To date 1454 clients have been referred, of whom approximately 140 have engaged with HWASA for ongoing assistance.

### **Project Indigo**

Project Indigo is a project funded by GOWM to assist clients back to a useful and meaningful way of life, by offering a range of challenging activities. Funding terminates end of March 2005.

### **Primary Care**

Wyre Forest funds a post within HWASA to work with clients in a primary care setting. The postholder currently operates within six GP surgeries in Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport, delivering cognitive behavioural therapy, motivational interviewing, brief interventions and referral for CPN assessment. A similar service was provided at two GP surgeries in South Worcestershire, but a lack of referrals from GPs led to the withdrawal of the service earlier this year.

### **Worcestershire Mental Health Partnership Trust**

The Substance Misuse Consultant currently delivers 1 session per week dedicated to alcohol clients. The clinic is held in Worcester, with no provision in the remainder of the county. The role of the SM Consultant in the alcohol treatment system is not clearly defined.

The Trust employs a Dual Diagnosis Liaison Nurse (DDLN), for the purpose of picking up clients with severe and enduring mental health problems combined with drugs and/or alcohol problems. The DDLN currently carries a caseload four times the contracted limit, due to difficulties in referring clients to other parts of the service. The post covers Worcester City, with no provision in the remainder of the county. Engagement of mainstream mental health services with dual diagnosis clients is variable across the county.

Although substance misuse detox inpatient bed days are not commissioned from the Trust, detoxes do take place on the psychiatric wards at Newtown on an ad hoc basis. Criteria for accessing inpatient detox are not clearly defined, and difficulties are often experienced in getting clients admitted. The Trust does not record data on the number of occupied bed days for either drug or alcohol detox.

### **Residential Rehabilitation**

In 2003/4 a total of 7 clients were placed out of county for residential rehab at a cost of £41,000. This cost is picked up by the substance misuse residential rehab budget, funded by Social Services. Access to residential rehab is by referral to a multi-agency funding panel, which meets on a monthly basis.

During the first six months of 2004/5 six clients have been funded for rehab, with a further six awaiting a decision by the panel. The budget is under pressure, and it is likely that funds will be fully committed well before the end of the financial year.

### **Young People**

There is a young person's alcohol education worker attached to SPACE, supervised by HWASA.

### **Supported Housing**

There is 7 bedded, supported housing unit in Worcester, which is managed by St Paul's Hostel. Funding is via Supporting People, Housing Benefit and client contribution. Access is by referral from St Paul's, as well as drug and alcohol agencies, and there is always a waiting list. Clients must be drug free on entry and remain drug free for the duration of their stay, which averages 2 years.

## **GAPS IN THE TREATMENT SYSTEM**

If the recommendations of the Commission on the Future of Alcohol Services' report are accepted as a model of best practice, then the following gaps in provision within Worcestershire can be identified.

### **Services in non-specialist settings**

There is little evidence of screening or interventions within generic services.

### **Low Threshold Specialist Services**

There is unequal coverage across the county, with lower levels of provision south of Worcester City.

There are no drop in facilities.

### **Structured Programmes of Care**

There are no structured day programmes

There are no specialist in-patient services

There are no aftercare programmes

Liaison services with the acute sector are very limited and exist only in Worcester City

Liaison services with the psychiatric sector need strengthening

### **Services for people who are unwilling or unable to change their drinking**

There are no specific services for this group of people

### **Children of drug using parents**

There is currently no mechanism for targeted interventions with children of alcohol misusing parents.

### **Service User Involvement**

There is little or no evidence of service user or carer involvement in the planning of alcohol treatment services in Worcestershire.

### **Supported Housing**

There is no provision for women in Worcester, and no provision at all in the remainder of the county.

## **COST BENEFITS**

If the national estimated annual cost of alcohol misuse (approx £20 billion) is translated to a local level, this equates to an annual cost to the local economy of approximately £200 million per annum.

Research suggests that 4% of the adult population drink at harmful levels and 23% drink at hazardous levels. For Worcestershire this equates to 13,316 adults drinking at harmful levels and 76,567 drinking at hazardous levels, which implies an in-need population of almost 90,000 adults. In 2003/4 HWASA treated 1,224 clients, i.e. just 1.36% of this population.

It is clear from the wide body of evidence available that an increase in the identification of harmful and hazardous drinkers, combined with brief interventions and referral to appropriate services leads to a reduction in the level of alcohol consumption in a significant percentage of drinkers. Research also indicates that this leads to an associated reduction in the impact on health services and criminal justice system.

It is probable that the implementation of widespread screening in generic services would lead to an increase in referrals to specialist services, which would require an increase in capacity. However, investment in service provision would be repaid by a reduction in demand on health services and the criminal justice system in the short, medium and long term.

Although outside the remit of this report, it is possible that a more in-depth study of the available evidence could generate an approximate cost-benefit analysis.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

There is no agreed system for the treatment of alcohol issues within Worcestershire.

Alcohol services in Worcestershire have never been formally commissioned, with clear funding, activity levels and targets. Service developments (and cuts) have been provider led.

There are no agreed priorities for developing alcohol treatment provision.

There is no Service Level Agreement with HWASA,

There is no detail regarding funding or activity for alcohol service provision within the NHS Service and Financial Framework (SAFF) with WMHPT. Elements of alcohol treatment that used to be provided by the Trust (e.g. dedicated substance misuse detox beds) are no longer provided

There is no contract monitoring system in place for alcohol services.

Baseline funding for HWASA is insufficient to maintain the service they currently deliver. Unless this can be remedied they will need to make cuts in their service.

The Police have not confirmed continued funding of the Alcohol Arrest Referral scheme

GOWM funding for Project Indigo runs out 31.3.05, and unless alternative funding can be identified service cuts will be unavoidable

The roles of agencies involved in the care of clients with dual diagnosis are not clearly defined.

The role of the Substance Misuse Consultant in the treatment of alcohol misusing clients is not clearly defined.

There are clear gaps at all four levels of the treatment system, when profiled against a model of best practice.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The SMAT Board is recommended to:

1. Consider the issue of the shortfall in HWASA funding – either additional funding will need to be provided or services will need to be cut from April 2005
2. Consider the unmet need and gaps in service provision, with regard to identifying ways of meeting needs and filling the gaps
3. Support the recommendations within the brief interventions alcohol training report
4. Task the Assistant Commissioning Manager (ACM) to work with the SMAT Co-ordinator, to ensure a commissioning framework is included within the countywide Drug and Alcohol Strategy.
5. Task the ACM to arrange a process mapping day, involving stakeholders, service users and carers, to map existing services and any blockages and gaps in provision
6. Task the ACM to develop and agree an SLA with HWASA
7. Task the ACM to establish a contract monitoring system with HWASA
8. Task the ACM to develop a mechanism for the continued involvement of service users and carers in the planning and development of an alcohol treatment system for Worcestershire.
9. Task the Joint Commissioning Group to review the membership of the Alcohol Liaison Forum and define its future role
10. Encourage the PCTs to ensure that detail of alcohol service provision is specified within the SaFF with WMHPT
11. Encourage HWASA and WMHPT to develop and agree a partnership agreement for the provision of jointly delivered services
12. Encourage WMHPT to review and report to the Alcohol Liaison Forum on the role of the Substance Misuse Consultant in the alcohol treatment system
13. Encourage WMHPT, with HWASA, to review the dual diagnosis liaison service and the pathways into mental health services and the alcohol treatment services

Anne McKay  
Assistant Commissioner Substance Misuse

10.11.04

**Alcohol misuse: How much does it cost? Cabinet Office Strategy Unit 2003**  
**OVERALL COSTS OF ALCOHOL MISUSE (£ millions)**

	1st Estimate	2nd Estimate
<b>Health Care Costs</b>		
Hospital inpatient (&day) visits		
Directly attributable to alcohol misuse	126.2	126.2
Partly attributable to alcohol misuse	344.2	399.8
Hospital outpatient visits	222.8	445.6
Accident and emergency visits	305.2	305.2
Ambulance services	205.0	205.0
Practice nurse consultations	19.1	19.3
NHS GP consultations	27.8	48.7
Laboratory tests	N/A	N/A
Dependency prescribed drugs	1.6	1.6
Other health care costs	35.3	35.3
Specialist treatment services	96.2	96.2
<b>Workplace and Wider Economy Costs</b>		
Lost output due to absenteeism	1,213.6	1,785.9
Lost output due to reduced employment	1,726.1	2,153.7
Lost output due to reduced employment efficiency	N/A	N/A
Lost output due to premature death	2,254.3	2,481.8
<b>Costs of alcohol-related and alcohol specific crime</b>		
Criminal Justice System costs		
Alcohol specific offences	29.9	29.9
Alcohol-related offences	1,720.4	1,720.4
Property/health and victim services	2,521.2	2,521.2
Costs in anticipation of crime (alarms etc)	1,494.6	1,494.6
Lost productive output of victims	969.8	969.8
Emotional impact costs for victims of crime	4,678.6	4,678.6
<b><u>Drink driving</u></b>		
Criminal Justice System costs	77.3	77.3
Cost of drink-driving casualties		
Lost output		
Serious casualties	33.8	33.8
Slight casualties	25.9	25.9
Medical and ambulance		
Serious casualties	20.5	20.5
Slight casualties	11.0	11.0
Human costs		
Serious casualties	232.8	232.8
Slight casualties	123.8	123.8
<b><u>TOTAL COSTS</u></b>	<b>18,517.1</b>	<b>20,044.0</b>

**Alcohol misuse: How much does it cost? Cabinet Office Strategy Unit 2003****Total costs of crime – England and Wales - 2001**

<b>Criminal Justice System costs</b>	
Alcohol specific offences*	29,917,238
Alcohol related offences	1,720,402,794
Property/health and victim services costs	2,521,171,533
Costs in anticipation of crime	1,494,606,106
Crime costs of lost productive output	969,796,364
<b>Total costs of crime excluding human costs</b>	<b>6,738,541,756</b>
Emotional impact costs	4,678,595,205
<b>Total Crime Costs (excluding drink-driving offences)</b>	<b>11,414,489,240</b>
<b>Total Crime Costs (including drink-driving offences)</b>	<b>11,939,728,430</b>

**Costs in response to crime excluding drink driving offences – 2000/01**

<b>Arrests 2000/01</b>	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Average costs (#)</b>	<b>Total costs (#)</b>
Alcohol related	299,308	180.6	54,055,025
Alcohol specific	81,000	117.2	9,493,200
CJS Costs			
- Alcohol related			
- Drunkenness, disorder and related			1,666,347,769
Magistrate	33,749	550	20,424,038
<b>Total costs (#)</b>			<b>1,750,320,031</b>

\*Alcohol specific offences are those of drunkenness and disorder

To: WCC Scrutiny Committee re Community Safety  
 From: Phil Deakin, Co-ordinator for Worcestershire SMAT  
 Date: 24 January 2005

Subject: **Gap analysis and proposals for addressing alcohol issues in Worcestershire**

---

**Introduction**

This is a short paper to highlight gaps in provision and proposals for addressing alcohol issues in Worcestershire following a request from the WCC Scrutiny Committee re Community Safety.

**Gap Analysis**

The principle gaps in the services and support to address alcohol issues are:

- Funding for current adult alcohol services is inadequate to meet current service costs and certainly inadequate to meet established need
- Limited screening or brief interventions in generic services, such as social services, housing, mental health etc. Plus, unequal coverage of 'low threshold specialist services' and very limited/stretched specialist services
- Limited support and training for A&E and Primary Care NHS services
- No specialist outreach substance misuse (drug & alcohol) education work with young people
- No planned activity to address the implications of the new licensing laws other than developments to implement the laws per se. That is, no multi-agency activity to address alcohol related crime and disorder, binge drinking or under-age drinking
- Limited Pubwatch, Door Supervisor, Late Night Transport and Conflict De-Escalation schemes and associated training to address such issues
- Limited or non-existent services to address the role of alcohol within domestic violence, teenage pregnancy, the lives of children of alcohol misusing parents

**Proposals**

The following proposals are recommended:

Name of intervention	Could be provided by	Likely Cost	Cumulative Cost
Secure baseline funding of alcohol service	via SMAT Commissioning	£10,000	£10,000
Alcohol Counsellor	HWASA	£35,000	£45,000
Alcohol Liaison Worker for A&E	HWASA	£35,000	£80,000
Trainer re Alcohol Issues (Half time)	HWASA	£17,500	£97,500
Outreach Substance Misuse (drug & alcohol) Education Workers x 2	County Youth Service, but attached to SPACE*	£70,000	£167,500
Additional test purchases against under-age drinking	Trading Standards	£7,500	£175,000
Increase to Pubwatch and other schemes	District Councils/SMAT	£10,000	£185,000
Campaign addressing binge drinking	SMAT/SPACE*	£10,000	£195,000
Expansion of Proof of Age scheme	Trading Standards	£5,000	£200,000

\* SPACE is a specialist service to address young peoples' drug and alcohol use/misuse

PD



## Record of Phone Call

**Call from: Claire Richards, Domestic Violence Co-ordinator**

Date: 25.01.2005

Reason for Call: Sent apologies for Community Safety Task Group meeting at 10am on 26 January.

During our conversation, in summary, the following points were raised:

I mentioned the statistic that nationally, 50% of Anti Social Behaviour was connected with Domestic Violence – and asked her view on this.

She advised that there was a counselling service for young people (aged 10 – 18yrs) living with domestic violence. Access to the service was by referral from refuges, schools or the Youth Service.

She agreed it would be useful if those delivering diversionary activities were also aware of this service and of contacts for signposting those in need.

She had discussed recently with staff from the Youth Offending Service, the problem of how young (often male) offenders were found to physically abuse girlfriends or Mothers, often as a reaction to violent situations in the home.

If more money was available she would be keen to:

- Develop educational packages for delivery in schools, linking in with out of school activities, targeted at those in need and at those who had slipped from mainstream school; and
- Establish a crisis fund for refuges. A mother with children, having left a violent situation, sometimes found it difficult to provide for the children (even little things like travel expenses). Sometimes the only alternative was to offer to take children into care. Claire felt it was more important to keep families together during an already difficult time, and a crisis fund would help make this possible.

Stella Wood  
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

**Documents Circulated and available to the Task Group**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Date</b>
Resources Scrutiny Panel Agenda (item 6 with original proposal) and Minutes of the meeting	19 November 2004
Notes of Lead Member of Task Group scoping meeting	23 November 2004
Emails to Community Safety Officers in Bromsgrove, Wyre Forest, Redditch and Worcester City (S Worcs Community Safety Partnership) explaining purpose of scrutiny, requesting a scoping visit and outlining questions.	1 December 2004
Notes of a meeting with the Community Safety Officer, Bromsgrove District Council, the Council House, Bromsgrove  The Community Safety Officer's detailed response to the questions, Feedback from partners on what could improve the way in which Districts and County work.  The Partners comments were under headings *1 - *4 as follows: ⇒ *1 Sports and Leisure Team (Bromsgrove District Council) ⇒ *2 Multi Agency Resource Centre (MARC) ⇒ *3 Arts Service (Worcestershire County Council) ⇒ *4 County Youth Team (Bromsgrove Manager)  Bromsgrove Community Safety Partnership's Position Statement – September 2004	8 December 2004
Local Area Agreements Advice note 1 from ODPM	December 2004
Acknowledge Document from the Audit Commission – Community Safety Partnerships (Actions required to deal well with Section 17 requirements)	December 2004
Reducing Crime: The Home Office working with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships - Summary and Conclusions (published 1 December 2004)	December 2004
Notes of a meeting with the Community Safety Officer, at Stourport (Wyre Forest)	8 December 2004

Documents received prior to the meeting: Recent Wyre Forest Residents Survey Recent Wyre Forest Citizen Panel Survey Summary of the Wyre Forest Crime and Disorder Audit report, compiled in conjunction with JUIS (full document available from David Onions)	
Notes of a meeting with the Community Safety Officer, Redditch Borough Council, the Town Hall, Redditch  Documents provided during the visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of Actions that Local Authorities departments could take to mainstream community safety (to comply with section 17 of Crime and disorder Act)</li> <li>• The duty to consider community safety</li> <li>• Booklet – ‘HOTstuff!’ Summer Youth Programme 2004</li> <li>• ‘HOTstuff!’ Summer Youth Programme 2004 Feedback Report</li> <li>• ‘HOTstuff!’ Summer Youth Programme 2003 Feedback Report</li> <li>• ‘HOTstuff!’ Summer Youth Programme 2002 – Evaluation Report (large doc)</li> <li>• YOUTH INFORMATION GUIDE (Redditch BC)</li> <li>• 20:20 Young People’s vision Conference Report (published Jan 03)</li> </ul>	14 December 2004
Notes of a scoping meeting with the Chairman of the South Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership and the Worcester City Community Safety Officer  Documents provided at the meeting (by the Community Safety Officer): Diversionary Activities over last couple of years/why they worked/funding streams Neighbourhood Youth Group Details (Worcester City) Worcester City Council Application for LGC ‘Community Involvement Award’ (Anti Social Behaviour Detached Team) South Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership Extract from Building Safer Communities Plan (BSC) Plan 2004 (includes Wychavon and Malvern)	16 December 2004
Agenda and Minutes of the Resources Scrutiny Panel (Joint Task Group and Terms of Ref agreed)	21 December 2004
Wyre Forest Audit on Alcohol Misuse and Alcohol Related Crime and Disorder	31 December 2004
Response to email dated 1 December by the Community Development Manager, Wyre Forest DC.	10 January 2005

Background information provided by Bridget Cooper – Principal Youth Officer: Standards Of Youth Work Provision (Appendix B) Implications For The County Council To Meet The Standards Set Out In The Dfes Document – Transforming Youth Work – Resourcing Excellent Youth Services (2003) Table showing number of youth workers per head of youth population in each District	10 January
Youth Service Post OFSTED Inspection Action Plan	10 January
Community Safety Diversionary Activities Task Group meeting with Diane Tilley, Head of Chief Executives Unit	12 January 2005
Community Safety Diversionary Activity Task Group meeting with Phil Deakin, SMAT Co-ordinator  Gap analysis and proposals for addressing alcohol issues in Worcestershire  Report on the SMAT Board on Alcohol Treatment Services in Worcestershire  Probation Service Investment in Alcohol Services	14 January 2005  (provided following this meeting on 24 January 2005)
Meeting with Connexions Service  Available Papers: Email dated 11 January 2005, explaining purpose of visit and outlining questions.  Documents provided at the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive Activities for Young People – Leaflet and Aims and Objectives</li> <li>• Key Findings and resulting Action Plan of Review of Work with 16-18 year olds who are ‘Not in Education, Employment or Training’ (NEET)</li> </ul>	14 January 2005
Community Safety Diversionary Activity Task Group meeting with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Social Services, and relevant Childrens’ Social Services Managers	21 January 2005
Community Safety Diversionary Activity Task Group meeting with Youth Service representatives	21 January 2005
Community Safety Diversionary Activity Task Group meeting with Police Representatives	21 January 2005
Summary of points raised during phone call with Domestic	25 January

Violence Co-ordinator	2005
Drinking Responsibly – The Government's Proposals (ODPM) January 2005	27 January 2005
Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership – Consultation on the Worcestershire Strategy for Children and Young People	1 February 2005
Findings 245 – Young people, crime and antisocial behaviour: findings from the 2003 Crime and Justice Survey	1 February 2005
Letter including emerging findings and a paper outlining the Youth Service support to vulnerable young people, describing the difference between outreach and detached youth work, good practice, and an estimation of costs	17 February 2005
Notes of Community Safety – Diversionary Activity Task Group Meeting to Consider Emerging Findings	18 February 2005
Agenda and Minutes of the Resources Scrutiny Panel (Draft Final Report)	14 January 2005

**RESOURCES SCRUTINY PANEL****Scrutiny Report – Community Safety - Diversionary Activities****RESPONSE FROM CABINET MEMBERS WITH RESPONSIBILITY**

1. The issues in this report are the responsibility of more than one Cabinet Member with Responsibility. However it is clearly preferable that the Cabinet should receive a composite report and therefore, in preparing this response, I have taken into account the respective views of both Adrian Hardman, Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Resources, Cultural and Community Services and Liz Eyre, Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Social Services Health and Well Being.
2. Whilst it can be said that the publication of this report is in some ways premature, I can understand why the Scrutiny Panel has published this report now. The Government's Green Paper "The Integrated Youth Offer" was expected in October 2004 and despite several false dawns has still not been published.
3. It is anticipated that the Green Paper will include "things for young people to do", i.e. diversionary activities. An analysis of the value of such activities would be helpful. However, this is not the report's centre of attention. Instead the report moves to paving the way for a shift from general youth services for all young people suggesting that we focus more resources on problems related to young people living in areas experiencing high levels of anti social behaviour. Whilst these areas are likely to be urban areas of deprivation, rural areas are not necessarily excluded. This concept may be sound and could lead to a new approach to youth work in Worcestershire but time will tell.
4. Detached work is one way of working with young people. However a measured approach must be taken. We should not be blind to the successes of our Youth Service in recent years, especially when the service has gained recognition from young people themselves and other partners within Worcestershire both regionally and nationally.
5. I am pleased to note that the Scrutiny Panel has already influenced the Council's approach to community safety. An experiment has been planned involving areas in Worcester and Redditch where detached youth workers will be embedded in the community, working with young people where they congregate. It is essential that this experiment is objectively evaluated over a reasonable period of time. Furthermore, it must be recognised that whilst youth work already contributes to community safety issues, its main purpose is to meet the needs of young people.
6. There are also some specific issues that, I feel, need clarifying. Paragraph 33 refers to "providing services for vulnerable young people". The report provides different parameters for the ages of "young people" and no clear definition for "vulnerable young people".

- The County's Youth Service prioritises on young people between 13 – 19 years old. However national statistics suggest that children are most likely to carry out their first offence at 10 years old and are unlikely to start offending if they have not done so by 15 years old.
  - The definition of vulnerability is usually based on the notion of “relative poverty”. The highest concentration of such vulnerable young people is in urban areas of deprivation but as I have already said it must not be forgotten that there are pockets of deprivation outside those areas and deprivation can also be found in the countryside.
7. Paragraph 65 refers to moving “towards a strategy where detached youth work is the core activity of the Youth Service”. The Scrutiny Panel may have uncovered evidence that suggests that detached youth workers have a positive effect by either reducing the problems of vulnerable children or the problems that they cause. However this does not seem to feature as part of the report. Workers are employed by some District Councils to respond quickly to problem areas. Such an alternative strategy may be successful but does not come under the definition of detached youth work. I comment further on the detached youth work aspect in my response to the individual recommendations by the Panel.
  8. Having considered the report I feel that I need to express some concern on behalf of the County's young people. One of the proposed key corporate priorities of the Council's new Corporate Plan is that of Children and Young People Centred Services, which is supported by a commitment to active involvement of children and young people in decisions which affect their lives. There is no evidence in the report that any consultation with young people has taken place and in this respect the report contains a significant weakness.
  9. My response to the individual recommendations is attached. I welcome fully the recommendations that the Council should carry out a review of how it approaches issues in relation to community safety and an examination of best practice elsewhere. (Recommendations 2 and 3). This will help take forward another of the Council's main priorities of “Safer Communities” proposed in the next Corporate Plan.
  10. Consequently, I do not think that this Council can commit itself at this stage to any of the other recommendations in the Report. It may well be that some of them will bear fruit but I consider that it is right for the new Council to revisit those recommendations in helping it to be informed as to how it wishes to take forward its approach to developing safer communities. By that time the Government's Green Paper may hopefully have been published, the reviews referred to above carried out and the opportunity can also be taken to consult with young people on the way forward.

**ANDY ROBERTS**

**Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Education and Lifelong Learning**

**Response by Cabinet Members with Responsibility to the individual Recommendations**

Recommendation	Cabinet Members' Response
<p>1. In order to strengthen the involvement of county councillors in community safety, we recommend that the Member Reference Group becomes the responsibility of the Cabinet member with Responsibility for Resources and that meetings are timetabled regularly. (see paragraph 16).</p>	<p>The new Council will decide on the composition of its political structures and areas of responsibility. However, there is clearly value in a structured timetable for any meetings that need to take place.</p>
<p>2. We recommend that a review of how Worcestershire County Council discharges its duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, is carried out, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A section 17 audit, based on the Audit Commission's Acknowledge document.</li> <li>b) A review of what duties should or could be addressed centrally;</li> <li>c) An assessment of how County Council services and directorates consider community safety in their decision making and budget allocation process;</li> <li>d) A review of County Council involvement with local CDRPs to enable greater cohesion between County and District;</li> <li>e) The involvement of members in strategic thinking around community safety. (see paragraph 22).</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>3. We also recommend that the Council's existing support structures for Community Safety are reviewed. As part of this, the support provided to community safety by other County Councils and beacon authorities should be examined. (see paragraph 22)</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Recommendation	Cabinet Members' Response
<p>4. Although we cannot predict the outcome of such a review, we recommend that consideration is given to the establishment of a senior post to coordinate community safety activity in the County Council. Such a role is the epitome of a cross cutting one and would be best placed within a cross-cutting directorate. (see paragraph 23)</p> <p>5. We recommend that the County Council should ensure provision of detached 'youth workers' for every area which shows up on the JUIS information system as experiencing high levels of anti social behaviour. (see paragraph 41)</p> <p>6. Although we are not able to specify how any extra resources should be spent, we recommend that the Council review the resources targeted at alcohol. (see paragraph 57)</p>	<p>To develop the strategy outlined the report suggests that the Youth Service should receive an additional £250,000 pa for four years (i.e. an extra £1m). This would absorb funding intended to develop services for young people. If there is a shift in focus there will be losers. Those who will miss out are young people from villages and rural areas, the 'average' child in our bigger towns and members of many voluntary groups, which form the backbone of the current provision.</p> <p>For the reasons I have already given in my general response, these three recommendations should not be accepted at this stage but it would be appropriate for the new Council to revisit them.</p>