

DRUG ACTION TEAM AND CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP INTEGRATION/CLOSER WORKING – FURTHER GUIDANCE

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The Police Reform White Paper *Policing a New Century*, published on 5 December 2001, set out the Government's intention to bring DATs (Drug Actions Teams) and CDRPs (Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships) together. The aims were to simplify local working relationships, give greater recognition to common interests and provide the right framework to enable the more effective delivery of the crime reduction and drugs agendas.

1.2 The Police Reform Act 2002 extended the statutory duty on "responsible authorities" - from 1 April 2003, local authorities, the police, police authorities, fire authorities and health authorities in Wales - to formulate and implement a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder **and** a strategy for combating the misuse of drugs (substance misuse in Wales). Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) in England remain subject to an order commencing these statutory responsibilities; such an order will be made no earlier than April 2004.

1.3 The next crime and disorder and drugs audits will take place during 2004/05. Crime and disorder and drugs strategies must be produced by April 2005. In respect of drugs, information on the content of drugs audits and strategies will be confirmed in December in the performance management resource pack. Further guidance on audits and strategies will also be issued early next year.

1.4 A consultation exercise commissioned by the Home Office and conducted by the market research agency BMRB in 2002 revealed that concerns about forming a single partnership "were chiefly from two-tier authorities, rather than the unitaries and other local government structures", but "where there was one CDRP relating to one DAT the proposals made sense". While support for integration in unitary areas was not universal, the proposal was broadly accepted by DATs and CDRPs in these areas.

1.5 Initial guidance to partnerships issued by the Home Office in November 2002 *Improving Partnerships – Local Analysis of Merger or Closer Working between Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Drug Action Teams and Merger of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships* provided the framework for DATs and CDRPs to consider and implement proposals for closer integration of local processes and structures.

1.6 This guidance updates the November 2002 guidance and clarifies what is expected of DATs and CDRPs in unitary/metropolitan and two-tier authorities, as confirmed in the letter, of 20 October 2003, from Caroline Flint and Melanie Johnson to DAT and CDRP Chairs and DAT and CDRP Co-ordinators/Community Safety Officers.

1.7 This guidance takes into account feedback from partnerships which have begun the integration/ closer working process and, rather than prescribing structures, recommends that local partners should focus on improved outcomes. Partners should decide locally on structures which best meet local circumstances and enable these agreed outcomes to be delivered effectively.

- In **unitary/metropolitan authorities**, DATs and CDRPs should adopt the most appropriate local arrangements in order to achieve integration. In these areas, DATs and CDRPs should operate on an aligned basis “as a single partnership”. This may mean that DATs and CDRPs formally become a single partnership. Alternatively, they may opt to align existing structures locally, underpinned by measures such as strategic planning, joint working on planned targets, joint use of staff, premises and commissioning and more straightforward links to other partnerships such as the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and Youth Offending Team (YOT). The structure selected should be the one likely to achieve the best outcomes locally.
- A number of DATs and CDRPs in **two-tier authorities** have integrated. Where integration will not provide the most effective way of working locally, partnerships should adopt and work towards closer working arrangements. Partnerships in two-tier authorities should work towards the same outcomes as integrated partnerships, although the different processes and structures in place will affect the method by which these outcomes can be achieved.

2. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR INTEGRATION/CLOSER WORKING

2.1 Partnerships should:

- **have an aligned and integrated planning process** - for example, they should hold joint planning meetings and have a planning schedule that incorporates the requirements of both agendas and other related agendas.
- **establish and deliver joint cross cutting targets** which, for example, are reflected in the partnerships’ strategies and are consistent with both agendas, including the key performance indicators on drugs currently being developed. The targets should form the basis for partnerships’ work during the year. In two-tier authorities, the DAT and CDRP should agree a joint planning timetable. DATs should use targets against the National Drug Strategy KPIs to inform local target setting in individual CDRP areas.
- **develop integrated strategic and delivery plans** - for example, there should be one overall or overarching strategy/mission statement to which all plans adhere. All supporting plans, for example neighbourhood renewal plans, should be consistent with or complementary to this overarching strategy. DATs and CDRPs in two-tier authorities should consider whether a common mission statement could also be achieved.
- **undertake joint planning of expenditure and put in place joint delivery processes** - for example, a group/process should be established to jointly plan

what projects should be funded by the Building Safer Communities fund. Where partnerships are integrated they should pool Drug Strategy funds (DAT development funding and CAD for DATs) with Building Safer Communities funding. All funding decisions should be addressed openly and all plans should be monitored and reported back to this funding group. Where budgets are not pooled, partnerships should ensure consistency in spending. Within two tier authorities DATs and CDRPs should give strong consideration toward the identification of economies of scale that could best be exploited by pooling part of the funds allocated to individual CDRPs into a single county fund. These economies will support the improved delivery of those performance indicators/targets corresponding to both the crime and drugs agendas. The young persons, availability and communities themes of the National Drug Strategy are clearly areas that would benefit from enhanced joint planning of spend (see section 5 below).

- **have a joint performance and accountability structure** - for example, all new groups should have clear terms of reference, a structural map should be drawn up which clearly identifies responsibilities and accountability lines. There should be a clear and consistent monitoring structure in place for all plans, including the use of timelines and milestones. This will be more difficult for DATs and CDRPs in two-tier authorities, but a joint accountability structure should be considered, for example to ensure joint accountability for local crime and disorder and drugs audits.

2.2 Completion of the self-assessment framework for CDRPs and DATs will assist partnerships to integrate/adapt closer working arrangements.

3. BENEFITS OF INTEGRATION/CLOSER WORKING

3.1 Effective integration of DATs and CDRPs should contribute to sustained and measurable reductions in crime and disorder and more effective local delivery of the National Drug Strategy. It will also ensure effective engagement with PCTs.

3.2 Benefits to flow from this include:

- more effective use of resources, including sharing of resources;
- better co-ordination and use of staff across partnerships;
- improved mainstreaming and a heightening of the profile of crime and drugs issues with key stakeholders;
- strengthened engagement with the neighbourhood renewal agenda;
- better communication and sharing of skills and knowledge, particularly through co-location of teams;
- reduced local bureaucracy, with simpler partnership arrangements and a reduced burden on agencies in terms of representation;
- more effective linkage with other local partnerships, in particular LSPs, YOTs and the local voluntary sector;
- streamlining of reporting and accountability arrangements.

4. STAFFING STRUCTURES IN INTEGRATED PARTNERSHIPS

4.1 The main driver for integration of CDRPs and DATs is the more effective delivery of the Government's crime reduction and drug strategies. The local delivery of the Government's drugs and crime agendas is equally important and this should be reflected in staffing structures following integration.

4.2 Partnerships should agree locally the level of capacity that they require to implement the work effectively, assisted by the regional Government Office. Any resultant staffing implications will be subject to consultation.

5. PARTNERSHIP FUNDING

5.1 Funding to CDRPs is largely by way of the Building Safer Communities fund (BSC). The fund is designed to enable DAT/CDRP partnerships, or CDRPs working closely with DATs, to take a more holistic and structured approach to using their funds to reduce crime and combat drugs misuse. The Building Safer Communities guidance (Home Office Circular 34/2003) confirms that partnerships could use the "single pot" funding available to them to build capacity and to support the integration process. Delivery of the National Drug Strategy is funded from a range of sources, including central grants and specific departmental allocations (education, health etc). These funding streams are ring fenced for the delivery of specific targets under the National Drug Strategy.

5.2 Following integration, partnerships retain the level of funding (grants and in kind) previously available to the DAT and CDRP. Integration requires a pooling of resources. All of these resources need to be managed in a co-ordinated way. Integrated partnerships are encouraged to pool DAT partnership support funding (DAT development funding and CAD for DATs) with the Building Safer Communities fund.

6. NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AND LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

6.1 Most areas have an overarching Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) responsible for the local Community Plan. All LSPs have been asked to prioritise development of a 'green, clean and safe' environment to underpin success in other issues. The integrated partnerships have an opportunity to ensure their analysis, objectives and actions on community safety are fed into the LSP programme. Integrated partnerships should therefore ensure robust links with their LSPs are in place or developed to provide input on community safety in the Community Plan and the 'green, clean and safe' agenda.

6.2 In the 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund areas, the LSP is responsible for drawing up and implementing its Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (LNRS), using its allocated Neighbourhood Renewal Fund. Crime, incorporating substance

misuse and work combating anti-social behaviour, is one of the five key themes of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal and the LSP has to produce a Crime Theme in its LNRS. Developing links with the LSP will be an excellent opportunity for the partnership to influence the local neighbourhood renewal agenda and promote the integrated partnerships' priorities and actions in the LNRS' Crime Theme.

7. THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT OFFICE DRUGS AND CRIME REDUCTION TEAMS

7.1 Government Office (GO) Drugs and Crime Teams will jointly assist partnerships in working towards new integrated or closer working structures. Advisers from GOs will attend relevant meetings and meet with key individuals to:

- support the change process;
- provide practical support on developing new integrated planning and delivery structures and closer working practices;
- share good practice emerging in other parts of the region and nationally;
- ensure minimum integration or closer working criteria are being addressed;
- support partnerships in identifying and securing resources required.

8. SUPPORT FROM CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

8.1 Integration/closer working of partnerships will be mirrored by closer working in central Government on the drugs and crime agendas. In addition to reinforcing the links between the two agendas, this will also contribute to a reduction in the bureaucratic demands on partnerships.

9. PROCESS AND TIMETABLE FOR ACTION

9.1 Partnerships should agree what arrangements they wish to adopt locally. GO Advisors can assist with this work. Before finally agreeing new structures and working practices, all stakeholders should be consulted. When this has been done, the new arrangements should be formalised in writing and a copy sent to the Home Office Director in the relevant GO.

9.2 Arrangements for the integration of all DATs and CDRPs in unitary/metropolitan authorities and closer working in two tier authorities should be finalised by 1 April 2004.

10. CASE STUDIES

10.1 Five case studies that you may find useful are attached at **Annex A**. These describe the steps partnerships have taken to integrate in Torbay, Rochdale, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire and Hackney.

Crime Reduction Delivery Team/Partnership and Regions (Drugs Unit)
Home Office
21 November 2003

Case study 1: Safer Communities Torbay

The newly integrated Safer Communities Torbay partnership has identified some key benefits of working together. Following the co-location of the drugs and crime teams, a single administrator provides support to both teams and a newly appointed analyst is working on both the crime and drugs audit.

In the view of the Community Safety Manager, Alison Parnell, bringing the crime and drugs structures together helps local people understand the whole picture. It allows key treatment and education work to be appropriately linked to the wider community safety agenda. Where something is identified as a local priority, as was recently the case in respect of street drinkers in the town centre, there is now an effective structure to share information, agree and resource local action and monitor the outcomes.

Although embryonic, this new structure bodes well for delivery within the partnership area.

Case Study 2: Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership

The Rochdale Safer Communities Partnership incorporates the DAT, CDRP and YOT. Meetings are attended by all representatives with the result that contributions on the three strands of work are wide ranging and there is multi-agency commitment to progressing activity. Partnership discussions regularly focus on how various funding streams can be used to best overall effect. Twice a year strategic day sessions are held at which strategic priorities are reviewed and key issues identified in business meetings are given greater consideration. A post has recently been created to provide oversight of the whole partnership. The structure has ensured coherence in planning processes and an ability to respond effectively to issue of crime and disorder and public health and substance misuse.

Case study 3: South Worcestershire Safer Communities Partnership (two-tier authority)

From 1 April 2003 the three district-based community safety partnerships in South Worcestershire (Malvern Hills, Wychavon and Worcester City) have merged to form a single partnership.

The new South Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership includes representatives from the three district Councils (including elected Members), County Council, local Police division, Probation, Police and Fire Authorities and Youth Offending Team and the SMAT (Substance Misuse Action Team, formerly the DAT) co-ordinator. The new partnership structure also retains district area groups who continue to focus on the delivery of local initiatives.

The new partnership held its inaugural meeting on 15 May 2003. To date it has agreed terms of reference, appointed a Programme Manager, and is developing a funding protocol as well as agreements for the pooling of mainstream and grant budgets.

Closer working with the Worcestershire SMAT builds upon well-established links. For example:

- the SMAT co-ordinator chairs the South Worcestershire Drug and Alcohol Group;
- the SMAT is represented on the new partnership's Strategic Group;
- the chair of South Worcestershire Partnership has joined the SMAT board;
- the South Worcestershire Drug and Alcohol Group now reports to both the new Community Safety Partnership and the Worcestershire SMAT.

[NB: It should be noted that the South Worcestershire Partnership has only been in formal operation since 1 April 2003 so it is too early to formally evaluate the success of the merger.]

Case Study 4 : Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership (GCSP)

Gloucestershire DAAT and the six CDRPs within the county have worked closely together since 2000. All worked collaboratively at a county-wide and local level on the public consultation and development of crime and disorder strategies for 2002-2005 and to ensure that the strategies reflected the DAAT's priorities.

Representatives from the Chief Officers Group for Crime and Disorder joined representatives from the DAAT to agree a process for merger. This process incorporated feedback and consultation with other Chief Officers, each CDRP and staff officers from each of the Districts and the DAAT. The process culminated in an awayday where all had a chance to air their views and at which the format for the new merged partnership was agreed.

All county agencies are represented in the new partnership, including the heads of the Youth Offending Services, and Connexions. Each District is represented by the Chief Executive of the Council and the CDRP Chair. The group is currently chaired by the Chief Probation Officer, with the Executive Director of Social Services as the Vice-Chair. The lead PCT Chief Executive carries the portfolio for Drug Treatment and the Joint Commissioning Group and also line manages the DAAT staff. The Chair of the Young People's Joint Commissioning Group and the Chair of the Service Providers forum are also members of the partnership.

The 'engine room' of the partnership is the Executive Support Officers (ESO) group. Within this group, officers of the County Council, Police, District Councils, YOT, Connexions and DAAT meet regularly to take forward the agreed county-wide agenda and to share best practice. Also represented is the manager of the local multi-agency information database, MAIDeN.

Having operated in the new mode since April 2003, it is apparent that there are still refinements to be made. The partnership intends to self-assess its performance and the resulting improvement plan will inform a review of the new arrangements (agreed as part of the original conditions for the GCSP).

The GCSP offers the following advice to colleagues in other areas:

- don't rush the process;
- engage all interested parties in a consultation process that allows their concerns to be aired;
- listen to the concerns aired and respond positively;
- make the ownership of the new arrangements a truly 'shared' experience.

Case study 5: Hackney

Integration of the DAT and CDRP in Hackney took place in September 2000 in response to a recognised need for the strategic services to work together to plan and develop activities to tackle the problems of substance misuse and crime and disorder.

Integration of the partnerships has led to innovative and more effective ways of working. Strategic, tactical and operational structures have been developed to provide a co-ordinated response to local substance misuse and crime and disorder issues.

The creation of joint action groups has resulted in initiatives with a wider focus, for example initiatives for young people which address both anti-social behaviour and drug misuse.