

## **POSITIVE FUTURES STRATEGIC GROUP**

**10:00am to 12noon, Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2008**  
**Abbey Room, Church House Conference Centre, Great Smith Street,**  
**London, SW1P 3AZ**

### **NOTE AND ACTIONS OF MEETING**

#### **Item 1 – Introduction and apologies**

Introductions and apologies were noted (see Annex A).

Members were welcomed to the first meeting of this reinvigorated group, which had the objective of helping to set the strategic direction of Positive Futures.

The Group were advised that the future placement of the programme may move from the Drug Strategy Unit into a dedicated cross-cutting Young People Team within the Home Office, but the Chair (Ian Martin) stressed the high level of support for the programme within the Department. Government funding had been confirmed for Positive Futures projects at £5.03 million per annum for 2008/09. This was also the level of indicative funding for 2009/10 and 2010/11. However, it was also stressed that levels of indicative funding beyond 2008/09 were not guaranteed and that the Home Office was expected to demonstrate continued programme delivery; efficiency savings and the leveraging-in of funding from additional sources.

**Action Point 1: Secretariat to send members of the group the latest organogram of the Crime and Drugs Strategy Directorate**

#### **Item 2 – Draft Terms of Reference and membership of Strategic Group**

Discussion focused on the draft Terms of Reference attached at **Annex B.** .  
The main points were as follows:

**Purpose of Group** The Strategic Group is ***not*** a vehicle for managing delivery of the current contract between the Home Office and Crime Concern for management of the Positive Futures Programme. This is managed through the regular contract meetings between the Home Office and Crime Concern.

The Group should focus on strategic issues which impact on the delivery and expansion of the Programme, make strategic links across-Government, break down any Departmental barriers and review the impact of the programme. The Group would be a subgroup to the Drug Strategy Delivery Group which was the senior officials' group responsible for delivery of the overall Drug Strategy and Public Service Agreement on reducing drug perceptions. The Group would also be able to challenge Government on the level of ambition and to task the Home Office with actions.

**Terms of Reference** It was felt that the first bullet point under 'Terms of Reference' actually described the overall purpose of the Group. It was agreed that the second bullet point (relating to performance management of the Programme) should be deleted as this was dealt with outside the group. It was agreed that the fourth bullet be amended to reflect the need to engage support from partners without limiting such support to just sources of funding. There should also be a new bullet point on strategic co-ordination across key stakeholders and partners and Other Government Departments. The reference to external funding should be removed as other partners often provided support in kind.

It was agreed that even after the Terms of Reference were agreed, they should still be revised by the Group as required.

**Membership** Everyone would be shown as full members of the group, removing the distinction between standing and non-standing membership. The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) should be invited. The Secretariat would also ask the Local Government Association whether they would be interested in becoming a member. Kevin MacPherson, of the Football Foundation, should also be invited. For the next Strategic Group meeting one of the agenda items should examine the role of the arts and the Arts Council should be invited to discuss this.

**Action Point 2: The Secretariat will invite Jane Todorovic (CLG) and Kevin MacPherson (Football Foundation) to become members of the Group.**

**Action Point 3: The Secretariat will discuss with the LGA about whether they should become a member of the group. DCMS colleagues suggested that Paul Raines was a good starting point**

**Action Point 4: The Secretariat would revise the draft Terms of Reference in the light of the points made. Attached at Annex C is a revised draft Terms of Reference. Members are invited to email Dilveer ([dilveer.sually@homeoffice.qsi.gov.uk](mailto:dilveer.sually@homeoffice.qsi.gov.uk)) indicating agreement or proposed amendments**

**Action Point 5: The Secretariat to ensure that the role of the arts is on the next agenda and that the Arts Council are invited to attend to discuss**

### **Item 3 – High level overview of Performance**

Substance provided a high-level overview of project performance across the national Programme. The main points made in discussion were:

- In keeping with the broad brush approach of the Group's remit of strategic management, detail about particular projects would be avoided. Performance reports would not be required at every Group meeting.

- All projects had been required to submit an online report by early April 2008. 115 projects out of 123 had submitted reports. Substance had reviewed the reports and produced summary reports. Projects were fully engaged with the monitoring system and their ability to use the system had developed through training and support.
- Projects were rated from Gold (highest performance) downwards through Green, Amber and Red (lowest performance). Substance set out the key criteria behind these assessments, including: partnerships built up; headline statistics and outcomes on numbers; length of contact; qualifications gained; engagement levels; Every Child Matters outcomes; case studies; and self assessments by projects on their progress during the year.
- In terms of those projects rated Red, there were a number of core themes and issues such as the appropriateness of activities, for example conventional sporting work was being delivered but not social inclusion work; administrative issues such as tensions between host institution and front line staff; and concerns around the activities/work being delivered.
- There was discussion about how to improve poorly performing projects. The appointment of regional support managers would be one way to support projects and share learning and best practice from high performance projects. There was also a need to consider further options to address poor performance. The Group discussed the option of closing down poor performing projects. The Home Office was clear that this was the final option to be taken as Ministers would have to be consulted before any project was closed and evidence provided that efforts had been made to turn the project around.

There was also discussion on how to recognise and reward good performance. It was acknowledged that a well-compiled positive report can serve to lever-in funding and attract high calibre staff. The Home Office made the point that every year they run the Tackling Drugs Changing Lives Awards to recognise the achievements of local services and projects. The Home Office would give further thought about how to recognise and publicise high performing projects.

**Action Point 6: Drug Strategy Unit to grant permission for Substance to share the summary reports with Crime Concern. (Achieved, consent has been provided to Substance)**

**Action Point 7: Crime Concern and Substance to meet outside the group to identify the top 10% performing projects and the bottom 10% performing projects and then discuss with the Home Office**

**Action Point 8: Drug Strategy Unit to consider how to reward and publicise high performing projects**

## **Item 4 – Crime Concern Management Priorities for 2008/09**

### **Supporting Quality Delivery**

Crime Concern was reconfiguring support to projects through regional support managers drawn from “trailblazing” Positive Futures project managers. They were currently in the process of sifting through applications and appointing managers. Over the course of the year a key priority was to raise girls’ and young women’s participation in sport and testing new approaches. Crime Concern had obtained Arts Council funding and was recruiting an arts development worker to support the development of arts initiatives. They were also building on the work by the London “V” Team and increasing the participation of young people in volunteering.

### **Workforce Development**

Crime Concern had successfully negotiated an arrangement whereby Positive Futures project staff could access 25% of Kickz training and vice versa. Crime Concern was also working closely with SkillsActive.

### **PF’s Wider Replication and Sustainability**

The Home Office explained that no more money was available from central Government to fund the continued expansion of the programme. There was a need to see how the investment could be spread further and how the programme could be mainstreamed over the next 2-3 years.

Crime Concern explained that Lincolnshire had expressed a high level of interest in developing a new Positive Futures project which would be funded entirely by the Local Authority. The Group agreed that a model for new projects to be able to ‘buy-in’ into the Positive Futures franchise should be formulated.

### **Impact Report**

Work was on track with the draft Impact Report which provided a good opportunity to highlight good practice and publicise high performing projects. The first draft would be shared on 17 June 2008. The deadline for producing a final draft was 10 July, with the launch of the report intended for Autumn 2008 after Ministers return from Recess. There was discussion about the opportunity for a cross-Government Ministerial launch event of the report involving HO, DCSF and DCMS Ministers.

**Action 9: The Secretariat to ensure that the next agenda covered discussion on the implementation and impact of National Skills Academy training across projects**

**Action Point 10: Drug Strategy Unit and Crime Concern to meet separately to work on developing a franchise arrangement with Lincolnshire and develop a framework that could be replicated**

**Action Point 11: Drug Strategy Unit to advise Ministers on the Lincolnshire development in due course**

**Action Point 12: Drug Strategy Unit to co-ordinate any Ministerial launch event of the Impact Report and liaise with DCSF and DCMS colleagues**

**Item 5 – Update on re-tendering exercise**

The Chair advised the Group that the re-tendering process would require significant work using limited staff resources within the Home Office. No additional staff were available to the Drug Strategy Unit to work full time on the exercise although the unit would be able to draw on the support of the Home Office Commercial Directorate.

The re-tendering exercise would run for approximately six months. Whilst the intention was to run it as swiftly as possible, any minimum time periods involved will be observed. The option of continuing with two separate contracts, one for both Programme management and one for monitoring and evaluation, or to offer one combined contract for both these services was under consideration. The intention would be to award contracts by mid-January 2009.

As the re-tendering process was likely to attract a high level of interest, the Home Office proposed to use a pre-qualification questionnaire to reduce the number of interested parties down to a manageable number..

The mechanism of a potential handover will need to be considered and developed as early as possible with current contracted parties.

As some members have an interest as potential bidders in the future re-tendering exercise the Group agreed to the release the notes of this Group's meetings in the interests of fairness and transparency.

**Action Point 13: Drug Strategy Unit will meet with current contract providers to determine the mechanism of any potential handover of services**

**Action Point 14: The Secretariat will make the notes of these meetings available to potential bidders**

**Item 6 – Update on Reapplication Process**

The Home Office accepted the need for a reapplication process to ensure successful delivery and value for money but expressed concern over the current timing given that the priority had to be the re-tendering of the Programme.

It was agreed that the running of a full re-application process would be postponed until 2009/10. The Chair confirmed that responsibility for not

undertaking a full reapplication exercise during the 2008/09 financial period rested with the Home Office.

Instead the option of undertaking a smaller appraisal exercise focused on the ten best performing projects and the ten least well performing projects should be considered. Substance confirmed that projects had been given prior notification that reports could impact on future funding. It was also suggested that for those projects who failed to submit any monitoring information, consideration should be given to withholding funding.

**Action Point 15: Crime Concern and Substance will provide the Home Office with advice and agree with the Home Office a smaller appraisal exercise**

### **Item 7 - Any Other Business**

#### **Local Government Association (LGA) Annual Conference**

The LGA Annual Conference would take place from 1-3 July in Bournemouth. The Home Office would be showcasing the new Drug Strategy at the event. There was the opportunity to promote Positive Futures.

**Action Point 16: Simon Eglington to liaise with Crime Concern and the Football Foundation over a stall at the LGA Conference.**

Future Group meetings would consider how a greater range of activities, including non-sport activities can be routinely delivered through Positive Futures projects. This included arts based activities.

#### **Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the Strategic Group would take place in September 2008.

**Action Point 17: The Secretariat would circulate potential dates to members and also seek potential agenda items for inclusion.**

UPDATE – The next meeting will be held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

## **Annex A**

### **Present:**

Ian Martin (Chair), Head of Drug Strategy Unit (DSU), Home Office  
Clare Checksfield, Chief Executive, Crime Concern  
Rosie Chadwick, Director of Prevention Services, Crime Concern  
Mark Blake, Programme Director, Crime Concern  
Richard Leahy, Programme Development Manager, Crime Concern  
Paul Thorogood, Chief Executive, Football Foundation  
Tim Crabbe, Substance  
Bansari Somani, SkillsActive  
Gary Stannett, Chief Executive, London Active Communities  
George Baxter, Crime Strategy Unit, Home Office  
Mike Hewitt, Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS)  
Bruce Hellman, DCMS  
Owen Rowland, Deputy Head DSU, Home Office  
Simon Eglington, DSU, Home Office  
Dilveer Singh Sually, DSU, Home Office

### **Apologies:**

Jennie Price, Chief Executive, Sport England  
Ian Brady, Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF), Youth Task Force  
Anthony Hughes, DCSF, Positive Activities for Young People  
Dee O'Connell, Anti-Social Behaviour and Crime Prevention Unit