



*Working in partnership to prevent, and support recovery from
the harmful use of alcohol and drugs.*

ARGYLL AND BUTE ALCOHOL AND DRUGS PARTNERSHIP

EXECUTIVE GROUP MEETING

**With invited Delivery Group and Performance Management and Resourcing Group
Members**

Monday 14th December 2015

J03, 05 and 07, MACHICC, Lochgilphead

10:00am

PRESENT:

John Owens	A&B ADP Independent Chair
George Morrison	NHS Finance Manager, Argyll and Bute
Carol Muir	A&B ADP Coordinator
Elaine Garman	Public Health Specialist
Craig McNally	Chair of the Delivery Group
Nikki MacGillivray	Co-Chair of the Third Sector Group
Nona Ruesgen	Co-Chair of the Third Sector Group
Cath Cakebread	Addictions Manager
Derek Wilson	Scottish Fire and Rescue
Christina West	Chief Officer, Argyll and Bute
Caroline Gorman	Co-Chair Bute SMG
Jon Belton	Service Manager, Criminal Justice
Alison Guest	Local Area Manager (Mental Health)
Elaine Robertson	Co-Chair OLI SMG
Lana Stewart	Local Authority Liaison Officer, Police Scotland
Jennifer Goff	Co-Chair, Cowal SMG
Bev Ison	Co-Chair, OLI SMG
Lesley MacKay	Co-Chair, Kintyre, SMG

APOLOGIES:

Marlene Baillie	Area Commander, MAKI, Police Scotland
Louise Long	Head of Children Services, Argyll and Bute Council
Wendy Brownlie	Area Education Officer, Helensburgh and Lomond
Isobel Strong	Co-Chair Bute SMG
Liz Strang	Lead Officer, Child Protection
Rebecca Barr	Lead Officer, Adult Protection
Norman Firth	Manager, Argyll, Bute and Dunbartonshire's Criminal Justice
Steve Hunter	Chair, Mid Argyll SMG

IN ATTENDANCE:

Sarah Marquis

ADP, Administrator

Item	Subject	Action
1.	<p><u>Welcome</u></p> <p>John Owens (JO) the newly appointed chair of Argyll and Bute Alcohol and Drug Partnership and will be chairing future Executive Group meetings.</p> <p>JO spoke to the group and is hoping to get round to visit as many partners as he can after the festive season. JO would also like to acknowledge that this is CC last meeting as she is leaving, and would like to thank her for all her support and hard work over the past years.</p> <p>For the purpose of minute taking only, the meeting was recorded.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Apologies</u></p> <p>As above</p>	
3.	<p><u>Previous Minutes</u></p> <p>Agreed as an accurate reading of the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Dr Johnson – At the last meeting Dr Johnson had expressed concerns over the last Executive Group Minutes not being accurate re the discussion which took place. SM provided GM with a transcript of the minute recording and GM was satisfied the minutes accurately reflected the discussion which took place. It is also to be noted that Dr Johnson has now resigned as a member of the Executive group.● Licensing – CMN currently sits on the licensing forum and attended the meeting last week. After the review by an independent company, it was found no overprovision statement was presently needed in Argyll and Bute. Joint working will be set up with the ADP to monitor this.● Contract Monitoring – The meeting was postponed ,no report for this meeting. It will be available for the next meeting● LACPG – This is the Local Area Community Planning Groups. CM attended Oban, Helensburgh, Dunoon and Lochgilphead to present an update on the ADP and commissioned services. These were well attended and feedback was positive with the progress being made.● Service User Involvement – The ADP Has had sixteen expressions of interest with five tenders to be discussed. The evaluation group will meet	

	<p>this week to score and discuss the bids. CMN asks that now Nikki MacGillivray (NM) has now changed as third sector co -chair with Colin Ferguson (CF) are they happy for CF to see this process though? Changing the panel could hold the process up. CC adds that she also finishes this week so that would be another change if CF was not allowed to continue. NM and NR are happy with CF to see this process through and remain on the panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Training Calendar – This has been well attended, twenty three attended Motivational Interviewing, eighteen attended Drug Awareness and thirty have attended NPS training. This is the first year of the training calendar and suggestions are always welcome how to improve this. It is also to be noted that employers are responsible for keeping their staff up to date on training and not the ADP. 	
5.	<p><u>SRC ADP In Recovery Day</u></p> <p>Thirty seven people attended the Recovery Day in November. This day was to help with the historic issues and help move the ADP into the future. This was done by a world conversation style cafe and facilitated by the Scottish Recovery Consortium. The feedback was positive with the majority of partners wanting to draw the line and move forward. CM is aware that some partners are looking to have the day to concentrate on the new structure, vision statement and Partnership agreement. JO would like to slow this process down and visit all partners over the next three months and by the end of March have a clearer idea of what the values of partners are and the best idea for restructure. JO expressed that all the previous work that has been completed is great and he would now like to see the partners of the ADP use that and build on it. NR commented that she is pleased to hear JO say that he would like to slow the process as some people were unhappy and felt it was a buy in process. CM commented that it was a very difficult day and noted that some people were unhappy and did not feel able to air their issues but it was a hard day for all and what was shared by some people should not be lost. JG asked when JO expects to have these discussions and conclusion? JO would like to have this paper to the meeting at the beginning of March. CM is pleased to hear JO talk about this and the ADP targets, this ADP needs to meet the targets, at the moment this ADP has a one year interim plan, every other ADP has a three year delivery plan. JO adds that we are already completing targets but how they are articulated in the plan is crucial. For the first year it will be to make the basics brilliant in terms of values, relationship and structure then in years 2 and 3 be more innovative.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Month 8 Budget Report</u></p> <p>GM talked to the paper which was distributed prior to the meeting. The ADP has an allocation of 1.4 million which was distributed across the budget lines. GM has some concerns around the under spend and funds not being fully utilised. DC has added a table at the end of the budget reports which shows a £16,500 under spend GM is keen for this to be utilised. Pages two and three of the reports shows a break down on the budget lines, in December the ADP still having this amount of under spend is slightly worrying, it's not a criticism it's an observation. This money can be carried over on the condition it's not a large amount and things to be in place to fully utilise the funds, GM is not keen to do this but it can be a fall</p>	

back for the ADP. DC adds that he finds it happens a lot to this ADP and funds are not always utilised for what the ADP needs. JO would like to see this more focussed on the start of the year for next year's spend, to carry the money over would be the best solution so we can use the money in the best way possible and not have a quick spend. CW adds that the budget reflects where this ADP currently stands systematically and the ADP still does not have a three year plan in place. CW would support JO in the carry forward process. GM would like to see the process carried on as normal and try to reduce the under spend that is to be carried forward. Any questions are welcome; GM is keen for the process to be open and transparent as possible. CMN adds that the funding process for bidding will happen this year as identified in line six, we agreed at the beginning of the year that we would change our process and use £25,000 allocated in the budget to fund the provision of children and young people prevention, early intervention and education, the needs assessment was £10,000 on the same budget line. We now have potential not to go ahead with that. CM adds that we should have reports from SFAD by the end of January which will show us the needs if the ADP wants to wait for that. CW's understanding was the funding was specifically in line with the Argyll and Bute Children's plan, no point in the ADP reinventing the wheel that is a plan that has specific priorities that all partners contribute towards. CMN that's different line, that's line five. NR there was a suggestion that during the process for the GAP funding that the local children's groups met and scored bids against the plan and they felt it worked well with the local services and knowing the need. After a small discussion as this process for the GAP's was not the same in all area and it was only used in 3 areas, even though it is a great example it might not be suitable in each area. CMN asks the group if they feel the process should be halted and carried over until we look at the process or do we go ahead as planned? GM states that we need to look at the process and if its flawed take the time to look at it again but if people are happy with it then we move forward and use the spend as planned. After a small discussion it was agreed to continue to spend as planned and any under spend will be carried forward.

Application process – CMN spoke to the group on the process which was used last year, it was identified that the governance within the ADP around funding was not at a high enough standard, and there was no disagreement within the ADP. LL was tasked to look at that but at the last meeting handed that over to CMN as position on the interim chair of the Resource Group. LL recommended we mirror the funding process for the early years collaborative funding. CMN met with Liz Strang who led on this, they have drafted the proposed application which is based on the early years collaborative. It was sent out to members of the Resource Group and received several comments to what needed adapted and then amended. If the group agreed, to look at the process around using this format, recommendations are that the application is adopted, we use a similar process which is used in national funding processes where, applications are evaluated by a panel of three or four people and one of whom is finance, which also mirrors the early years collaborative, individuals who have connections to organisation submitting a bid would not be allowed to evaluate so the panel remains independent, the evaluation process should be two stages, stage one that applications should be read by the evaluation board and any comments fed back to allow the application to be strengthened before a final judgment is given. Stage two once amended they are evaluated and funds are agreed and no comments to be sent out post evaluation. That was a recommendation from the third sector to use the process the national funders use. NM comments that she would like the rest of the third

	<p>sector to look at this and have comment before this is endorsed; NM feels this has been an issue in the past. JO doesn't disagree but feels we have to trust the work that has gone in to it and would then ask who from third sector was involved? CMN well the Resource Group members so NR and CF have both received copies of this and CMN received comments from CF therefore third sector forum representatives were included in the process. NR what's the difference between this and the early years application. CMN most of the time it was a change in wording to ensure it referred to us. NR can we get sight of the other one? CMN yes you can get it from them or I can send it out from the one I was working from. JG makes the point that if it goes to the Third Sector forum it would also need to go to the local forums. JO has a concern on time as well, could we compromise with the Third Sector chairs today that we endorse it today.. NR and NM agree. NM says she is not saying there is anything wrong with the document, it's just to ensure all partners have seen it as this is the first time she has seen it. CMN makes the point that this is because NM was represented by someone else until this morning when NM got voted in as Co Third Sector Chair. CMN states that the process now agreed will also be sent out. CM states that a ceiling should be put on each application as is the case with early years funding also? CMN agrees this could be agreed at each round of funding. CM also asks that as JG says she is not represented by the Third Sector forum so who is in the forum and who attended the AGM? NR & NM replied, HART, CAMA, OASIS and KADAS. JO summarise that the application is now endorsed and the process has to be sent out to partners.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Annual Report</u></p> <p>CM asked the Third Sector partners for feedback which was collated and added to the report. Argyll and Bute have two firsts, which are having an Independent chair and holding an event where all ADP National Support organisations and the national support team were in once place. We have ministerial priorities from for 2016 including looking at NPS. CM also reported that we now have 6 suspected deaths in Argyll and Bute since mid August 2016, the next DRD meeting will be held in the new year to review the DRD's. The ADP Annual Interim Improvement report will be at the CPP on Friday for final sign off and will be presented by JO and EG</p> <p>CMN has had an email from Public Health in Inverness offering training for Drug and Alcohol Interventions for Young People. The course will be on the 18th of February and would the ADP be willing to cover the cost of accommodation and travel? Group agree for this to be covered.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Developments since last meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABAT Report – SDF completed an independent review of the ABAT services in Argyll and Bute. Very good feedback was received and the report has been circulated. • ROSC Practitioners Group – JG presented a paper to the group to introduce a ROSC group, after the recent discussions it maybe too early for this. JO feels this is a very useful paper and will look at it again at the end of March. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORT – Lesley MacKay would like to see this brought back to the group for more discussion and to progress. This is also to be on the recovery/ROSC agenda. All areas now have ORT in place. • Social prescribing – EG spoke to the group that this is to help people in everyday life and give them support in their social life. Alison McGrory is currently leading on this and has had a good response so far. The contract will be to help and support GP’s to use the service. CMN adds that the Leisure Services passes needs to be picked up again and put in to place and this could link with the Social Prescribing project activityCMN and CM have had preliminary discussions with AMCG, Public Health on this. 	
9.	<p><u>AOCB</u></p> <p>None</p>	
10.	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>It was agreed to have the next meeting on the 23rd of February</p>	