


Criminal Justice Project: Drug Interventions Programme



Re-offending of clients testing positive
for class A drugs across Merseyside

October 2017

Petra Collins, Karen Critchley, Mark Whitfield



Public Health Institute, Faculty of Education, Health and Community,
Liverpool John Moores University, Henry Cotton Campus,
15-21 Webster Street, Liverpool, L3 2ET

www.ljmu.ac.uk/phi

k.a.critchley@ljmu.ac.uk

0151 231 4290

twitter.com/PHI_IMS

ISBN: 978-1-912210-13-8 (web)

PHI | Public
Health
Institute
LIVERPOOL JOHN MOORES UNIVERSITY



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With thanks to Merseyside Police, service providers and commissioners for their ongoing support, and providing data produced within this report. We would especially like to thank Steve Smith for matching drug testing data with the Police National Computer system to identify offending. We would also like to thank Jenny Brizell for proofing the report and Laura Heeks for designing the covers.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	1
Key findings	2
Introduction	3
The positive drug test cohort	4
Overview	4
Offending pre- and post-positive drug test	6
Drug testing following re-offending	8
DIP's impact on offending	11
Results across Merseyside	11
Conclusion	14
Recommendations	14
References	16
Appendix 1: Methodology	17
Appendix 2: Results of multivariate analysis of variance by custody suite	19
Copy Lane	19
St Anne's Street	21
St Helens	23
Wirral	25
Index of figures	27
Index of tables	27

KEY FINDINGS

- Of the individuals who tested positive for Class A drugs across Merseyside's custody suites between April and September 2015 and were successfully matched to Police National Computer records, 872 had offences recorded in the 12 months prior to the positive drug test and/or in the 12 months following the positive drug test.
- Overall, both the volume of offending and the number of individuals offending reduced post-positive drug test when compared to pre-test.
- Individuals were arrested a total of 1,951 times in the 12 months pre-positive drug test, compared to 1,626 times in the 12 months post-positive drug test, representing a 16.7% reduction in the number of offences for the positive drug test cohort.
- Seven in ten (69.6%) individuals of the positive drug test cohort had at least one offence recorded in the 12 months following the positive drug test.
- Trigger offences decreased by 15.3% post-positive drug test compared to non-trigger offences which decreased by 21.9%.
- Of the offending which occurred in the 12 months following the positive drug test, just over two in five (42.4%) had a drug test carried out for subsequent arrest occasions.
- Those not drug tested following subsequent arrests were arrested slightly more often those who were tested.
- Of the individuals not drug tested following subsequent arrests, 83.1% were male; those aged 35 to 39 years and 40 to 44 years accounted for the largest proportions (18.3% and 18.5% respectively); 36.6% were arrested for theft/handling, followed by non-Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime offences (19.4%), violence (16.6%) and drugs (7.8%).
- The overall volume of offending across Merseyside significantly reduced by 17.0% post-positive drug test when compared to pre-test. Individuals who were care planned following the positive drug test had the highest proportional reduction (18.3%) in offending post-test, compared to those who had no further contact (16.5%) and those assessed but not care planned (15.4%).
- The mean seriousness of offences significantly reduced by 16.1% in the 12 months following the positive drug test. Individuals who were care planned following the positive drug test had the highest proportional reduction (17.8%) in offending post-test, compared to those who had no further contact (14.6%) and those assessed but not care planned (15.9%).
- Following the positive drug test, there were significant reductions in the mean number and mean seriousness of offences in the medium and high offending groups, while numbers significantly increased for those in the low offending group.
- The mean number and mean seriousness of offences reduced in the 12 months following the drug test for all positive drug test result groups, though results were only significant for those who tested positive for cocaine only and those who tested positive for both cocaine and opiates.

The link between illicit drug use and crime has been well researched (Pierce et al., 2015; Hayhurst et al., 2013; Bennett et al., 2008; Seddon, 2000). The Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) is a multi-agency initiative with an overarching aim to break the cycle of drug use and crime, and as a result reduce acquisitive crime in communities within England and Wales. DIP directs Class A drug using offenders towards appropriate treatment which incorporates a holistic support system and includes harm reduction interventions and overdose management, as well as other more generic services relating to housing, health, independent living, managing finances, developing new social support networks and rebuilding relationships with families. Although the Home Office decommissioned DIP as a national programme in 2013, Public Health England (PHE) took responsibility for collecting and reporting the criminal justice interventions dataset. DIP continues to be operational in four of the five Merseyside areas (Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral), though the processes remain in place at all stages of the criminal justice system in order to engage offenders into drug treatment within all five Merseyside areas.

Until mid-2015, Test on Arrest in Merseyside occurred when an adult was drug tested following an arrest for a trigger offence (offences that have a clear link to substance misuse; usually involving stealing, theft, fraud or drugs) or an offence where the custody Inspector suspected specified Class A drug use was a causal or contributory factor. Following a pilot in Wirral early in 2015, Merseyside Police rolled out a targeted drug testing approach in its custody suites, and this system was fully implemented by August 2015. Targeted testing involves a set of questions around drug use and offending that should be considered before a decision is made on whether the arrestee is drug tested. The main aim of targeted testing was to reduce the number of negative drug tests carried out in the custody suites, while ensuring drug using offenders continue to be tested and referred to drug treatment services through the Required Assessment (RA) process¹.

However, there is some evidence that targeted testing may not be working effectively. Recent findings show a substantial reduction in the number of drug tests following the implementation of targeted testing (Critchley and Whitfield, 2016a-e), and service providers have suggested some individuals who are known Class A drug users are not being drug tested. A report investigating the impact of targeted drug testing on drug using offenders coming into treatment in Liverpool identified that the number of attempted drug tests carried out in the city's custody suites halved between 2014-15 and 2015-16 (Critchley and Whitfield, 2017). Furthermore, evidence indicated a reduction in the number of RAs imposed, criminal justice assessments and Restrictions on Bail, following the implementation of targeted testing; therefore there are lower numbers of drug using offenders coming into the treatment system as the system is missing out on crucial routine opportunities to be identify them.

The main aim of this report is to identify whether offenders who previously tested positive for Class A drugs in a Merseyside custody suite between April and September 2015 are no longer offending, or that they continue to offend but are not being drug tested. The report will also investigate the impact of criminal justice interventions and DIP on offending by comparing the offending in the 12 months prior to and 12 months following a positive drug test.

¹ Offenders who test positive for Class A drugs in the custody suite are served with an RA by the police. This is a compulsory legal sanction for the individual to attend up to two appointments (initial/follow-up RA) with a drugs worker. During these assessments the drugs worker assesses the individual's drug use and offending behaviour and, if deemed necessary, provide them with the opportunity to engage with the drug treatment services on offer.

THE POSITIVE DRUG TEST COHORT

Between April and September 2015, there were a total of 1,507 positive tests for Class A drugs across Merseyside's custody suites. Of these, there were 1,187 individuals, based on their earliest positive drug test within the six-month period. Just under two in five (38.6%) were conducted at St Anne's Street in Liverpool, followed by 25.5% in St Helens, 23.1% in Copy Lane in Sefton and 12.8% in Wirral. However it should be noted that targeted testing was implemented in Wirral's custody suite earlier than the other Merseyside areas.

OVERVIEW

Just over half (52.1%) of positive tests were for some form of opiate metabolites (both cocaine and opiates = 36.6%; opiates only = 15.5%), while the remaining positive tests were for cocaine only (47.9%; Figure 1).

Figure 1: Positive drug test result





Figure 2 shows the offence recorded at the time of the positive drug test. Two-fifths (40.2%) had been arrested for theft, followed by Misuse of Drugs Act (MDA) offences (26.5%), burglary (9.2%) and assault (6.3%).

Figure 2: Offence recorded at the time of the positive drug test²



² Please note throughout this report numbers less than five have been suppressed (with ***) to maintain confidentiality. If there is only one number less than five in a category then a second number has been suppressed to prevent back calculations from totals (e.g. <10).

OFFENDING PRE- AND POST-POSITIVE DRUG TEST

The 1,187 individuals who tested positive in the six-month period were matched to Police National Computer (PNC) records to identify arrest occasions 12 months prior to and 12 months following a positive drug test. There were 35 individuals not in the returned dataset from Merseyside Police which is likely due to incorrect PNC identifiers. There were also 280 individuals who had a PNC record at the time of the positive drug test only (i.e. there were no offences recorded in the 12 months prior to or 12 months following the positive drug test). These individuals were removed from the dataset, leaving a total of 872 individuals from the positive drug test cohort matched to the PNC dataset as having at least one offence recorded in the 12 months before and/or 12 months after the positive drug test.

Table 1 shows the number of arrest occasions prior to and following the positive drug test. Overall, both the volume of offending and the number of individuals offending reduced post-positive drug test when compared to pre-test. Individuals were arrested a total of 1,951 times during the 12 months prior to their positive drug test, compared to 1,626 arrest occasions during the 12 months following the drug test. This represents a 16.7% reduction in the number of offences following the positive drug test. Notably, 607 individuals who tested positive for Class A drugs between April and September 2015 were arrested at least once in the 12 months following the drug test, compared to 730 pre-positive drug test. This represents seven in ten (69.6%) of the positive drug test cohort.

Table 1: Number of arrest occasions pre- and post-positive drug test

Number of arrest occasions	Pre-positive drug test		Post-positive drug test	
	n	%	n	%
1	298	40.8	235	38.7
2	156	21.4	144	23.7
3	102	14.0	82	13.5
4	65	8.9	43	7.1
5	32	4.4	40	6.6
6	27	3.7	22	3.6
7	14	1.9	14	2.3
8	6	0.8	15	2.5
9	15	2.1	5	0.8
10	6	0.8	***	0.3
11	***	0.5	***	0.2
12	***	0.1	0	0.0
13	***	0.1	***	0.2
14	***	0.3	***	0.3
15	***	0.1	0	0.0
16	0	0.0	0	0.0
17	0	0.0	0	0.0
18	0	0.0	***	0.2
Total individuals	730	100.0	607	100.0


Table 2 compares trigger offences³ and non-trigger offences pre- and post-positive drug test. The proportion of trigger offences committed post-positive drug test (80.7%) was slightly higher than the proportion pre-positive drug test (79.4%). Overall, trigger offences decreased by 15.3% post-positive drug test, compared to non-trigger offences which decreased by 21.9%.

Table 2: Offence type pre- and post-positive drug test

Offence type	Pre-positive test		Post-positive test	
	n	%	n	%
Trigger	1,549	79.4	1,312	80.7
Non-trigger	402	20.6	314	19.3
Total	1,951	100.0	1,626	100.0

Figure 3 shows the offences committed in the 12 months pre- and post-positive drug test, as recorded on the PNC system. It should be noted that these PNC offence categories differ somewhat from the drug testing dataset. Theft/handling accounted for around half of all offending pre- and post-positive drug test. There were reductions post-positive drug test for most offending categories; however, they increased in robbery (44.4%), criminal damage (14.3%), burglary (10.6%) and public order (1.9%) offences.

Figure 3: Offences committed pre- and post-positive drug test⁴



³ Trigger offences are commonly associated with drug use and generally involve burglary, theft, fraud or drugs.

⁴ HOCR = Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime.

DRUG TESTING FOLLOWING RE-OFFENDING

Of the total 1,626 offences committed post-positive drug test, five were removed due to being recorded as a second offence on the same day/time as another offence for an individual. These 1,621 arrest occasions were then matched to Merseyside Police drug testing data to identify whether a drug test had been carried out. Over half (57.6%) were not drug tested (n=934; 480 individuals), while 42.4% were drug tested (n=687; 346 individuals). It should be noted that these figures include individuals who were arrested more than once (n= 219), some of which resulted in a drug test and others did not; therefore a proportion will be represented in each group, i.e. arrested and drug tested, and arrested and not drug tested.



There was a similar pattern in the number of arrest occasions between the two groups; however those not drug tested were arrested slightly more often (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Number of arrest occasions of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested






Figure 5 shows there was a higher proportion of males not drug tested (83.1%; n=399) compared to males drug tested (79.2%; n=274). In contrast, there was a higher proportion of females drug tested (20.8%; n=72) compared to females not drug tested (16.9%; n=81).

Figure 5: Gender of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested




Comparing re-offenders drug tested and not drug tested, there were differences in the patterns between the two groups (Figure 6). Of the re-offenders drug tested, proportions increased by age group peaking at 35 to 39 years (20.5%; n=71), before decreasing in those aged 40 to 44 years and 45 years and over. However, proportions fluctuated across age groups of the re-offenders not drug tested, with those aged 35 to 39 years and 40 to 44 years accounting for the largest proportions (18.3% and 18.5% respectively).

Figure 6: Age group of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested



The breakdown of the types of offences committed by those who re-offended are shown in Figure 7. Of those drug tested, theft/handling accounted for over two-thirds (67.2%; n=462) of the offences committed, followed by non-HOCR offences (9.8%; n=67), drugs (7.6%; n=52) and burglary (6.6%; n=45). Comparatively, of those not drug tested, theft/handling accounted for over one-third (36.6%; n=342), followed by non-HOCR offences (19.4%; n=181), violence (16.6%; n=155) and drugs (7.8%; n=73).

Figure 7: Offences committed by re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested



RESULTS ACROSS MERSEYSIDE

There were 872 individuals who had offences recorded prior to and/or following their positive test for Class A drugs. In order to investigate the potential level of contact with DIP, these individuals were then allocated into one of three comparison groups based on their level of contact following the positive test: i) no further contact⁵ (n=276); ii) assessed⁶ (n=337); iii) care planned⁷ (n=259). The results of multivariate analysis of variance are presented in this section.

The overall volume of offending across Merseyside reduced by 17.0% post-positive drug test (Table 3). This was a significant reduction in the number of offences committed by individuals in the 12 months post-test compared to pre-test (p<0.001). There were also significant reductions in the number of offences in all three groups. Individuals who were care planned following their positive drug test showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 0.47) and the highest proportional reduction (18.3%) in offending when compared to no further contact (16.5%) and assessed but not care planned (15.4%).

Table 3: Number of offences and level of DIP contact⁸

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	2.36	1.97	0.39	p=0.015
Assessed	1.88	1.59	0.29	p=0.020
Care planned	2.57	2.10	0.47	p=0.006
Total	2.24	1.86	0.38	p<0.001

⁵ Client was not assessed by a drugs worker.

⁶ Client was assessed by a drugs worker but was not taken onto the caseload.

⁷ Client was assessed by a drugs worker and was taken onto the caseload.

⁸ Throughout this report, findings are considered significant when p<0.05; ns = non-significant.

Table 4 shows that there was a significant reduction (16.1%; $p < 0.001$) in the mean seriousness of offences among individuals in the overall sample in the 12 months post-test compared to pre-test. Furthermore, there were significant reductions in the number of offences in all three groups. Individuals who were care planned following their positive drug test showed the most substantial reduction in the mean seriousness of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 1.50) and the highest proportional reduction (17.3%) in offending when compared to assessed but not care planned (15.9%) and no further contact (14.6%).

Table 4: Seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	7.72	6.59	1.13	$p = 0.040$
Assessed	6.02	5.06	0.96	$p = 0.017$
Care planned	8.68	7.18	1.50	$p = 0.014$
Total	7.35	6.17	1.18	$p < 0.001$

Individuals were allocated into an offending group (based on their matrix score to indicate the seriousness of the offence recorded at the time of the positive drug test⁹): i) low ($n = 443$); ii) medium ($n = 233$); iii) high ($n = 196$). There were significant reductions in the number of offences in the medium and high offending groups in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test (Table 5). Individuals in the high offending group showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 2.51) and the highest proportional reduction (45.4%) in offending compared to the reduction in offending of the medium offending group (19.6%). The number of offences in the low offending group significantly increased in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test (91.3%; mean difference = -0.63).

Table 5: Number of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	0.69	1.32	-0.63	$p < 0.001$
Medium offending	2.40	1.93	0.47	$p = 0.002$
High offending	5.53	3.02	2.51	$p < 0.001$
Total	2.24	1.86	0.38	$p < 0.001$

⁹ See Appendix 1 for further details.

There were significant reductions in the seriousness of offences in the medium and high offending groups in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test (Table 6). Individuals in the high offending group showed the most substantial reduction in the mean seriousness of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 8.65) and the highest proportional reduction (45.1%) in offending compared to the reduction in offending of the medium offending group (15.6%). The seriousness of offences in the low offending group significantly increased in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test (100.5%; mean difference = -2.12).

Table 6: Seriousness of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	2.11	4.23	-2.12	p<0.001
Medium offending	7.36	6.21	1.15	p=0.024
High offending	19.18	10.53	8.65	p<0.001
Total	7.35	6.17	1.18	p<0.001

Of the 372 individuals who tested positive for cocaine only, there was a significant reduction in the mean number of offences (21.3%; p<0.001) and in the seriousness of offending (22.2%; p=0.002) in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test. There were 138 individuals who tested positive for opiates only. There was no significant reduction in the mean number of offences (8.4%; p=0.466) or in the seriousness of offending (4.1%; p=0.753) in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test. While for individuals who tested positive for both cocaine and opiates (n=362), there was a significant reduction in the mean number of offences (16.4%; p<0.001) and in the seriousness of offending (16.0%; p<0.001) in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test.

Results of the multivariate analysis of variance by custody suite of where the positive drug test result was attained are available in Appendix 2 (Tables 7 – 22).

CONCLUSION

Although the overall volume of offending and the number of individuals offending reduced following the positive test for Class A drugs, the majority of individuals continued to offend. Almost three in five of the positive drug test cohort who re-offended following the drug test were not tested at subsequent arrests. This shows us that a substantial proportion of Class A drug using offenders are not being drug tested under the targeted testing process, thus highlighting missed opportunities to identify and engage them in treatment to reduce their drug use and offending behaviour.

Re-offending varied depending on the level of DIP involvement following the positive drug test, with the greatest reductions in proportions of offending being in individuals who had meaningful contact with DIP following the positive drug test. The reduction was greatest for those who received a care plan following their assessment with a drugs worker, suggesting the benefits of this level of DIP contact.

Data analysed for this report suggests that the DIP process, which starts with drug testing by Merseyside Police following an arrest, has a positive impact on drug using offenders. All partners involved in the process should identify the value of drug testing in engaging individuals in treatment in order to reduce future offending and drug use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The drug testing process is the main criminal justice route whereby drug using offenders are identified and assessed for treatment. However, the findings of this report clearly highlight a considerable proportion (57.6%) of drug using offenders had not been drug tested under the targeted testing process in Merseyside, and therefore an RA could not be issued as there was no positive drug test. The value of drug testing by Merseyside Police should not be underestimated as it is a key stage in the process of identifying drug using offenders and helping them to engage with local drug treatment services. Although Merseyside Police have been taking action to address the issues caused by targeted testing (i.e. offenders not being drug tested), they should continue to review their processes and monitor progress, which is supported by the Public Health Institute (PHI). Training and/or information regarding the value of drug testing in the DIP process can be provided by PHI.
- Other findings from this report illustrate the pivotal role the initial drug test and level of contact with drug treatment services can have on reducing offending behaviour of this population group. This underlines the value of steering those clients into appropriate treatment through the drug testing and RA process, highlighting the multi-agency connection that needs to exist for this process to occur successfully. It is imperative that there are effective and prompt communication channels between the police in the custody suites, the local drug treatment agency and all other drug treatment agencies across Merseyside for the successful delivery of criminal justice interventions. Although organisational operations may differ considerably, an overarching aim of assisting drug using offenders towards treatment should be shared and facilitated by all involved with the criminal justice process. High levels of communication are particularly relevant when dealing with Knowsley residents, who do not have a local custody suite. Regular feedback of any issues arising need to be encouraged and addressed, as well as adequate training where and when required.

- Local police drug testing data are not available through other reporting mechanisms; therefore this resource should be utilised by the police, drug treatment agencies and local commissioners regularly. All partners should utilise available data which allow for the monitoring of trends over time; for example, total attempted drug tests and positive drug test rates. This information will enable stakeholders to observe any changes and/or trends within their local area and across Merseyside, as well as investigating the reasons for these trends. This should then help to evidence any process changes that may be needed, in addition to highlighting potential gaps or barriers which may deter these clients from engaging with treatment services.
- Data provided by Merseyside Police (drug testing and PNC records) can provide monitoring and analysis to enable client profiling. This can help inform stakeholders of drugs used, offending behaviour and demographics of drug using offenders. Such information can identify who is more likely to present through this criminal justice route, ensuring effective and appropriate resources and services are available to cater for the needs of these individuals in the custody suite, drug treatment services and the local community.

The benefits of these recommendations are unlikely to be achieved without sustained working between all stakeholders; however their implementation would likely ensure drug using offenders are being drug tested when necessary and referred to local drug treatment services in order to reduce their offending and have a successful and positive drug treatment experience.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, T., Holloway, K. and Farrington, D. (2008). The statistical association between drug misuse and crime: a meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 13, pp. 107-118.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2016a). *Criminal Justice Project: Drug Interventions Programme. Knowsley Drug Testing Profile (2013/14 to 2015/16)*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2016b). *Criminal Justice Project. Liverpool Drug Testing Profile (2013/14 to 2015/16)*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2016c). *Criminal Justice Project: Drug Interventions Programme. Sefton Drug Testing Profile (2013/14 to 2015/16)*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2016d). *Criminal Justice Project: Drug Interventions Programme. St Helens Drug Testing Profile (2013/14 to 2015/16)*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2016e). *Criminal Justice Project: Drug Interventions Programme. Wirral Drug Testing Profile (2013/14 to 2015/16)*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Critchley, K. & Whitfield, M. (2017). *Criminal Justice Project: Impact of Targeted Testing on Drug Using Offenders Coming into Treatment in Liverpool*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Cuddy, K., Collins, P., Whitfield, M. & McVeigh, J. (2015). *An Evaluation of DIP's Impact on Offending in Merseyside*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Cuddy, K., McVeigh, J. & Collins, P. (2013). *An Evaluation of DIP's Impact on Offending in Merseyside*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Cuddy, K. & Duffy, P. (2011a). *An Evaluation of DIP's Impact on Offending in Merseyside*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Cuddy, K. & Duffy, P. (2011b). *An Evaluation of DIP's Impact on Offending in Merseyside*. Liverpool: Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University.
- Hayhurst, K. P., Jones, A., Millar, T., Pierce, M., Davies, L., Weston, S. & Donmall, M. (2013). Drug spend and acquisitive offending by substance misusers. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence*, 130, pp. 24-29.
- Pierce, M., Hayhurst, K., Bird, S. M., Hickmann, M., Seddon, T., Dunn, G. & Millar, T. (2015). Quantifying crime associated with drug use among a large cohort of sanctioned offenders in England and Wales. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence*, pp.52-59.
- Seddon, T. (2000). Explaining the drug-crime link: theoretical, policy and research issues. *Journal of Social Policy*, 29 (1), pp.95-107.
- The Crown Prosecution Service (2013). ACPO Youth Offender Case Disposal Gravity Factor Matrix [online]. Available at: <http://cps.gov.uk/legal/assets/uploads/files/Gravity%20Matrix%20May09.pdf> [accessed September 2017].

APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

For this report, we used three data sources:

- Merseyside Police
 - Drug testing data:
 - a) All offenders who tested positive for Class A drugs across Merseyside’s custody suites between April and September 2015 (positive test cohort);
 - b) All drug tests carried out between April 2015 and September 2016.
 - Police National Computer (PNC) data: all offences recorded on PNC for the above positive test cohort who were arrested between April 2014 and September 2016.
- Criminal Justice Intervention Teams Data Entry Tool (CJIT DET): data collected by DIP staff on assessment monitoring forms.

The positive test cohort was matched to PNC data to compare the number of arrest occasions and offence types committed 12 months pre- and post- positive drug test. Of those who were still offending post-drug test, data were further analysed against the police drug testing data to ascertain whether a drug test was carried out on these individuals. The resulting two groups were then compared across gender, age, number of arrest occasions and offence(s) committed. It should be noted that the data only covers offending across Merseyside and that any offending outside the area will not have been taken into account when measuring client’s level of offending.

Multivariate analysis of variance (General Linear Model) was carried out on the positive drug test cohort in relation to their level of offending and contact with DIP to compare numbers of arrests, seriousness of offending and to determine whether there were any significant differences between groups:

- The number of offences 12 months pre-test and 12 months post-test were compared to assess the significance of the difference by three DIP outcome groups, as follows:
 - No further contact – offenders who had no contact with a drugs worker recorded on CJIT DET within 28 days of their initial positive drug test.
 - Assessed – offenders who were assessed by a drugs worker within 28 days of their initial drug test but did not go on to agree a care plan (as recorded on CJIT DET).
 - Care planned – offenders who were assessed by a drugs worker within 28 days of their initial drug test and went on to agree a care plan (as recorded on CJIT DET).
- Seriousness of offences were ranked using a disposal gravity factor system, set out in the Final Warning Scheme¹⁰. The matrix classified offences on a scale of 1 (low gravity) up to 4 (high gravity), based on the seriousness of the offence. Each individual was then given a matrix score which was calculated by multiplying the number of offences committed by the seriousness of offence rating.

¹⁰ The Final Warning Scheme was drawn up by the Association of Chief Police Officers, in conjunction with the Crown Prosecution Service, the Home Office and the Youth Justice Board (The Crown Prosecution Service, 2013).

- Furthermore, levels of offending pre-positive test were examined and divided into three distinct categories in order to effectively gauge the severity of offending:
 - Low offending category – individuals with a matrix score of 4 or less
 - Medium offending category – individuals with a matrix score between 5 and 10
 - High offending category – individuals with a matrix score of over 10
- Multivariate analysis of variance was also carried out to compare the number of offences 12 months pre-test and 12 months post-test to assess the significance of the difference by Class A drug type:
 - Opiates only
 - Opiates and cocaine
 - Cocaine only

It should be noted that the above analysis was carried out on all drug tests recorded by Merseyside police and not just Merseyside residents as in the case for An Evaluation of DIP's Impact on Offending reports (Cuddy et al., 2013 and 2015; Cuddy and Duffy, 2011a and 2011b). Therefore direct comparisons should not be made with these reports as the cohort make-up is different.

COPY LANE

Overall there were significant reductions in the mean number of offences (29.3%; Table 7) and in the seriousness of offences (28.7%; Table 8) in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test. However, when comparing the level of DIP contact¹¹, results were only significant for individuals with no further contact and those care planned following the positive drug test. Individuals who were care planned showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 0.72) and in the seriousness of offences (mean difference = 2.20), as well as the highest proportional reduction (35.6% and 32.4% respectively) when compared to no further contact and assessed but not care planned.

Table 7: Copy Lane - number of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	2.16	1.50	0.66	p=0.017
Assessed	1.97	1.54	0.43	ns; p=0.150
Care planned	2.02	1.30	0.72	p=0.002
Total	2.05	1.45	0.60	p<0.001

Table 8: Copy Lane - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	6.97	4.80	2.17	p=0.027
Assessed	6.51	5.13	1.38	ns; p=0.168
Care planned	6.79	4.59	2.20	p=0.005
Total	6.77	4.83	1.94	p<0.001

¹¹ Copy Lane: no further contact = 74; assessed = 61; care planned = 66.

When comparing offending groups¹², there were significant reductions in the mean number of offences and in the mean seriousness of offences in the medium and high offending groups (Tables 9 & 10). Individuals in the high offending group showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-positive drug test (mean difference = 3.16) and in the seriousness of offences (mean difference = 11.05), as well as the highest proportional reduction (58.2% and 57.9% respectively) when compared to the medium offending group. For the low offending group, the mean number of offences significantly increased by 47.8% and the mean seriousness of offences significantly increased by 62.7% in the 12 months post-drug test.

Table 9: Copy Lane - number of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean number of offences			Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test	Difference (pre – post)	
Low offending	0.69	1.02	-0.33	p=0.019
Medium offending	2.31	1.67	0.64	p=0.017
High offending	5.43	2.27	3.16	p<0.001
Total	2.05	1.45	0.60	p<0.001

Table 10: Copy Lane - seriousness of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences			Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test	Difference (pre – post)	
Low offending	2.12	3.45	-1.33	p=0.008
Medium offending	7.16	5.23	1.93	p=0.024
High offending	19.08	8.03	11.05	p<0.001
Total	6.77	4.83	1.94	p<0.001

In regards to the positive drug test result¹³, the mean number of offences significantly reduced for individuals who tested positive for cocaine only (36.4%; p<0.001) and for both cocaine and opiates (24.5%; p=0.031) in the 12 months following the positive drug test. Furthermore, the seriousness of offences significantly reduced for individuals who tested positive for cocaine only (36.4%; p=0.003) and for both cocaine and opiates (24.4%; p=0.029) post-test. There were no significant findings for those who tested positive for opiates only.

¹² Copy Lane: low offending = 103; medium offending = 61; high offending = 37.

¹³ Copy Lane: cocaine only = 106; opiates only = 20; both (cocaine and opiates) = 75.

Overall there were significant reductions in the mean number of offences (20.7%; Table 11) and in the seriousness of offences (21.1%; Table 12) in the 12 months post-positive drug test compared to pre-test. However, when comparing the level of DIP contact¹⁴, results were only significant for individuals assessed but not care planned and individuals care planned following the positive drug test. Individuals who were care planned showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 0.66) and in the seriousness of offences (mean difference = 2.21), as well as the highest proportional reduction (22.8% and 23.0% respectively) when compared to no further contact and assessed but not care planned.

Table 11: St Anne's Street - number of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	2.63	2.17	0.46	ns; p=0.095
Assessed	2.02	1.60	0.42	p=0.025
Care planned	2.89	2.23	0.66	p=0.016
Total	2.42	1.92	0.50	p=0.001

Table 12: St Anne's Street - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	8.64	7.17	1.47	ns; p=0.124
Assessed	6.36	4.99	1.37	p=0.024
Care planned	9.61	7.40	2.21	p=0.030
Total	7.86	6.20	1.66	p=0.001

¹⁴ St Anne's Street: no further contact = 64; assessed = 165; care planned = 114.

When comparing offending groups¹⁵, there was a significant reduction in the mean number of offences (46.3%; Table 13) and in the mean seriousness of offences (46.3%; Table 14) in the 12 months post-drug test in the high offending group only. In the low offending group, the mean number of offences significantly increased by 86.6% and the seriousness of offences significantly increased by 91.5%. Although the mean number and mean seriousness of offences decreased in the medium offending group, results were non-significant.

Table 13: St Anne’s Street - number of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	0.67	1.25	-0.58	p<0.001
Medium offending	2.36	1.95	0.41	ns; p=0.063
High offending	5.94	3.19	2.75	p<0.001
Total	2.42	1.92	0.50	p=0.001

Table 14: St Anne’s Street - seriousness of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	2.01	3.85	-1.84	p<0.001
Medium offending	7.19	6.22	0.97	ns; p=0.200
High offending	20.12	10.80	9.32	p<0.001
Total	7.86	6.20	1.66	p=0.001

In regards to the positive drug test result¹⁶, the mean number of offences significantly reduced for individuals who tested positive for both cocaine and opiates (18.7%; p=0.009) in the 12 months following the positive drug test. Furthermore, the seriousness of offences significantly reduced for individuals who tested positive for cocaine only (25.6%; p=0.047) and for both cocaine and opiates (18.2%; p=0.015) post-test. There were no significant findings for those who tested positive for opiates only.

¹⁵ St Anne’s Street: low offending = 165; medium offending = 94; high offending = 84.

¹⁶ St Anne’s Street: cocaine only = 134; opiates only = 50; both (cocaine and opiates) = 159.

Overall, the mean number of offences and mean seriousness of offences reduced (10.6% and 7.5% respectively) in the 12 months post-positive drug test, though results were non-significant (Tables 15 & 16). However, when comparing the level of DIP contact¹⁷ there were some variations. The mean number of offences significantly reduced by 22.8% for individuals who had no further contact following the positive drug test, while they increased by 6.1% for individuals assessed, though not significantly. Although results were non-significant across all three groups, the mean seriousness of offences reduced by 18.2% for individuals who had no further contact following the positive drug test, while they increased for individuals assessed but not care planned and individuals who were care planned (4.3% and 0.9% respectively).

Table 15: St Helens - number of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	2.59	2.00	0.59	p=0.046
Assessed	1.47	1.56	-0.09	ns; p=0.675
Care planned	2.53	2.45	0.08	ns; p=0.854
Total	2.18	1.95	0.23	ns; p=0.288

Table 16: St Helens - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	8.46	6.92	1.54	ns; p=0.144
Assessed	4.65	4.85	-0.20	ns; p=0.777
Care planned	8.76	8.84	-0.08	ns; p=0.959
Total	7.19	6.65	0.54	ns; p=0.504

¹⁷ St Helens: no further contact = 87; assessed = 75; care planned = 51.

When comparing offending groups¹⁸, there was a significant increase in the mean number (74.6%; Table 17) and mean seriousness of offences (88.3%; Table 18) in the low offending group in the 12 months following the positive drug test, while there was a significant reduction in the mean number and mean seriousness (36.5% and 34.3% respectively) in the high offending group. Although results were non-significant in the medium offending group, the mean number reduced by 9.7% and the mean seriousness of offences reduced by 2.3% post-test.

Table 17: St Helens - number of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	0.71	1.24	-0.53	p=0.005
Medium offending	2.48	2.24	0.24	ns; p=0.546
High offending	5.15	3.27	1.88	p<0.001
Total	2.18	1.95	0.23	ns; p=0.288

Table 18: St Helens - seriousness of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	2.13	4.01	-1.88	p=0.004
Medium offending	7.54	7.37	0.17	ns; p=0.903
High offending	18.08	11.87	6.21	p<0.001
Total	7.19	6.65	0.54	ns; p=0.504

In regards to the positive drug test result¹⁹, the mean number of offences reduced across all drug groups, though results were non-significant. The mean seriousness of offences increased by 5.4% for individuals who tested positive for opiates only, though results were non-significant.

¹⁸ St Helens: low offending = 115; medium offending = 46; high offending = 52.

¹⁹ St Helens: cocaine only = 94; opiates only = 40; both (cocaine and opiates) = 79.

Overall, the mean number of offences and mean seriousness of offences increased (8.6% and 6.2% respectively) in the 12 months post-positive drug test, though results were non-significant (Tables 19 & 20). Results were also non-significant across the three levels of DIP contact²⁰; however the mean number and mean seriousness of offences decreased post-test for individuals assessed but not care planned following the positive drug test (12.7% and 12.8% respectively). Individuals who had no further contact following the positive test showed the most substantial reduction in the mean number of offences pre- and post-test (mean difference = 0.47) and in the seriousness of offences (mean difference = 1.53), as well as the highest proportional reduction (24.7% and 23.9% respectively) when compared to those care planned.

Table 19: Wirral - number of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	1.90	2.37	-0.47	ns; p=0.270
Assessed	1.97	1.72	0.25	ns; p=0.506
Care planned	2.64	2.82	-0.18	ns; p=0.775
Total	2.10	2.28	-0.18	ns; p=0.630

Table 20: Wirral - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
No further contact	6.39	7.92	-1.53	ns; p=0.297
Assessed	6.47	5.64	0.83	ns; p=0.531
Care planned	9.25	9.32	-0.07	ns; p=0.974
Total	7.11	7.55	-0.44	ns; p=0.789

²⁰ Wirral: no further contact = 51; assessed = 36; care planned = 28.

When comparing offending groups²¹, there was a significant increase in the mean number (197.3%; Table 21) and mean seriousness of offences (201.7%; Table 22) in the low offending group in the 12 months following the positive drug test, while there was a significant reduction in the mean number and mean seriousness (39.7% and 42.6%) of offences in the high offending group. Although results were non-significant in the medium offending group, the mean number reduced by 24.2% and the mean seriousness of offences reduced by 20.2% post-test.

Table 21: Wirral - number of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean number of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	0.73	2.17	-1.44	p<0.001
Medium offending	2.56	1.94	0.62	ns; p=0.165
High offending	5.04	3.04	2.00	p=0.006
Total	2.10	2.28	-0.18	ns; p=0.630

Table 22: Wirral - seriousness of offences and offending groups

Groups compared	Mean seriousness of offences		Difference (pre – post)	Significance
	12 months pre-test	12 months post-test		
Low offending	2.33	7.03	-4.70	p<0.001
Medium offending	7.94	6.34	1.60	ns; p=0.294
High offending	18.43	10.57	7.86	p=0.003
Total	7.11	7.55	-0.44	ns; p=0.789

In regards to the positive drug test result²², the mean number of offences reduced by 5.4% for individuals who tested positive for both cocaine and opiates in the 12 months following the drug test, while they increased for those who tested positive for cocaine only and opiates only (16.5% 37.2% respectively); however results were non-significant. The mean seriousness of offences reduced by 8.0% for individuals who tested positive for both cocaine and opiates post-test, while they increased for those who tested positive for cocaine only and opiates only (17.8% 40.8% respectively); however results were non-significant.

²¹ Wirral: low offending = 60; medium offending = 32; high offending = 23.

²² Wirral: cocaine only = 38; opiates only = 28; both (cocaine and opiates) = 49.

INDEX OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Positive drug test result	4
Figure 2: Offence recorded at the time of the positive drug test.....	5
Figure 3: Offences committed pre- and post-positive drug test	7
Figure 4: Number of arrest occasions of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested.....	8
Figure 5: Gender of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested	9
Figure 6: Age group of re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested.....	9
Figure 7: Offences committed by re-offenders, drug tested vs. not drug tested.....	10

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1: Number of arrest occasions pre- and post-positive drug test	6
Table 2: Offence type pre- and post-positive drug test.....	7
Table 3: Number of offences and level of DIP contact	11
Table 4: Seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact.....	12
Table 5: Number of offences and offending groups.....	12
Table 6: Seriousness of offences and offending groups	13
Table 7: Copy Lane - number of offences and level of DIP contact	19
Table 8: Copy Lane - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact	19
Table 9: Copy Lane - number of offences and offending groups.....	20
Table 10: Copy Lane - seriousness of offences and offending groups.....	20
Table 11: St Anne's Street - number of offences and level of DIP contact.....	21
Table 12: St Anne's Street - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact	21
Table 13: St Anne's Street - number of offences and offending groups.....	22
Table 14: St Anne's Street - seriousness of offences and offending groups.....	22
Table 15: St Helens - number of offences and level of DIP contact.....	23
Table 16: St Helens - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact.....	23
Table 17: St Helens - number of offences and offending groups	24
Table 18: St Helens - seriousness of offences and offending groups	24
Table 19: Wirral - number of offences and level of DIP contact.....	25
Table 20: Wirral - seriousness of offences and level of DIP contact.....	25
Table 21: Wirral - number of offences and offending groups	26
Table 22: Wirral - seriousness of offences and offending groups	26

