Country: BELGIUM

Partner organisation   CAD LIMBURG vzw

Course site(s):   Provincie Limburg - Genk

Contact person: Carlo Baeten

I. Basics

1. Are there any differences between the intended target groups for FreD goes net and what was actually achieved?

Below is a summary of the intended target groups as originally defined. Please delete the entries in the column "planned" and replace them with the correct information for your country in the new column "implemented".

Criterion	PLANNED (according to 2008 RAR)	IMPLEMENTED (Pilot phase 2009)	brief comment if necessary
Age	14 to 21-year-olds		
Access route	– Police / judiciary system – School –	Parents	
manner of (first) coming to notice	It is possible to also include youths that have come to notice several times on account of their drug use	YES	Iff diagnosis = no addiction
Substances	– Illegal drugs except heroin – Alcohol		
classification of drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	experimental	High risk is referred to other traject

2. Meeting the main aims

2.1. Was it possible to implement FreD goes net in the pilot regions?

[X] yes   [ ] no

Comments:

Police and schools formulated the necesity of this kind of early intervention after another experiment in the region. So the concept was already known. There was a need and no alternative offer.

2.2. *In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to improving access to drug-consuming adolescents and young adults?*

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Before FreD there was no traject for (not addicted) drug consuming adolescents (exept experiment). There was the acces route (school/police) but none adapted intervention for young people. FreD improved communication in the network and provided us from the answer to the needs from schools/police.

2.3. *In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to developing or improving cooperative relationships between the chosen settings (police, schools etc) and drug counselling organisations/institutions (course sites)?*

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Yes, the relation between counselling (CAD) and settings was a problem, because if no diagnosis addiction young people were send back because of no offer for them. Young people communicated to schools/police that even specialists consider they have no problem. Now there is an offer and rules for communication are clear – rapport to school/police.

2.4. *If cooperation as set out in 2.3 was successfully established/developed, will it be sustainable and continue beyond the pilot phase?*

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Yes we continue Early Intervention because of the number off participants and the expectation of the network.

2.5. *Were there any specific conditions/changes (political, economic) in your country during the first two years of FreD goes net that affected the implementation of the project?*

☐ yes ☒ no

II. RAR

In the first project year all partners used the method of RAR to carry out a stocktake of the current situation and current needs. This consisted of three elements:

– Background research,
– Interviews with key persons
– Identifying „good practice projects".

Results were documented in country reports.

1.   Did you identify good practice projects in your country that met the agreed criteria?

☒ yes   ☐ no

2.   Looking at it retrospectively after concluding the pilot phase: Was the method of RAR useful in identifying suitable settings for your site(s)?

☐ yes   ☒ no

Reasons for this:

Because a similar experiment (early intervention) already existed, the RAR did not bring much new information.

3.   Judging by the results it achieved, and based on your professional perspective, was the time spent on the RAR exercise justified?

☒ yes   ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Not much new information, but it made the network stronger, motivated settings and did us make clear appointmens aboud sharing information and reporting.

4.   Would you recommend this method of stocktaking to other early intervention projects?

☒ yes   ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Networking !!!

III. Cooperation

1. Implementation of FreD goes net requires **viable cooperative relationships between the participating institutions. What methods of establishing/maintaining these have proven successful in your pilot region?** (e.g. informal verbal agreements, formal written agreements, regular meetings, agreements at certain levels of hierarchy) Please describe these.

Informal agreements – community based
Formal agreements with justice/police about information sharing/reporting + timing (ending the hole traject and reporting within 6 moths) – regional level.
Participation in FreD as a condition to take part in a schoolservey and as a condition to get help in elaborating drugpolicy for individual schools.

2. **What difficulties were encountered in developing and maintaining cooperative relationships?**

Please describe these.

1. information sharing
2. distance between place of living and place of fred-courses
3. expectations from parents/schools : FreD as punishment and target : never use again

3. **Did you enter into any written cooperation agreements?**

$\boxed{X}$ yes ☐ no

If yes: How many such agreements did you have and with which cooperation partners?

– Site 1: (Name of town)

1. Police/justice

4. **Was there a local steering group for implementing the FreD approach?**

$\boxed{X}$ yes ☐ no

If yes, please list the members and rate the work of the steering group in implementing FreD goes net for each of the pilot sites.

– Site 1: (Name of town)

Katarsis : institution for treatment (official partner for people send by police)
VAD : Vereniging voor alcohol- en andere Drugproblemen (Network in Flanders)

5. **Please list those institutions/organisations/services that really did refer young persons to the courses.**

Police / judicial system
Which institutions and divisions exactly were these? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? Why was cooperation successful in these specific cases?

Local police : In Limburg there are 4 districts for police. Young people were referred by all of the 4 districts.
Contcact : local policeman (on the street), youthpolice and social police services.
Finaly they could do "something" with first offenders, in their opinion as an alternative punishment.

School
What types of school? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? What characterises the schools that were willing to cooperate/where cooperation was successful?

Student counseling services in schools
CLB : external student counseling
Directors from schools (as responsible for Punishment policy)-legal system.
School who offer $^1/_2$ lessons $^1/_2$ work
Secondary school (12-18j) : all types
Finally they could do "something" with first offenders, in their opinion as an alternative punishment.

Other settings, specifically:
What divisions/ contact persons (function/position)?
Why was cooperation successful in these cases?
Parents – as a supplementary offer after information-sessions

6. **Chapter 4.4 of the manual gives recommendations for successfully establishing structures of cooperation. Did you find these tips helpful?**

☐ yes   ☒ no
Reasons for this:

Not in our case because already known as an experiment.

7. **Do you have any further suggestions or comments on the topic of "cooperation"?**

Proposal, introduction from FreD as an element of an integrated system, not as a stand-alone intervention.

IV. Access

1. The role of the respective legal provisions in facilitating access to FreD courses:

The manual presents an overview of the legal provisions that currently apply in each country. After completing the pilot phase, would you say these facilitate or obstruct access to drug-using youngsters?

Police context / judiciary system:

☒ Current provisions facilitate access   ☐ obstruct access

reasons for this:

Finaly they could do "something" with first offenders, in their opinion as an alternative punishment. And in case of young people referred by police it is really used as an alternative punishment.
If they do not complete FreD the is a referral to youth court off justice.

School context:

☒ Current provisions facilitate access   ☐ obstruct access

reasons for this:

Finaly they could do "something" with first offenders, in their opinion as an alternative punishment. – No legal background for this only the common feeling of necessity to react on first offenders.

Other (please state which):

☐ Current provisions facilitate access   ☐ obstruct access

2. Were there any differences between these legal provisions (and any other rules and agreements) 'on paper' and their implementation 'in real life'?

☐ yes   ☒ no

3. Which flyer did you use for 'your' young persons? Please enclose 5 copies.

☒ yes   ☐ no

Basically used the available   or   developed our own flyer
flyer (the template)

4.   Did you change any of the main messages of the template?

☐ yes   ☒ no

5.   Can the universal flyer for young persons (the emplate) be included as a recommendation in the handbook or does it need to be changed in any way?

Yes, it is OK.

6.   What are typical situations for youngsters to come to the notice of a particular setting and be referred to FreD?

Typical situation of coming to the notice...

of the police / judiciary system	The fact of consuming/possesion illegal drugs
of school	The fact of consuming/possesion illegal drugs ore be suspicious + excessive use of alcohol
of another setting (please state which):	Parents : The fact of consuming/possesion illegal drugs ore be suspicious + excessive use of alcohol

7.   What benefits can young persons draw from taking part in a course that could motivate them enough to contact the course leader?

gains or benefits obtained from participation

Police / judiciary system	They are obliged – by law
School	They are obliged – if they want to stay on the school
Other setting (please state which):	To arrange life "normally" in the family.

8. FreD goes net works to the principle that "coming to notice on account of legal or illegal drug use is followed by intervention." For your chosen settings, please describe a **typical chain of events/the individual steps from first being noticed all the way to completing the intervention** (bullet points; if needed refer to the chart "Alex is caught…" from the ppt of the kick-off workshop – see attachments of the e-mail that was used to send out this questionnaire).

-caught by police
-policy gives them a referal-formular
-Youngster phones for first contact
-intake/ check in- and exclusion criteria
-sesssions
-individual evaluation session

9. **Were the parents involved in referring the youngsters to FreD?**

☒ yes   ☐ no

If yes:

– How and in what form were they involved?

Intake (obliged by law if -18j)
Information session for parents (at the same time as 1 session for young people)
Evaluation session

– Would you recommend parental involvement to new FreD sites?

☒ yes   ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Community reinforcement !
Law : -18!

10. **Do you have any other comments on the topic of access? What measures do you find helpful in facilitating access to the intake interview and/or course?**

As an element in total of integrated system for prevention and treatment

V. Implementing the intervention (Intake and courses)

1. After the intake interview, what were typical reasons for you to find that FreD was unsuitable for the adolescent/young adult in question?

4. IQ
5. History of treatment for addiction
6. Age
7. Not capabel to work in a group
8. Diagnosis off addiction

2. On average, how many weeks were there between the intake interview and the beginning of the course?

5 weeks

3. Up to this point, at which sites did you carry out how many courses with how many participants?

Name of site 1: Genk
14courses with 101 participants

4. How many sessions did you divide the course into?

☐ **2 sessions**   ☒ **3 sessions**   ☐ **4 sessions**

5. Did some of the sessions also take place at weekends?

☐ yes   ☒ no

6. How satisfied are you generally with the exercises that currently make up the course?

Please rank on a scale from 1 to 4
(1 = very satisfied, 4 = not at all satisfied)

2

7. **Please name (up to 3) exercises that have proven particularly effective:** The following should definitely remain in the manual (please give the exercise name and number):

   Scale 0-10
   Quiz (knowledge)
   Consume graph

8. **Were there any exercises in the course that proved ineffective or too difficult to implement?**

   ☒ yes   ☐ no

   If yes: please list a maximum of three together with the respective name and number.

   Check yourself

9. **Are there any other exercises you would like to be included in the manual?**

   ☒ yes   ☐ no

   If yes: please write them out separately in the format of the manual and attach to this report.

   Atomium

10. **Was / is implementing the FreD courses something that enriches your work?**
    Did you gain any particular insights? Did something unexpected happen?

    Improve contacts with settings (school/police)
    FreD was a answer for an existing need

11. **What are your experiences with respect to group composition?**
    (gender, age, different substances consumed, different patterns of consumption etc)

    - same age
    - most male
    - cannabis !
    - experimental use (but in many cases not harmless)

12. **Do you have any further comments/ideas/recommendations on the topic of course implementation?**

VI. Summary

1. **Do you find the overall concept and approach of FreD goes net convincing?**
Please rate on a scale from 1 (yes, very) to 4 (no, not at all)

2

2. **2. If you had several pilot sites: Were your experiences at each site fundamentally different? (e.g. with respect to cooperation, access or course implementation)**
Skip this question if there was only one pilot site.

☐ yes   ☐ no

3. **Please summarise the aspects you consider central for each of the thematic blocks.**

	aspects that obstruct…
… cooperation	Problem of communication about realistic aims of the course Young people sometimes even amuse themselves and communicate in a positive way about the course (and that is no punishment !!!)
… access	
… course implementation	Location "far away" 1 group each month, waiting list 2/3 moths, early ?

	aspects that facilitate…
… cooperation	Networking, integrated system
… access	Wednesday afternoon Young, motivated, well-trained trainers
… course implementation	